PD-AAN-993

CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) — PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AND CREDIT ADMINISTRATION	517-0136	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

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)

[X] 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 78	A. Total $ 320,000	From (month/yr.) 4/79
B. Final Obligation Expected FY 81	B. U.S. $	To (month/yr.) 3/82
C. Final Input Delivery FY 82		Date of Evaluation Review

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
FINAL EVALUATION	A. Valdez	No action

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- [ ] Project Paper
- [ ] Financial Plan
- [ ] Logical Framework
- [X] 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. [X] Discontinue Project

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

Clearances:
ARDO:KEllis
AGR:AValdez
OPE:RVeith

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature

Typed Name: Philip R. Schwab

Date

AID 1330-15 (3-78)

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

XD-AAN-993-A

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Agricultural Marketing and Credit Administration

OPG 517-0136

Final Evaluation

Prepared by:
American Institute for
Free Labor Development

October 31, 1982

Summary

The AIFLD/FENAC Agricultural Marketing and Credit Administration Program (USAID/DR OPG 517-0136), completed in March of 1982, has met or nearly met the majority of its objectives in the three year course of its operation, and in the process provided a great many valuable lessons for campesinos, and national and international technicians working in rural development in Latin America. Most impressively, the program appears to have been instrumental in effecting a 325% increase in the net income of the small farmer beneficiaries, achieved since the project's initiation in April 1979. The project also proved that campesinos can be trained to supervise, manage and oversee economic and technical assistance programs of a rather sophisticated nature, given a willingness on the part of technicians to make the needed investments of time and money. In general, it is believed that the project has vindicated the central working hypothesis that assistance programs with a high degree of beneificiary participation can be effective in raising the income of small farmers in the short run as well as provide a solid institutional base for addressing a host of other social and economic problems over the long run. In this regard, we consider one of the project's greatest successes to have been the creation of a professional administrative capability within a grass roots organization which will enable it to handle financial, physical and technical resources of almost any kind and magnitude in the future. It is hoped that other development organizations will take advantage of this structure when seeking ways in which to reach large numbers of small farmers with considerable resources at low overhead.

A. General Administration

The overall objective of the General Administration component of the grant was to hire and train a team of professionals (administrator, accountant, agronomist, secretary) to assist the federation in the planning, design and execution of its member service programs, particularly agricultural credit and marketing. The particular challenge in this project was the fact that FENAC is a 100% campesino-directed organization in which the elected leaders themselves were accustomed to taking a direct role in the execution of the member service programs. FENAC directors had some initial difficulty adjusting to the idea of relinquishing control over these responsibilities to "outsiders", as evidenced by the fact that the first two administrators and two accountants either resigned or were fired. By the third year, however, lines of authority were more clearly established, and an administrator and accountant more understanding of the nature of the campesino-directed organization were recruited.

For the first two years of the project, an AIFLD technician worked closely with the FENAC Board of Directors and professional staff to assist them in all phases of the administration: planning, budgeting, control of personnel, accounting, and operation of the credit and marketing programs. This assistance was reduced in the degree FENAC directors and their employees assumed increasing responsibility for meeting the program's objectives. By the middle of the third year, AIFLD's role in the administration of the project had been reduced to that of providing periodic consulting in a few specialized areas, e.g., long term planning, project proposal development, and export marketing.

The termination of the project found FENAC fully competent to administer a greatly increased variety and volume of member services, ranging from credit intermediation, to direct marketing, to a rural housing project. While problems with the marketing program had caused its loan repayment record with one of its lenders (AIFLD) to be erratic, it had met its obligations to other government and private sector creditors on a timely basis.

One area of concern should be noted. Much of the credit for the efficient execution of FENAC's programs is due to the skill and drive of the present Secretary General, who over the three year life of the program has emerged as the primary decision-maker within the organization, overshadowing the other directors by virtue of his unique grasp of the mechanics of the programs, and his control over personnel decisions. One shortcoming of the program and of its AIFLD advisor has been the failure to place adequate emphasis on the education and training of the other FENAC leaders, who collectively should wield countervailing power to that of the Secretary General, to insure that the overall policy and programs are not subverted to the aims of any one individual in the future.

