

FINAL REPORT

**COLLABORATIVE EVALUATION AND PROCESS
CONSULTATION SERVICES TO THE NON-
TRADITIONAL AGRICULTURAL EXPORT SUPPORT
PROJECT (PROEXAG) IN CENTRAL AMERICA**

Presented to:

**Regional Office for Central American Programs (ROCAP)
Guatemala City, Guatemala**

By:

**David A. Schrier
Checchi and Company Consulting, Inc.
1730 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-3193**

**Under IQC No. PDC-0085-I-00-6097-00
Delivery Order # 41**

December 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
OVERVIEW	1
I. FINDINGS	4
A. General Themes	4
1. PROEXAG Performance	5
2. Project Strategy Issues	10
3. Shortcomings	12
B. Specific Findings by Respondent Population	13
1. USAID Missions in Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras	13
2. Growers/Shippers	14
3. Agricultural Federations	14
4. PROEXAG	15
5. ROCAP	15
II. RESULTS	17
III. OBSERVATIONS ON COLLABORATIVE EVACUATION AND PROCESS CONSULTATION FOR ROCAP PROJECTS	22
IV. METHODOLOGY OF THE COLLABORATIVE EVALUATION	25
A. Methodology	25
B. Conceptual Framework	28
ATTACHMENTS	
I	SCOPE OF WORK
II	LIST OF EVALUATION PARTICIPANTS

OVERVIEW

This report summarizes the activities and findings of a collaborative evaluation carried out by Checchi and Company Consulting, Inc. for the Non-Traditional Agricultural Export Support (NTAES) Project # 596-018. This ROCAP project was authorized in December 1985 and became operational in September 1986 through a contract with Chemonics International, a technical services firm that specializes in agricultural development. The project is intended to strengthen private sector capabilities related to production and marketing of agricultural exports from Central America.

A collaborative evaluation may be defined as a structured self-assessment of a project that actively involves the interested parties in refining the issues to be evaluated, in conducting the analysis, and in developing a shared plan of action, as opposed to an independent assessment by a team of outside analysts that provide the answers. The Checchi team was led by Dr. David Schrier, a specialist in process consultation who served as evaluation facilitator. The second team member was Mr. Roland Kemp, a produce industry specialist with expertise in non-traditional agricultural export development. The team's objective was to guide ROCAP and the Chemonics staff through a process that asked tough questions and assembled data that could be analyzed and acted upon in a practical way to make the project more successful.

The collaborative evaluation process was completed by an evaluation workshop held on September 8 and 9, 1988. The workshop was attended by ROCAP staff, the Chemonics project team (PROEXAG is the name used by the team which is headquartered in Guatemala City) and the Checchi evaluators. This workshop focused both on implementing operational improvements within

PROEXAG and on clarifying and strengthening relationships between PROEXAG and ROCAP.

Improvements in the PROEXAG Project were guided by data obtained from written questionnaires and follow-up interviews with respondents from the following populations: Agricultural Federations, Growers/Shippers, the USAID (bilateral) Missions, ROCAP, and PROEXAG. The workshop participants agreed on seven improvements; in addition, teambuilding was achieved among PROEXAG and ROCAP staffs that is likely to leave behind an ongoing capacity to bring about organizational improvements.

The survey and interview data provided an important reference point for planning change and "checking-out" perceptions of the project among those who work with PROEXAG throughout the region. The data revealed valuable perceptions of PROEXAG's effectiveness which permitted some conclusions to be drawn in the sense of overall trends. However, these data would have been insufficient without the in-depth analysis that occurred during the evaluation workshop, where data distortions and self-serving statements by respondents were identified and screened out. In fact, a great deal of insight was gained through the process of untangling perceptions and uncovering the hidden agendas of respondents.

Overall, PROEXAG is seen as an excellent resource that federations and growers can't get enough of. PROEXAG is a principal source of practical, high level and timely consulting advice available to growers in the region. The full-time PROEXAG staff, backed up by what is unanimously perceived by growers, Agricultural Federations, and USAID personnel as a team of excellent short-term specialists, has had a highly visible impact on pre-takeoff stage ventures and active agricultural export ventures throughout the region. The survey results show that the new Chief of Party for PROEXAG has, in a very short time,

reorganized a problem-ridden and leaderless project into an increasingly well directed and effective one. There is a consensus throughout the region that PROEXAG is headed in the right direction. An important conclusion of the workshop participants was that the PROEXAG Project is well regarded and is meeting perceived assistance needs.

The remainder of this report is organized as follows:

Section I	Findings
Section II	Results
Section III	Methodology
Section IV	Notes on the Collaborative Evaluation Process

I. FINDINGS

The first part of this section (Subsection A) focuses on the general themes or patterns that emerged through analysis of the survey data in its entirety, while the second part (Subsection B) summarizes findings specific to each respondent population: Agricultural Federations, Growers/Shippers, USAID Missions, ROCAP, and PROEXAG. Caution should be used in interpreting the population-specific data since rigorous sampling procedures were not employed. This is particularly true in the case of growers/shippers where the sample size was very small relative to the total population.

A. General Themes

The following outline is used to present the general themes revealed through analysis of the questionnaire and interview data:

1. PROEXAG Performance
 - a. Overall satisfaction
 - b. Staff excellence
 - c. Two distinct levels of performance in PROEXAG history
2. Project Strategy Issues
 - a. Deal making versus federation strengthening
 - b. Use of channel captains
 - c. Crop and country jealousy
3. Shortcomings
 - a. Unpredictability of response
 - b. Lack of communication to user audiences concerning resource limitations and service

capabilities

c. Lack of work plans tailored to user needs

1. PROEXAG Performance

The most consistent theme reflected in the data is the high regard in which the PROEXAG Project is held by all respondent populations. Although the questionnaires and interviews tended to focus on critical perceptions more fully than on positive ones, positive findings nonetheless predominate.

a. Overall Satisfaction

All populations rated their overall satisfaction with the PROEXAG Project in the positive range. The depth and sincerity of this satisfaction is shown through interview comments, of which the following are illustrative:

"I started in French stringbeans even before Ricardo Frohmader gave me seeds for experiments while demand in the U.S. was growing really fast. They helped me find brokers with whom I now do business. The seeds that Ricardo gave me, eight varieties, resulted in two that are very good for me. The market has reacted to these two. I might have found out about these; but who knows when, or, if at all."

"I trust PROEXAG and call them for help. I have the good luck of having their professional help and friendship. If there are other consultants who give advice as good as their advice has been for me, then I don't know them."

"They helped me find new brokers and they push new products that have markets. PROEXAG complements the Federation; if PROEXAG didn't exist it would have to be invented."

"PROEXAG has done better than A.I.D. directly. They did it perfectly in asparagus. A.I.D. could not have made that project efficient, the way PROEXAG does."

"This help could not have been better. It would have taken years to get where we are now with the overland shipment of melons without PROEXAG's help linking us to receivers."

"Dr. Mondonedo visited my farm and we started varietal trials on 1/6 manzana in blueberries and strawberries. The results were excellent and I will plant 6 manzanas (ten and a half acres) now on a commercial export level. Sure I heard of these crops, but maybe I wouldn't have done it without the PROEXAG staff. Or maybe it would have taken years instead of four months."

Help with selection of crop variety was reported to be very useful. "If you don't have the right variety the project is dead. We think we have selected the right ones with their help." In the case of seedless watermelons, "I think this will develop projects, maybe even an industry, this is true of asparagus too." "The trips were very useful. RF introduced us to Sunworld, he was a good bridge. As a result we will plant 40 acres of seedless; without RF we would not be doing this."

"I feel comfortable with the project, it's a well designed vehicle and a hell of a good complement to our activities. What we can't get from our people we get from them. They wanted a seminar on asparagus and PROEXAG was the only one who could it. Mondonedo and RF put it on. It was good."

"PROEXAG has opened a new gate, a new opportunity we are all excited about."

These comments are representative of the survey findings regarding overall satisfaction with PROEXAG's performance. This overall satisfaction is the most forceful message of the data in terms of the emotional tone and frequency with which it was expressed, and the emphasis placed on it during opening and closing comments by respondents.

b. Staff Excellence

The fulltime PROEXAG staff is held in very high regard, so much so that a major problem now confronting PROEXAG is the need to communicate its service limitations in the light of the strong demand throughout the region for staff time. Short-term consultants made available by PROEXAG also received high marks.

It is widely acknowledged that the PROEXAG staff regularly works 60 or 70 hours per week. There is also a feeling that, in

this sense, they may be stretched too thin. This ties in with the discussion of PROEXAG shortcomings under point (3) below.

Comments on the PROEXAG staff often made reference to its dedication, professionalism, responsibility, technical competence, and ability to deliver. For example:

"I have to be sincere; they have been very helpful to me and even gave me their home phone numbers."

"I don't know if there is anyone else qualified to give us PROEXAG's level of training."

"RF has brought in people where I had a problem with a cooperative. He even called brokers to have them call me. I have no gripes, quite the contrary."

"What I see from RF is a solid flow of good information. I get a quick response and good answers especially in melons."

"I trust PROEXAG and call them; they help. I have the good luck of having their professional help and friendship. If there are other consultants who give advice as good as their advice has been for me, then I don't know them."

"They have done quite a lot. P. Michel stays in touch with me and sends down important information on transportation. She has convinced some steamship companies to come down here and she is always informing me on what's going on."

"I got a call from J.L., he said he had a few free days and sent Bruce. Bruce discovered there was no back up for the hard disk. While he was solving that problem, it turned out by coincidence that we were conducting interviews for the computer position at FEPROEXAAH. HE just fit in. Following that, Bruce was here to follow up on the hard disk solution. We had a serious roof leak and Bruce knew exactly what to do with a wet computer. He was here and he knew how to dry it out."

"The stuff Bruce has been doing is real good, not just with FEPROEXAAH, he is one of the best examples of where particular expertise is matched with what is needed."

"These people are very practical; not full of theory, they get down to the farmer level. We don't have such luck with university professors and other consultants; they talk too scientifically."

One USAID Private Sector Officer said of the PROEXAG staff, "They are the best talent money can buy."

"You can trust his word, he is so dependable. If he says he will meet you at 5:00 AM he will be there."

"He is totally dedicated. We learned in one harvest what would have taken two or three years otherwise."

"He is tough and direct, I like that. He needs to come more often, but something is better than nothing. I like how he works."

"We started melons not knowing anything, PROEXAG started our melon program, without them I would not have started."

"He has a good work attitude and is "exigente como el diablo," at first we were bothered by his demanding style, now I like him."

c. Two Distinct Levels of Performance in PROEXAG's History

The new Chief of Party arrived just several months prior to the evaluation. The data indicate that a clear turnaround occurred in the project following his arrival. The new COP has in this short time reorganized a problem-ridden and leaderless project into an increasingly well-directed and effective one. Perceptions of difficulties surrounding previous leadership are quickly fading away. It should be mentioned that at about the same time the new COP arrived, ROCAP also welcomed a new Regional Agricultural Development Officer, and a new Regional Evaluation Officer. These new staff have strengthened the ROCAP side of the equation and contributed to recent project improvements.

There was clear indication from the survey respondents that the project had been headed in the wrong direction as a management unit until the new COP arrived. The following comments describe this theme quite well:

"I had trouble answering the questionnaire. I mean, for which period, before Lamb or after? Things have been

working out over the past two months, before that, J.L. was just getting it under control."

"You now have experience, quick response. Before, you forgot they came or just got there. Now you get a trip report, we see this particularly in J.L. and R.F."

"Historically it was here is what they want to do and here is what we want to do. Now we are listening to each other and finding what we want to do together. We are finally meeting in the middle."

"Now they are coming up with it quickly because PROEXAG deals directly with FEPROEXAAH. That's OK, as long as they keep me informed. The last two months are better, much better."

"Why? Well, it's because both sides are getting better at developing specific kinds of work plans and specific objectives. Both institutions are doing that, rather than just saying let's do this together and let's do that together. Complementarity is flowing out of this -- they are matching up."

"We are working more closely and they are more involved with us. It's probably because of the new boss."

"An exercise in self-deception is to think that Ag. officers know what PROEXAG is up to and know what they are doing. The linkage now in this sense of the project is where both of us feel we are adequately informed. The directives are good, keep on doing what you have been doing lately."

The lack of common understanding of PROEXAG's scope of work may also reflect the difficulty of shaking loose from the problems identified with past leadership. The following interview dialogue shows the underlying rationale for any negative scores given PROEXAG by one Federation Manager who is still holding on to history:

"I sent them a memo, Feb. 23, 1987, that was a complete list of what we wanted from them. They never responded. They still haven't responded. John has spoken to me about one of my requests regarding short-term consultants, I know he is busy recruiting for one now, but he hasn't responded to the memo. There were approximately 12 specific requests that I made." Question: "Have you asked John about the memo? After all, he only arrived three months ago, it's possible he did not see it as it was submitted to his predecessor."

Answer: "No, I haven't, maybe I should."

2. Project Strategy Issues

This theme refers largely to problems that emerged during the first 18 months of the project and were inherited by the current COP. It should be mentioned that while these strategic issues did surface in the evaluation, leadership in both PROEXAG and ROCAP had long recognized the need to resolve problems associated with them and to move on.

a. Deal-Making versus Federation Strengthening

A.I.D. agricultural projects traditionally have focused on strengthening organizations of agricultural producers (i.e. federations) as development vehicles. However, because PROEXAG places importance on deals as a key to export success in the produce industry, PROEXAG staff often work directly with individual growers and shippers, some of whom may not even be federation members. The following comment illustrates this point.

"The unit of economic development where growth must occur is the enterprise; the unit of action for the produce industry is the deal, which is their term for a business transaction benefitting two enterprises. IF the NTAE sector is to grow, enterprises and deals must prosper."