B. Production Credit

The main objective of the credit component was to streamline the existing system, i.e., sponsored by the BAGRICOLA, to the end of channeling more resources to FENAC's associations on a more timely basis. Results in this area were mixed, with most objectives partially met, one exceeded, and one (cost of negotiationg loans) showing retrogresssion. On the positive side, the group loan model has achieved wide acceptance; with a total 60 associatons now in the system as compared to the original 18. The percentage of FENAC members using institutional credit (as opposed to high interest, local sources) has increased from 45% to 73.5%; the highest interest rate for a loan reported by the survey was 14%. One surprising finding of the survey was that the

average cost of negotiating loans, even under the group system, had increased, albeit only by four pesos in as many years. Most farmers still find it necessary to make at least 3 trips into the branch office, even under the group system.

On the negative side, while some reduction was achieved in the percentage of late loans (53% from 75%), over half were still not delivered in time for planting. The failure of the project in this regard can be attributed, we believe, to the inability of FENAC to "sell" the BAGRICOLA on the idea of offering a line of credit at the zone (or multi-group) level, extending unsupervised credit to associations on a case-by-case basis. FENAC is not entirely to blame for this situation; proposals were submitted to the bank; they were never acted upon.

C. Marketing

The objective of the marketing component of the project was to provide a secure market for the commodities produced by FENAC members, allowing them to reduce losses due to spoilage and obtain a more just price for their goods than the prevailing rates paid by intermediaries. While the federation was able to establish a commercially viable operation marketing coconuts and producing copra, the goal of expanding operations to include other commodities has eluded them. Except for brief experiments with avocados, ginger, rice, plantains and beans, FENAC has been unable to directly market the majority of the crops produced by its affiliates. The federation has, however, in addition to the $300,000 volume marketed directly, assisted its associations in finding markets for an additional $500,000 worth of produce locally, particularly with INESPRE. On the survey, 41% of the affiliates reported having received marketing assistance from FENAC of some kind.

The chief constraint on the marketing component has been FENAC's inability to attract sufficient working capital, and investment capital for the infrastructure (freezers, processing plants, etc.) needed to expand its operations to other product lines. Two IDB loan proposals were developed; the second is presently under study. In addition, a follow-up OPG proposal was submitted, but has been shelved due to lack of funds.

In a sense, the marketing component of the project has been the source of greatest rewards and greatest frustration. On the positive side, FENAC has derived a great deal of "psychological capital" from the effort. As a result of this experience, FENAC members feel an increased measure of control over their lives; less at the mercy of intermediaries. The mystique surrounding agribusinesses and large commercial enterprises has been largely dispelled; the small farmers involved now recognize that the financial rewards of capitalization need not be the exclusive domain of the rich and powerful.

Much remains to be done in this area, however, and FENAC could greatly benefit from ongoing technical assistance and above all, a large injection of capital. Without both of these, it will be difficult for FENAC to advance to the next level of development, and become, as was intended, the sole marketing agent for its affiliated associations.

D. Training and Education

The objective of the training and education program was to prepare FENAC directors, staff and affiliates for their respective roles in administering and directing the service programs.

With the exception of certain technical subjects, in agriculture and investment analysis, all courses met their objectives. The activists receive on-going training in relevent areas and are subjected to periodic performance evaluations.

The one area of neglect in this component of the project was technical agriculture. The explanation for this is the multiple responsibilities of the FENAC agonomist, who evolved as the "right arm" of the Secretary General, taking on obligations in marketing, credit and general administration components as well. To some extent, this deficiency was compensated for through liaison with the various government agencies involved in agronomic education, as well as a number of PVO's working in agriculture in the Dominican Republic.

A concern at the onset of the project was that the better-educated, more "worldly" technicians might come to dominate the elected leadership; therefore, much emphasis was placed initially on preparing the directors for their roles in supervising and controlling their employees. Under the strong hand of the Secretary General, this proved not to be a problem. Technicians who did not accept their status as executors and not makers of policy were eventually dismissed. A struggle then began to educate the Secretary General and others leaders in the division of responsibility and authority within the organization so that they would not inhibit the employees in the performance of their duties.

One deficiency in this area should be noted, as it may pose a problem in the future. While FENAC directors have generally heeded the advice of the accountant and scrupulously adhered to sound financial controls in accounting for USAID and AIFLD funds, certain other external funds, despite the urgings of AIFLD advisors, were not handled through the central accounting system, but rather through a separate account managed by the Secretary General. Obviously, such one-man control of resources invites speculation as to exactly how much money is involved and for what purposes it is spent. Although the Secretary General provides an accounting for these funds to the donor

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

organizations, no such accounting is provided to the rest of the Executive Committee or the Federation as a whole. In this regard, further education is needed to convince the rest of the Executive Committee to amend the statutes to require that all monies and other resources channeled to the Federation pass through the central accounting system, and pressure the Secretary General into compliance.