The new PROEXAG leadership has been building relationships with Federations in such a way that there is now less tendency to see Federation strengthening and deal-making consultations with growers as an either/or dilemma. The Federations appreciate the help that PROEXAG is providing to growers and are increasingly guiding such help so that both Federation strengthening and grower assistance occurs simultaneously. PROEXAG has become more persuasive in stating its case through discussions with the bilateral USAID Missions and ROCAP that the allocation of level

of effort between the growers and the Federations must also be decided on a country-by-country basis, as the Federations' needs vary greatly among countries. Thus, it appears that this problem is already being solved.

b. The Use of Channel Captains

Some survey respondents expressed concern about a tendency of PROEXAG to focus its assistance efforts on growers who are already established (i.e. "channel captains") rather than on small or marginal growers. This issue is also being resolved to the extent that ROCAP understands that "channel captains" are better able than less established growers to take the major business risks involved in the development of new export crops and follow-through in the market place. But there is unresolved concern among USAID Mission staff about the guided transfer of technology that will diffuse export success to smaller growers. Some feel that technology transfer in these settings is unavoidable and will happen automatically. Other USAID Mission staff feel differently; one questioned what would be left behind by successful deals with channel captains. Another went as far as to say, "We never fund Step I until we know what Step II is; PROEXAG doesn't know what Step II is yet."

c. Crop and Country Jealousy

Within each country there is a tendency on the part of user audiences to think PROEXAG should be spending more time and energy with them. Similarly, crop groups in each country tend to feel that their crop is not receiving the level of attention of other crops. This theme was observed throughout the region.

3. Shortcomings

The shortcomings noted in the PROEXAG Project by respondent populations across-the-board do not reveal any crippling problems. The few problems noted are manageable ones which are already being addressed by both PROEXAG and ROCAP.

a. Unpredictability of Response

This problem reflects the need for work plans, for time for new leadership to address past problems, and for communication to users of PROEXAG's service limitations. Unpredictability means that at times PROEXAG responds quickly, at other times slowly, and at other times not at all.

"When we were reorganizing FEPROEXAAH we called PROEXAG for experts to develop work plans for commodities. We wanted to build clear objectives for 12 months. We expected them, they never came. Maybe they had other engagements."

"The consistency with PROEXAG response varies. One time RF will respond immediately and go to the U.S. to inspect our shipments. But another time JGS could not check out virus problem until the season was already over. Another time RF and J. Mondonedo organized a very successful asparagus seminar that began fifteen days after our request. It's just that their response is unpredictable."

"They are professional, we have no complaints with that, except we need more time with them and a quicker response in some cases. Yes, their advice is great, but we can't rely on their timing."

During interviews at one Federation, concerns about not understanding the complete range of services offered by PROEXAG, delays in response, or non-response, were brought up repeatedly by respondents. In general, the respondents acknowledged that these concerns were no doubt inter-related and that they were consistent with their perception that the PROEXAG staff was spread very thin. No personal criticism was intended; this Federation was very complimentary of the PROEXAG staff and

impressed by their technical competence.

b. Lack of Communication Concerning Resource Limitations and Service Capabilities

To overcome this problem, PROEXAG needs to make a realistic appraisal of its ability to respond, and to communicate this to its user audience in unambiguous terms. This problem is already being addressed within PROEXAG.

c. Lack of Work Plans Tailored to User Needs

Federation and USAID Mission representatives interviewed felt that PROEXAG's overall objective had been communicated, but that what was needed was an annual work plan and, later, quarterly work plans by country. Many respondents felt that the distribution of a specific list of services and lead time requirements would set important limits on the expectations of Federations and growers who were overly demanding.

B. Specific Findings by Respondent Population

The themes described above represent the consensus views of all respondent populations covered by the survey. Findings that are specific to a particular respondent population are described below.

1. USAID Missions in Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras

USAID Mission representatives took particularly note of the dramatic improvements in PROEXAG performance that they had been observed in the past few months. Two respondents in this category admitted that difficulties within their respective missions may have contributed to some of PROEXAG's past perfor-

mance problems. All agreed that linkages and working relationships between the missions and PROEXAG could be further strengthened; representatives from three of the four missions noted the importance of coordinating project activities with the Federations. The need for focused work plans was also strongly communicated in interviews with USAID personnel, as was the need to develop a follow-on strategy to ensure the transfer of technology -- a concern that was also shared by ROCAP staff.

2. Growers/Shippers

The growers and shippers were perhaps the most emotional of the respondent populations in their praise of PROEXAG. They represent the bottom line in PROEXAG's strategy, and it shows. Growers and shippers interviewed often described their relationship with PROEXAG as a valuable partnership, citing example after example of new markets, new varietal trials, new solutions to problems, new transportation alternatives, etc. attributable to PROEXAG Project services. However, data for this population must be interpreted with caution in light of the small sample size and non-randomness of the sampling procedures utilized. Some of the interview comments also contained self-serving statements.

The grower/shippers were second only in the Federations in terms of emphasis placed on the need for clarification of PROEXAG's role and range of services. Crop and country jealousy exists very strongly at the grower level. Growers in Salvador are jealous of PROEXAG attention in Guatemala, and most other crop groups resent the attention being given by PROEXAG to melon producers.

3. Agricultural Federations

The Federations were the most vocal of the respondent populations in expressing the need for work plans, information on

PROEXAG services, and consistency of response. Although recent improvements in communication were acknowledged by the Federations, there still exists within these organizations a somewhat fuzzy understanding of how PROEXAG operates and the full range of services it offers. The Federations also want more presence and more concrete and timely response from PROEXAG. It is not clear whether Federations fully appreciate the delays caused by USAID country clearance requirements.

4. PROEXAG

PROEXAG staff were very concerned that the goal and purpose statements for the project were inadequate in their present form; this issue was addressed at the final workshop. PROEXAG agreed with ROCAP and the USAID Missions, though perhaps less strongly, that a realistic appraisal of its services should be conducted and communicated to the user audiences. The PROEXAG staff acknowledged the timely and dramatic improvement in leadership that had taken place over the past few months, with respect to both the new COP and the new ROCAP staff.

PROEXAG staff understood the disappointment felt by Federations and growers when response was unpredictable. PROEXAG would like to spend more time on-site; however, schedules are already tight. "For example, I feel uneasy right now about El Salvador. I want to be there and won't be able to for a while. We have to be more realistic with ourselves and with them about our project."

5. ROCAP

ROCAP felt very strongly that the communication and reporting problem must be resolved quickly. "They promise too much and need to communicate limits." There was also concern that too much of the wrong information was being produced by PROEXAG and

not enough of the right information. These issues were addressed at the workshop.

ROCAP acknowledged that, while improvements have been made, there is still a long way to go toward achieving complementarity with the USAID Missions with respect to federation strengthening. Working relationships and organizational linkages between ROCAP and PROEXAG were viewed by ROCAP as just slightly better than acceptable.