Another problem encountered in the training program was the difference in aptitude exhibited by the various FENAC directors, which range from nearly illiterate to, in the case of the Secretary General, extremely high. This situation naturally fostered a very uneven absorption pattern with the result that most of the benefits of the training program remain concentrated in four or five individuals. In this regard, the forthcoming Congress of FENAC will provide an interesting test of the extent to which new leadership emerges which broadens the representation on the Executive Committee.

One further, positive note should be added with regard to the effectiveness of the education program in reaching the base groups. A full 91% of the those surveyed reported having received education from FENAC. Clearly, the Federation took advantage of the OPG funds to better prepare not only the Executive Committee and staff, but the rank-and-file as well.

E. Expansion of On-Going Programs

FENAC met or slightly exceeded the majority of its growth objectives, effecting a 433% increase in affiliations over a three year period. It is likely that the majority of these new affiliations owe to the Federations enhanced ability to provide services to its members. An indication of this fact is the survey result in which 66.3% of those polled felt they had benefitted "mucho" from being affiliated to FENAC, as opposed to 23.6% "algo", and 0% reporting "poco" or "nada" (10.1% did not answer). The only major deficiency in this area was the failure to hire more than one female activist, and to prepare more agricultural promoters. The latter problem, we explained earlier, may be attributed to the multiple duties of the agronomist, who was unable to devote sufficient time to training courses in technical agriculture.

14. Evaluation Methodology

The basic methodology employed was to conduct a sample survey similar to the one conducted in 1978 to provide baseline data*. As in the past, FENAC activists were

*See "Feasibility Study and Financial Systems Design for expanded services program of the FENAC. Rupert Scofield. March 5, 1978.

employed as the interviewers and given appropriate orientation in the techniques of random sampling. The data was of sufficiently good quality to inspire reasonable confidence in the conclusions derived.

Other information, such as financial data, marketing and credit statistics, etc., were extracted from FENAC's financial records and through interviews with FENAC's Executive Board and staff. The evaluation was prepared by the AIFLD/Washington Assistant Director of Social Projects and Agrarian Union Development, with data and interviews collected by the AIFLD/DR Agrarian Union Development officer.

15. External Factors

The major external factor which has affected the project continues to be, as reported in the second year evaluation, banks and bankers. The liquidity problem of the BAGRICOLA was felt pervasively throughout FENAC, particularly among the rice growers whose production was adversely affected by the scarcity of credit and the untimeliness of loans. As previously reported, FENAC made little headway against the mentality among high level BAGRICOLA officials regarding unsupervised lines of credit or zone level loans to the associations. One apparent explanation for this is an unwillingness on the part of the GODR to "depoliticize" the bank: politicians persist in the belief that it is in their short run advantage to keep farmers dependent, to discourage any process which might result in less visibility for the government in the rural sector, especially at election time. In the long run, of course, this strategy will become self-defeating as small farmers become increasingly frustrated with the institutional system in general, and governments in particular. A possible role for FENAC in resolving this problem will be discussed in the Lessons Learned section.

The marketing program also has been hamstrung by the conservative attitudes of the banking community. Scores of loan applications have been filed and subsequently neglected in the offices of the various national and international lending institutions. In the short run, all FENAC requires is a 90 day revolving credit facility to greatly enhance the profitability of its coconut operation. In the long run, major investment capital will be required. The prospects for both, barring a renaissance in the Dominican banking industry, are dim.

A further external factor which has exerted some influence on the project is the influence of other donor organizations in the FENAC. Sometime during the second year of the project, a Swedish trade union organization took an interest in FENAC and initiated an assistance program. The agreement was negotiated bilaterally with FENAC's

Secretary General, a situation which at once generated conflicts with the National Confederation of Dominican Workers (CNTD) to which FENAC is affiliated. A further complication was introduced by the manner in which the program was administered, i.e., with very little accountability to the donor organization (and none to FENAC) being required. By choice of the Secretary General (and perhaps the donor organization) their funds do not pass through FENAC's accounting system. A dangerous precedent has been established, therefore; one which potentially could "undo" all the work of the OPG in this regard. How this problem is resolved (or not resolved) will influence greatly the ability of FENAC to maintain its high standards of acountability and sound administration in the future.