ROCAP respondents were unanimous in reporting that PROEXAG's effectiveness has improved in recent months. However, the respondents' assessments of the working relationship between PROEXAG and the bilateral Missions were split between good and poor. Respondents attributed some of the problems in the relationship to the fact that the Missions don't have the time to devote to the Project. PROEXAG's working relationships with the Federations and the growers/shippers were reported to be good.

II. RESULTS

This section describes actions taken during the evaluation workshop by PROEXAG and ROCAP. The output consisted of seven "results," as follows:

1. The purpose statement for the project remains valid, though it was necessary and useful to agree on clarifications of the terms used.
2. The Chemonics-PROEXAG model of deal-making as the main mode of project intervention needs to be clarified and communicated to the project's client community of growers, export federations, and USAID's. This will help to adjust client expectations to fit the project's limited resources.
3. Project progress indicators will be reduced in number, and formulated to show outputs or effects of the project, rather than inputs and activities.
4. Planning of work will be focused on tasks by crop or by function (such as post-harvest), incorporating all activities and cost elements, including training. The plans will be shared with producers' associations or Federations.
5. PROEXAG will continue to develop a pool of short-term experts to be made available to export federations and USAID's, and will over time deliver this consultant data base to the Federations.
6. Federation assistance will focus on (a) market information, (b) technical information on priority crops, (c) identifying marketing agents, and (d) ad hoc advice, including recommendations on fees charged for services to members.
7. The policy on communications by PROEXAG with parties promoting agricultural exports in the region was clarified so as to allow PROEXAG greater freedom to communicate directly and without prior approval. Reporting relationships and requirements within the PROEXAG team and from the team to ROCAP were also clarified.

During November, 1988, a final draft of ROCAP Project Manager's Letter No. 12 to Chemonics' Chief of Party John Lamb,

documenting the agreements reached and decisions taken during and subsequent to the collaborative evaluation and providing guidance to PROEXAG in Project implementation, was in the clearance process within ROCAP. While final clearance is still pending, the verbatim text of the draft is repeated below to provide the reader with a concise, updated understanding of the issues resolved in the evaluation. If changes in the letter should be made during the final clearance process, they would need to be incorporated in this report as well.

Draft Text of Project Manager's Letter No. 12

"During the recent collaborative evaluation conducted by Checchi and Company, and in the subsequent workshops held between ROCAP and PROEXAG, a number of important issues were resolved. In some cases, decisions taken were different than or reversed previous positions of ROCAP, reflecting the evolution of this project during the past year. This letter documents the agreements and decisions taken, and provides guidance to Chemonics in its implementation of the project.

1. All were in agreement that it was not necessary to change the project purpose statement which is to "create and/or strengthen private sector capabilities in the provision of hands-on training and technical assistance in skills related to production technologies and market intelligence for non-traditional agricultural exports." However, we all agreed that the following clarifications were necessary.

"Private Sector" includes any private organization or individual with a role in non-traditional export agriculture, but with particular attention to "Channel Captains" (or likely candidates) and the export federations.

"Created and/or strengthen capabilities" means assisting, facilitating, encouraging or instituting processes, relationships, knowledge or skills necessary to make non-traditional export agriculture from the region successful and self-sustaining.

"The provision of hands-on training and technical assistance" means direct training and technical assistance by the project to participants in non-traditional export agriculture. It also means improving the capacity of export federations to do the same or access similar resources.

2. It is necessary that PROEXAG clarify its implementation

strategy (the "deal" model and the crop association model) and that this be communicated to the export federations and Bilateral Missions.

The Chemonics-PROEXAG model of "deal-making", a process whereby the limitations or hindrances to a successful export venture are determined and then PROEXAG concentrates its efforts to resolve those problems, was understood by all those present. This concept should be thoroughly explained to the Bilateral Missions and Federations involved in the project, and coupled with the clarifications of the project purpose, and be used to address the Federation strengthening portion of the project, with indicators being developed to reflect this aspect.

An important finding of the survey was that the client group expected more of PROEXAG than was possible to deliver. A part of this strategy clarification exercise should be to determine the outputs that can be reasonably expected of the team as a whole, and of each member individually, given the limited time and resources.

As a part of the overall strategy, it is important to assure that where possible, enterprises should be encouraged to source part of their product from small-scale producers. Those companies doing so should receive greater support and attention from PROEXAG than enterprises engaging in large-scale plantation agriculture.

3. In order to measure project activities, it was determined that certain key indicators be developed that are easily quantifiable and would serve the reporting requirements of ROCAP as well as providing a means of tracking the project progress. These indicators can then be incorporated in the logical framework. The project should begin to refocus its tracking efforts from measuring inputs to recording outputs.

4. An integral part of the new strategy and refocusing as discussed above should revolve around "tasks" that would encompass crop and/or theme areas. These tasks would encompass long-term and short-term advisors' activities, and also define the need for travel, training, equipment and supplies, all in the same task order. Each task should also include an estimated budget to assist in controlling the limited project resources. It may be convenient to group the tasks under programs, such as production, post-harvest handling, transport, marketing, etc. Grouping the projected activities into tasks will enable the ROCAP office to approve overall task orders rather than each separate component.

It would be more practical to place a year's time limit to each task--either a calendar year or an agricultural cycle season. These tasks should be discussed with the Federations and

incorporated into their annual work plans; it will not be necessary to present annual work plans to each Federation, but rather send the separate task orders on a timely basis.

As each task will include whatever training is necessary to accomplish the task, a separate training plan will not be required.

5. In addition to providing short-term advisors as individuals, PROEXAG should continue to develop a "pool" of knowledgeable and tested experts that are available to work within the region. This "pool" should be made available to USAID Mission and Export Federations as part of the information system, and be constantly up-dated and expanded.

6. The team will provide assistance to the Federations in (1) providing market information either computer based or hard copy; (2) supplying technical information on priority crops and themes; (3) identifying marketing agents; and (4) advising on ad hoc situations, including minor assistance on other than priority crops, etc. As the Federations have changed since the beginning of project, it will not be necessary to assist them in determining an overall structure for assessing fees for Federation events or technical assistance. If abnormalities are observed for fees charged when dealing directly with PROEXAG advisors or events, recommendations should be made as to proper procedures for fee assessments.

7. It was agreed by all present that one of the continuing weaknesses of the project was the insufficient or incomplete communication at all levels. Closer contact needs to be maintained between PROEXAG and ROCAP, but of even greater concern is the communication process between PROEXAG and its clientele. The success of the project will be largely determined by the ability of the many participants in non-traditional export agriculture to absorb the lessons learned during the life of the project and the special expertise brought to Central America by PROEXAG staff. As such, the widest possible distribution of information, in a cost effective manner, that meets the needs of important clients in non-traditional exports, is strongly encouraged.

Accordingly, ROCAP encourages Chemonics to develop direct lines of communication -- newsletters, letters, monthly bulletins, workshops -- with interested parties in the region. There are many interested parties: host governments, Bilateral Missions, and U.S. Embassies, that have a keen interest in project activities.