16. Inputs

The fundamental input lacking, which was initially included in the design of the project, but removed due to cost considerations, was cargo vehicles. Due to this deficiency, FENAC was obliged to purchase trucks from local dealers, with credit at 27%. Far too great a share of the marketing profits have gone to finance these vehicles.

Financial contributions of these "key players" in the project — FENAC, A.I.D., AIFLD — were in line with the projections.

17. Outputs: Evaluation Bench Marks. See attached chart.

18. Purpose

Projected EOPS (March 1982)

(1). General Administration:

a. The Manager and his professional staff will be in place and fully competent to discharge their respective responsibilities.	a. Completed.
b. The Federation will have established an acceptable "track record" with regard to its loan payments, and it will be recognized as a good credit risk by national and international credit institutions.	b. Semi-completed. Line of credit obtained locally from oil processor. Loan proposal submitted for IDB. Loans to AIFLD past due as result of cash flow problems in marketing program.
c. The Manager and staff will have developed the capacity to plan, budget, and execute all service and educational programs, without direct supervision from the supporting agencies, UASID/DR and AIFLD.	c. Completed.

(2). Production and Credit System Reorganization	
a. Credit and supervisory committees will be organized and functioning in all "charter member" associations and in an additional 50 associations currently in promotion.	a. Credit Committees functioning in 60 associations.
b. All presently affiliated associations will have "graduated" from the Credito Supervisado Program (CS) to group lines of credit from the Banco Agricola.	b. Not achieved. Proposal for group lines of credit still under study by BA.
c. Another 50 associations will be receiving supervised group credit from the CS program.	c. New associations receiving group credit.
(3). Marketing Services:	
a. The federation will have established itself as the sole marketing agent for the 42 chartered associations, and it will be extending these services on an individual-by-individual basis to an additional 50 associations.	a. 42% of associations have received marketing services.
b. The Federation will have established a minimum of two regional marketing centers, one in Sanchez and the other in La Vega.	b. One center (Sanchez) in full operation.
c. FENAC will have negotiated financing for and begun construction on a combination rice mill-coconut processing factory.	c. Copra processing established. Rice postponed.
(4). Executive Committee and Paratechnicians (Activists) Training Program:	
a. The Exectutive Committee (EC) will be capable of reading and interpreting financial statements.	a. Completed.
b. The EC will be competent to evaluate major loans or investments and assets, in a broad sense, their impact on the economic welfare of the Federation and its affiliates.	b. Not completed. More education required.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

c. The EC will be knowledgeable as to what constitutes a sound system of financial controls and as to when such controls are being violated.	c. Completed. However, some resistance encountered in accounting for funds from non-OPG, external services.
d. The EC will be able to recognize financial mismangement or malfeasance and know which corrective measures are available and appropriate.	d. Completed.
e. The EC will be capable of setting broad policy objectives in all operational areas.	e. Semi-completed. EC dominated by Secretary General and Administrator in this respect.
f. Four presently employed and six newly hired "activistas" will be qualified to accept responsibilities in the areas of agricultural technical assistance, credit analysis, financial management, project planning and promotion and education of new groups.	f. Completed.

19. Goal/Sub-Goal (USAID/DR)

20. Beneficiaries

The immediate beneficiaries of this project were the some 25,000 Dominican farmers and family members associated with the Federacion Nacional Agraria Campesino (FENAC). The average FENAC member earns a net income of RD$1,405 from agriculture, and cultivates an average of 50 tareas (1.56 hectares). He or she is 35 years old with an average of 3.5 years of formal education. He drinks Cerveza Presidente and prefers Marlboro over Monte Carlo.

21. Unplanned Effects

There were no significant unplanned effects of the project.

22. Lessons Learned

A. General Administration

(1) Sound accounting and administrative procedures must be instituted from the very start of the project.

(2) All personnel should be selected together with the campesino leadership to avoid future complaints that the technicians were imposed upon the organization by outsiders.

(3) Heavy up-front investments in education need to be made to prepare all members of the Executive Board for their role in setting policy. Otherwise, they will permit the technicians to become involved in policy decisions, and, on the other hand, interfere unduly in operational decisions.