Please send ROCAP copies of information on project activities sent to any U.S. Government entity. Of special interest to ROCAP are topics commenting on U.S. policy or information you judge to be sensitive in a particular country.

In cases of communication with Ambassadors, Mission Directors, or high officials of host governments -- letters or conversations -- we ask that copies be cleared by ROCAP before transmittal or that Memoranda of Conversation be prepared and copies sent to ROCAP immediately afterward.

We count on Chemonics staff to use their judgement on politically sensitive issues and keep ROCAP advised, normally before the fact. You and your staff understand the volatile nature of the situation in Central America and the fact that seemingly innocent communications between U.S. contracted staff and interested parties can be misinterpreted.

In order to keep ROCAP informed of the team's activities and at the same time not overburden the contract team with paperwork, it was agreed that ROCAP will require the following reports: trip reports from both long and short-term advisors, and a quarterly report to be composed of the three monthly activity summaries generated by each team member, a summary report by the team leader, and a summary financial report. Other reports are covered in the general communications section above.

Finally, the results described above refer only to the immediate and direct results of the evaluation. Other ideas brought up at the workshop are having an impact on the project. The evaluation team leader will return to Central America during May 1989, in part to determine these other results." (End of Draft Text).

III. OBSERVATIONS ON COLLABORATIVE EVALUATION AND PROCESS CONSULTATION FOR ROCAP PROJECTS

A good measure of the success achieved through this collaborative evaluation process is the improvement that has already been made in the PROEXAG Project. The participants at the two-day workshop for feedback and action planning were sufficiently informed by the data to take immediate action on seven specific problems and plan for many more. In addition to these observable results, a substantial amount of teambuilding was experienced both within the ROCAP and PROEXAG staffs and between these organizations. There is no question that this collaborative evaluation process achieved results in excess of expectations.

The evaluation was intended to allow ROCAP "to analyze the administrative, technical, organizational, institutional, planning, and operational aspects of the project to determine if a re-design of project purpose, objectives, or implementation procedure is necessary in the current context." The evaluation was defined as "a management evaluation to look at present procedures, plans and technical assistance offered to help lay the basis for a subsequent study of the impact the project has had on increasing the production of NTAE crops."

The assignment, then, had objectives both in an evaluation sense and as a means of guiding change. Both objectives were met. The changes agreed to at the closing workshop were refinements in the Project's operating guidelines and direction. The initial idea of redesigning the project purpose and objectives was rejected. On the contrary, it was decided that the project was well designed and was meeting perceived needs.

The following characteristics were important components of this collaborative evaluation:

1. The evaluation team was permitted to meet with the ROCAP and PROEXAG staffs to establish mutually agreeable guidelines for issues to be explored, specific questions to be posed, and how interviewees would be identified and approached.
2. Both ROCAP and PROEXAG helped the evaluation team select respondents in the target countries for the initial (Phase One) interviews which were used to determine key issues to be explored further through questionnaires and follow-up interviews during Phase Two.
3. A one-day evaluation methodology workshop was used for feedback of key issues discovered through the Phase One interviews (conducted in Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras), and agreement in principle was reached on the content of the questionnaires.
4. Both ROCAP and PROEXAG advised the evaluation team on questionnaire development and execution in the field.
5. Both ROCAP and PROEXAG staffs gave the team generous amounts of their time as problems arose over the five-week process.
6. Substantial conflict, both of a substantive, issue oriented nature and perhaps purely emotional, occurred throughout the assignment. That conflict was accepted as part of the process and flexibly managed as needed by shifting the roles of key staff members within ROCAP, PROEXAG and the Checchi team.
7. ROCAP, PROEXAG, and the Checchi team chose to assume risk and use their authority to achieve not only the purpose of the collaborative evaluation, but also, more importantly, improve the outlook for PROEXAG's success.

The characteristics of this collaborative evaluation placed a great deal of stress on the ROCAP and PROEXAG staffs. The following effects should be acknowledged and anticipated for future efforts that involve collaboration for determining evaluation methodologies and uses of data, and for planning organizational change:

- Staffs in both the client organization and the evaluation target group are required to play roles outside of their job descriptions.

- The staffs in both the client organization and the evaluation target group will also have to give considerable time to this process, often on short notice.
- The audience or users of the evaluation target organization's services will be involved in the process in ways with which they have had no previous experience. They may also be in a position of conflict as a client resulting from interview or questionnaire requests by the evaluation team acting as a third party.
- Conflict is a natural ingredient of organizational change. Perhaps because change was the ultimate objective of the evaluation segment, issue-oriented conflict was ever present. It is emotionally draining and this should be anticipated.
- Finally, the organizational change process is a deeper intervention and a more fragile process than a conventional evaluation. In order to re-stabilize the client organization following such a process, sufficient facilitator time should be allowed and planned for after the actual changes are agreed upon. In this case, the evaluation team leader might usefully have remained in the field for several days following the workshop to ensure that unintended and unanticipated consequences of the process were being properly managed.

These characteristics of the collaborative process should be anticipated and planned for in advance. The deeper the level of collaboration and linkage to organizational improvements, the more thought should be given to the management of the above-mentioned characteristics.

IV. METHODOLOGY OF THE COLLABORATIVE EVALUATION

The first part of this section describes how the investigation was conducted, and how feedback was received and acted upon. The second section explains the concepts of collaborative evaluation, process consultation, and survey guided organizational development as they apply to the PROEXAG Project. A copy of the scope of work under which the evaluation was carried out is provided in Attachment I.

A. Methodology

Following preparatory meetings in Miami, the Checchi team consisting of Roland Kemp, a produce industry expert, and David A. Schrier, evaluation team leader, travelled to Guatemala on August 7, 1988. Interviews were conducted with ROCAP and PROEXAG staff to refine the scope and purpose of the consultation. These interviews were particularly useful since key leadership within both ROCAP and PROEXAG had begun their assignments within the past few months and, consequently, a great deal of change was already in motion.

Appointments were made for an initial series of interviews with USAID Mission staff, agricultural federations and growers in Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras, the countries where the project is currently active. The objective of the interviews was to identify key issues affecting PROEXAG's service delivery and effectiveness as perceived in the field by key users of these services and by subject matter experts. Once determined, these key issues were used to build questionnaires for the investigation.

Ten themes of issues emerged through this process of initial interviewing, and four draft questionnaires were developed by the

Checchi team for presentation to the PROEXAG and ROCAP staffs in a workshop setting. Due to the specialized talent and experience of the PROEXAG staff, the actual collaboration began in a very substantive way even before the workshop. The PROEXAG staff worked long hours with the Checchi team to refine the questionnaires. The one-day workshop that followed was devoted to sharing ideas and improving the questionnaires. The result of the workshop was agreement on the use of four separate questionnaires in each country designed specifically for each of the following populations:

- (1) Federation staff (Spanish)
- (2) Growers (Spanish)
- (3) USAID Mission staff (English)
- (4) ROCAP and PROEXAG staffs (English)

Guidelines were also established for follow-up interviews by the Checchi team with each questionnaire respondent.* These interviews were intended to elicit in-depth understanding of the questionnaire responses. In all four countries, the respondents were cooperative and, in almost all cases, felt that the questionnaire was comprehensive and thorough. Specific anecdotes and opinions were taken down verbatim by the interviewers in order to support the various themes emerging within each respondent population. Quotes were also recorded in cases where the respondent felt his or her observation to be important, whether or not it was supported by other respondents in that population. Particularly in the case of growers, and to some extent Federations as well, caution must be used in interpreting the findings as sample sizes were sometimes too small and key people were sometimes not available. Moreover, rigid sampling techniques (stratification and random selection) were not used, and some responses were found to be self-serving half-truths.

* A list of survey respondents and other participants in the collaborative evaluation is provided in Attachment II.

A data base emerged from the questionnaire results and interviews in each country for each respondent population category:

	USAID Mission Staff	Federation Staff	Growers	ROCAP	PROEXAG
Costa Rica	o	o	o		
El Salvador	o	o	o		
Guatemala	o	o	o	o	o
Honduras	o	o	o		

A second, two-day, workshop was held on September 8 and 9 to reach agreement on findings and needed organizational improvements. On the first day, through an all-day data analysis session, consensus was reached on both the value of the data and the need for caution in interpreting themes. In-depth discussion of the interview responses, particularly from grower and federation populations, revealed many instances of comments based on uninformed opinion or self-serving half-truths. Consequently, readers who were not present at the workshop could be misled by many of these comments.

The final day of the workshop was devoted to making changes in the way PROEXAG functions as well as improvements in the ROCAP/PROEXAG interface. There was a feeling that these changes were very important and that a new level of understanding about the project had been achieved. Some of these changes had been under examination and consideration prior to the evaluation team's arrival. The evaluation served to crystalize the process and move toward resolution of a number of outstanding issues.

B. Conceptual Framework

The concept of collaborative evaluation is distinguished from the audit-oriented approach by the involvement of the client and the project staff in determining the scope, focus, methodology and ultimate use of the evaluation information. In the case of this PROEXAG evaluation, process consultation was employed in the sense that the Checchi evaluation team leader facilitated the examination by ROCAP and PROEXAG staffs of their own organizational process and relationships as they affect the performance of the project. Needed changes were made directly as a result of this examination, and more changes are contemplated. This change process, if it can be self-generated, may also achieve results over the longer-term.

Survey guided organizational development was also an important component of this consultation, with the term "survey" referring to the data base of user and expert opinions and perceptions of those who are involved with PROEXAG throughout the region. Organizational development describes the systematic use of applied behavioral science tools for planning and implementing change in organizations. Reliance on interviews, questionnaires, group meetings, and guidelines for the flexible use of data feedback; inclusion of project participants and the motivation of their feelings of ownership in the process; and acknowledgement and use of resistance to change and defensiveness, creatively employed in the design itself, are among the organizational development concepts that were employed by the Checchi team.

SCOPE OF WORK

EVALUATION OF
NON TRADITIONAL AGRICULTURAL EXPORT SUPPORT PROJECT (596-0108)

1. OBJECTIVE:

The contractor will conduct a formative evaluation of the Non-Traditional Agricultural Export Support (NTAES) Project, 596-0108. The evaluation should provide ROCAP and other participating organizations with an objective and rational basis for making decisions about project design, and an opportunity to reach consensus on emphasis and direction in future project implementation. The challenge is to carry out a structured self-assessment of the project that actively involves the interested parties in refining the issues to be evaluated, in conducting the analysis of the project, and ending with a shared plan of action. Rather than seeking an independent assessment by a team of outside analysts to provide the answers, we are seeking an evaluation facilitator, backed up by subject matter specialists, to work with us on guiding the process, posing tough questions, and assembling data so that it can be examined and analyzed by those who must carry out the project and live with the results.

2. BACKGROUND:

A. The NTAES project was authorized in December, 1985, and became operational through the startup of the CHEMONICS International Consulting Contract in September, 1986. The project purpose is quote to create and/or strengthen private sector capabilities in the provision of hands-on training and technical assistance in skills related to the production and marketing technologies of non-traditional agricultural exports unquote. The CHEMONICS Team consists of a highly experienced group of technicians who have provided a wide range of support to export federations in the Central American countries, as well as to individual farmer-exporters and groups growing such crops as asparagus, cut flowers, melons, berries, and mangoes.

29

B. Project participants in addition to ROCAP and CHEMONICS include the national Ag. export federations listed below, the USAID Agriculture Offices in each country, and several producer associations and cooperatives.

C. Factors influencing timing of evaluation: The Project Paper called for an initial evaluation to take place after about two years of operation, which could fall approximately in early 1989, that would measure the increase in exports of NTAE and assess the extent to which the activities undertaken were responsible for the increase in exports. However, given that the project is working mainly with NTAES crops that are being marketed during the U.S. winter season, the logical time to do an impact evaluation is in May or June 1989. During recent months of project implementation, unanticipated events (discussed below) occurred which call for a reassessment of project operations and design. Some of the events that have caused ROCAP to decide on an earlier than planned evaluation are:

(1) The bilateral Missions have taken a more active role in NTAES, increased their support to the Federations, and developed other projects directed specifically at agricultural exports. At the same time, the Federations themselves have evolved and are changing significantly in their purpose, focus and organization. These Federations are CAAP (Consejo Agropecuario Agroindustrial Privado) in Costa Rica, Gremial de Exportadores de Productos No Tradicionales in Guatemala, FEPROEXAAH (Federación de Asociaciones de Productores y Exportadores Agropecuarios y Agroindustriales de Honduras), DIVAGRO (División Agropecuaria) Program of FUSADES (Fundación Salvadoreña para el Desarrollo Económico y Social), and CONDEPRO (Consejo Nacional de Productividad de la República de Panama).

Since project design, the following has occurred in each case:

In Costa Rica, CAAP has structurally remained the same as in the original project design, but has streamlined its organization to assist a limited number of NTAE crops. AID has taken a more active role in support of

CAAP, allocated more resources for NTAE through CAAP, and assigned a permanent U.S. advisor to CAAP.

In Guatemala, the GREMIAL as an institution has not changed. However, they have added more staff, and have placed greater emphasis on NTAE. USAID/G recently approved a project that includes funding to the GREMIAL for short term technical assistance with fifteen priority crops and provides a permanent export development advisor.

In Honduras the Mission is presently rethinking and revising the FEPROEXAAH organization and related projects, as well as the direct role of FHIA, the private research center, in NTAE.

In El Salvador, the ASPENT organization is non-functioning. As a result, ROCAP, in agreement with USAID/ES, decided to work through DIVAGRO, a program of FUSADES. AID has recently completed an evaluation of FUSADES, and a restructuring of FUSADES has taken place. An Agribusiness Project was also signed with FUSADES 9/29/87 to support efforts made by the private sector in El Salvador to increase the production and export of non-traditional agricultural products.

In Panama, although CONDEPRO is eligible to receive assistance from the Project, it is in its early stages of development and needs external technical and economic support if it is to function properly and become a service organization for its members. With the withdrawal of USAID/P and the political situation in the country, CONDEPRO's future is uncertain. The question of working in BELIZE has not been fully analyzed.

(2) In the original design it was envisioned that the project would provide training and on-the-job experience "to a corps of professional staff within each export federation". At the present time the Federations are not significantly involved in the direct provision of technical assistance (except for computer market information) for many NTAE crops, nor do they see their role as using fulltime staff to provide all of the services offered by Chemonics, though certain services may be developed within the federations.

(3) The CHEMONICS contract team has recently completed an LOP work plan focused on specific commodity crops and priority themes for each country, as well as an in-depth training plan offering a more-defined, more focused project direction by commodity, and has proposed a realignment of team composition.

(4) A recently completed Monitoring and Evaluation System and a Project Design Clarification report prepared by MSI under a sub-contract with Chemonics proposed changes in project purpose, outputs and the logical framework.

(5) Reassessment of the contract team staff, as well as responsibilities within the ROCAP management of the team is currently taking place.

Given the above, ROCAP has decided to advance the timing of the first evaluation of the project, in order to determine direction and focus of the contractors' and counterparts' efforts, and funding, implementation, and design changes for the remaining Life-of-Project.

3. SCOPE OF EVALUATION:

A. GENERAL COVERAGE - The evaluation will allow us to analyze the administrative, technical, organizational, institutional, planning, and operational aspects of the project to determine if a re-design of project purpose, objectives or implementation procedures is necessary in the current context. The evaluation will review the emphasis so far of project activities in relation to project organizational structure, staffing pattern, and the management procedures being employed, and assist to determine necessary changes. This is a management evaluation, to look at present procedures, plans, and technical assistance offered and to help to lay the basis for a

32

subsequent study of the impact the Project has had on increasing production of NTAE crops. The evaluators will help the project team to improve the monitoring or tracking system that will support statistical analysis or data gathering, land cultivated, new products exported, etc. A follow-up evaluation will measure the statistical data and perform a quantitative assessment that is scheduled for June 1989. Under present circumstances, evaluation activities will occur only in Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and Costa Rica.

B. Specific Concerns - Indicative areas to be covered are listed below, though this may be modified during the first phase of work as participants are interviewed as to their expectations of the evaluation, and as ROCAP collects comments and gets reactions from the USAIDs to this Scope of Work.

(1) Methodologies and procedures used by the contract team to make and carry out technical and administrative decisions. Assess how project decisions are made and implemented at the different levels of contract staff and communicated to the Federations or the end-user/producer, and suggest ways to improve the system to insure that individual decisions and actions performed by the project team are consistent with the overall objectives of the project.

(2) Administrative procedures and project oversight exercised by AID, including ROCAP and bilaterals, such as contractual requirements and clearances, clearances for country travel, project management letters, and other actions by AID, and the extent to which they are supporting or hindering achievement of project activities and objectives.

(3) The relationship of this project to other AID-funded projects within each country and with the Federations and how the projects can complement each other, strengthen relationships, and avoid duplication. This would look at whether the services provided by the project are consistent with

Mission strategies, if the role established by the contract team fits the Federations' goals and is within their organizational and institutional capacities.

(4) The role, if any, that the Project should have in institutional strengthening of each Federation. Develop alternative approaches, adapted to each country situation if necessary, and propose the project management and resource implications of different federation strengthening strategies.

(5) The perceived usefulness to various parties of the technical services presently being offered to the Federations through the long term staff, i.e. production, post harvest, marketing, market information and training, and to help to determine the appropriateness of the short term technical assistance. This assessment will be done in terms of the acceptance at the Federation and Mission level; value of a databank of external crop specific technical assistance experts for future reference of the federations; the type of short-term technical assistance provided, differentiating between agricultural technical assistance and administrative support assistance; whether the level of effort of short-term technical service should be increased or decreased, and other changes in short-term assistance the project should make to meet the needs of the federations and other beneficiaries.

(6) How the different types, mixes and priorities of technical assistance (e.g. specific commodity full coverage assistance, such as asparagus - from planting through marketing; specific assistance including virus control in cucumbers; or general policy and direction assistance such as the feasibility of a tropical fruit industry) in NTAE crops in participating countries are being utilized, and how changes in these mixes would affect project management.

(7) How the LOP training plan relates to training courses presently available to the federations through regional institutions or other sources, and whether the proposed courses complement, conflict or duplicate those offered by the federations.

(8) Perceived value, in cost/benefit terms, of the the market information service being proposed and implemented including the services offered by Agridata, the COMPEX model and other information services. Also, the service provided by the USDA Market News Information office in Miami and its usefulness to the Federations, producer organizations and members.

(9) Dissemination, acceptance and perceived value of the proposed and issued project publications (newsletter, bulletins, press releases) at the Federation and producer level, and how they compare to those already available through the Federations. Extent to which the other written communications (trip reports, technical reports, short term specific reports) prepared by the contract team are useful to the USAIDS and Federations and how they might be improved.

(10) As the above matters are clarified, we will need to review the proposed monitoring and evaluation system as proposed by MSI and adjust it to track indicators of the impact of the project on strengthening the federations or other user groups. The M&E system will be checked to see how well it will provide ROCAP and other participants with a methodology for conducting a quantitative impact evaluation that will be carried out in mid-1989. This later evaluation will measure the impact the project has had on increasing non-traditional agricultural exports in Central America through a compilation of statistical data gathered from project files, contract team files, analysis of government data, and other available relevant data. It will be based on the indicators as stated in the Project paper, ROCAP's Action Plan, in the proposed Chemonics

55

monitoring and evaluation system, and others that may be proposed by USAIDs, Federations, or farmers, and will include but not be limited to the following:

-Introduction of new commercially viable crops (fresh or processed) within the Region and within each country that are either being exported or have export potential.

-Increase in volume of sales of NTAE crops throughout the region brought about by numerous factors including better production techniques, improved post-harvest handling, introduction of new crops, etc. and a corresponding increase in foreign exchange and capital investment directly related to the production and export of NTAE crops.

-Decrease in the rejection rate of all forms of exported crops resulting from an increase in quality controls and standards at all levels.

-Increase in the number of new individuals or companies who have become directly involved in some stage of NTAE, whether they be new producers, new frozen food companies, new investment firms, etc., and whether these companies or individuals have entered into new ventures or businesses.

-Increase in the number of ports shipping or receiving NTAE, whether they are land or sea ports within the region, in the United States, Europe, or Far East. Examples would be Port Quetzal in Guatemala; Nogales, Arizona; Hong Kong, or Amsterdam.

-Increase in employment generation within the region brought about by the introduction of new export crops, increases in production, addition of new processing plants, inspection services, etc.

4. METHOD OR APPROACH TO EVALUATION:

(A) The evaluation team will work closely with the Project Team (counterparts in each of the Federations and the bilateral Missions, the ROCAP staff, and the Chemonics contract team) to allow them to make informed adjustments and refinements in the project's design and procedures. Representatives of each of these parties will be named to work with the evaluators to provide access to a cross-section of people working with or affected by the project (office staff, field staff and technicians, direct recipients of project services) and to work closely with the assessment (attending workshops, compiling information, etc.) as it proceeds.

(B) The work should be carried out in three stages. The first stage is to work with the interested parties listed above to refine the key areas of assessment. This will involve application of team planning and meeting concepts, with interviews in the four countries culminating in a summary workshop for ROCAP, CHEMONICS, and possibly others to agree on the final scope and plan for the assessment, and define the roles of the various parties in the assessment. The second stage will be the collection of information, involving participation by project parties, to serve as the basis for a workshop to assess the findings and reach consensus on the outcomes of the assessment and to develop a plan of action involving specific actions for each interested party. The third stage will occur approximately six months after the second. The team leader will travel the region, with ROCAP Staff, and review with participants the effectiveness of the assessment, proposed followup plans, and degree of satisfaction with the results of the evaluation.

5. TIMING OF THE EVALUATION;

- COMPLETE CONTRACTING July 1, 1988
- STAGE 1 July 21-Aug. 4 (3 days U.S., rest in field)
- STAGE 2 Aug. 5 - Aug. 26
- STAGE 3 Dec. 5 - 10

Six day work weeks will be authorized.

6. TEAM COMPOSITION;

ROCAP suggests that a two person field team be used. Both field team members will have demonstrated Spanish fluency at S-3, R-3. In addition, the contractor may use up to 7 person days of effort for supporting expertise from two U.S.-based specialists.

(A) Team Leader/Evaluation Specialist with experience in participatory evaluation of AID related projects and agricultural development in Latin America. This person will be responsible for the successful conduct of the evaluation, including refinement of the scope, data collection activities, and forging consensus among the participants, using Team Planning Meeting or similar methods. The team leader will also have editorial responsibility for presentations and reports. The team leader's background should include significant experience with institutional and management assessments of development projects.

(B) Produce industry expert with experience with a U.S. trade association or a business involved with export or import of NTAE agricultural products, having expertise in both production and post harvest handling of fresh fruits and vegetables. This person will guide the information collection process on technical matters and provide other technical counsel as determined in the final plan of evaluation.

Supporting Expertise may be required from:

(C) Market Information/Computer Specialist. A market information communications specialist with extensive knowledge of computers and electronic marketing systems. This person will offer guidance or install mechanisms that will guide the data collection process on information and communication matters, and help to assess findings in this area.

(D) A management or organization development specialist with extensive experience with Team Planning Meetings. This specialist will advise the field team on methods applicable to this type of project.

Proposers may wish to alter team composition to cover these skill areas, as long as overall level of effort is not drastically increased.

7. Workshops and Reports: The evaluation team will be expected to conduct two workshops as described above, each to be followed by a report containing the data or information on which the workshop was based, and the conclusions reached in each instance.

The Stage 1 Report will be brief, summarizing the agreed upon scope, work plan, and roles of participants in conducting the evaluation.

The workshop and report, which mark the end of Stage 2, will require the compilation and summary of data for presentation to the project team; the design and facilitation of an interactive process for assessing the data and reaching conclusions and action plans; and a writeup of the approach and the outcomes. THE STAGE 2 REPORT will be prepared in English and Spanish and submitted to ROCAP within three weeks of the departure of the team leader from the region. ROCAP will consult with the project team to assure that the report accurately reflects the process, the data and the results of the

evaluation, and will either accept the report, or provide comments to the contractor for revision or additional backup information. Ten copies of the final report in English and Spanish will be submitted to ROCAP within two weeks of receiving comments on the draft report from ROCAP. Funds for secretarial assistance within the Region and translation services in the United States are provided within the budget. The STAGE 2 evaluation report will include the following:

- (1) A stand-alone executive summary, including purpose of the evaluation, methodology used, findings, conclusions and action plans of the participants.
- (2) A copy of the scope of work under which the evaluation was carried out. The methodology used will be summarized. Any modifications to the scope will be explained.
- (3) A listing of the evaluation team, persons interviewed and participating as project evaluation team members, including project technicians and host country personnel.
- (4) A clear presentation of the evaluation findings, conclusions and time-phased action plans, in a separate section of the report.

Following Stage 3, the team leader will provide a brief report on the status of actions resulting from the evaluation, on the monitoring/evaluation system, and the satisfaction of participants with results of the first two stages.

Attachment II
LIST OF EVALUATION PARTICIPANTS

Checchi and Company Consulting, Inc.

David A. Schrier, Evaluation Team Leader/Facilitator
Roland Kemp, Produce Industry Specialist

Regional Office for Central American Programs (ROCAP)

Rick Clark
Ron Curtis
Nancy Fong
Pirie Gall
Paul Tuebner

Chemonics International PROEXAG Team

Bruce Brower
Ricardo Frohmader
John Lamb
*Jose Mondenedo
Jose Oromi

Questionnaire/Interview Respondents in Guatemala

Brian Rudert, USAID/Guatemala
William Campbell, USAID/Guatemala, formerly with
USAID/Panama (on which experience his responses were
based)
Irma Yolanda Carrillo de Arias, GREMIAL
Gustavo Chang Lou, GREMIAL
Jandira Elias, GREMIAL (assisted during the interview by
Estuardo Castro)
Ricardo Santa Cruz, GREMIAL
Six (6) Guatemalan Growers/Shippers

Questionnaire/Interview Respondents in Honduras

Blair Cooper, USAID/Honduras
George Garcelon, USAID/Honduras
Kurt Rockeman, USAID/Honduras
Benjamin Villanueva, USAID/Honduras
Miguel Angel Bonilla, FEPROEXAAH
*Ricardo Pell, FEPROEXAAH
Rolando Pretto, FEPROEXAAH
*Panfilo Tavora, FEPROEXAAH
Jesus Coto, United Brands Grower/Shipper

Questionnaire/Interview Respondents in Costa Rica

William Barbee, USAID/Costa Rica
William Baucom, USAID/Costa Rica
Ross Wheery, USAID/Costa Rica
Jose Roberto Calvo, CAAP
Eduardo de la Espriella, CAAP
Alvaro Estrada, CAAP
Mario Guzman, CAAP
Three (3) Melon Growers in Guanacaste

Questionnaire/Interview Respondents in El Salvador

Ken Ellis, USAID/El Salvador
Tony Gonzalez, USAID/El Salvador
Frank Skowronski, USAID/El Salvador
*Filadelfo Baires, FUSADES
Mario Molina, FUSADES
Jose Emilio Suadi, FUSADES
*Ricardo Suarez, FUSADES

*Questionnaire only.