B. Credit

(1) A great oversight on the part of the project designers was to pay no attention to the development of a parallel credit capability managed directly by FENAC. Although FENAC does manage a small rotating fund ($25,000) for its associations, there as yet exists no credit policy to govern it; no interest is charged, and there is no mechanism for increasing its capitalization. Given the fact that the BAGRICOLA requires no obligatory savings on the part of its clients, such a mechnism for capturing farmer savings is sorely lacking. Ideally, FENAC could serve this function, and gradually develop the ability to at least partially compensate for the shortcomings of the BAGRICOLA through both supplemental credits (during liquidity problems) and bridge loans (when bank loans are delayed).

(2) Another shortcoming of the project was a reluctance on the part of FENAC to fully exploit its potential as a political pressure group and lobby the GODR into allowing campesinos greater participation in the key institutions setting policy in the rural sector, i.e., the SEA, BAGRICOLA, and INESPRE. It is unthinkable, given the small farmer population in the Dominican Republic, that not a single campesino representative sits on the Board of Directors of the BAGRICOLA, or is in a position to influence the policies of the other goevernment institutions mentioned. Clearly, FENAC should have taken more initiative and shown more aggressiveness in this area, to the end of changing the mentality of those officials, particularly in the bank, whose decisions to a large extent determine the collective fate of the campesino sector.

(3) Much more attention needs to be paid to long range investment planning at the small farm level, as integrated with long term infrastructure development, particularly in the rice growing area. Too often, production credit is viewed in isolation, and its benefits are lost through failure to address problems at the macro- level,notably drainage, technical assistance, and marketing. FENAC, with a beefed up technical team — 3 more agronomists with training in economics and finance — could greatly increase the productivity of the credit component through

improved farm level planning and by mounting a more informed aggressive, lobbying effort at the national level, to channel more resources into the campesino sector.

C. Marketing

(1) The problem of transportation has already been discussed in the second year evaluation. It is only through controlling this aspect of the program that FENAC can provide reliable, low cost services to its membership.

(2) A shortcoming of the program has been its focus on coconuts, which only a small percentage of FENAC's socios produce. After the initial bad experience with rice marketing, FENAC's leadership was wary of attempting to service this important sector. In the future, however, to meet the dual objectives of income and service, FENAC must attempt to market a broader range of commodities. At this writing, it is encouraging that FENAC is arranging for the export of 9,000 quintals of name, a product grown by many FENAC affiliates.

(3) Every effort should be made to secure adequate working capital for the project before it is initiated, as well as locate sources of long term loans.

(4) The commercial motive must be instilled in the directors, managers and beneficiaries of the programs from the very outset. Those campesinos involved in the operation of the program must be made to understand that the beneficiaries cannot profit at the expense of the Federation; otherwise, the operation will fail and the service aspect will be lost as well.

(5) Strict attention must be paid to product quality, especially for export, as well as to meeting delivery committments. With one bad experience, buyers are scared off.

(6) In the long run, the Federation can only provide total market security for the members through a three-pronged operation — local sales, export and processing. This, of course, requires a big investment and much more technical assistance.

(7) Middlemen are tough and do not suffer competition gladly. The only advantages the Federation has over them are (a) more resources, and (b) an organized clientele. The ability to set delivery times and places is a tremendous plus. However, the more bureaucratic the Federation becomes, the more this advantage is eroded. The operational personnel should be pared to a minimum and then supervised closely.

(8) The export business is rife with hustlers. Much of the profits made are realized through double-bookkeeping, misrepresentation on bills of lading, and other well-known practices. FENAC, being a non-profit entity, cannot afford to play by these rules. To compete, the Federation must find those few honest buyers and deal with them.

(9) With all its problems, campesino federations must get involved in marketing.

23. Special Comments

This project constituted more than an economic project to improve the standard of living of a few thousand Dominican campesinos — it was also an important social and political experiment. Much discussion has taken place throughout Latin America as to whether grass roots organizations — to be effective — should be economic or political in orientation. Some argue that to become involved in politics will subvert the economic aim of the organization; others, concerned about the organization's effectiveness as a lobbiest on behalf of its members, think of marketing and credit programs as dangerous distractions.

We believe the FENAC project has demonstrated that the twin objectives of political advocacy and economic services to members can be simultaneously realized. It is not as simple a task as organizing a cooperative, or a pro-land reform peasant movement, but it can be done. The key is a strict division of authority and responsibility, and an enlightened leadership which adheres to the priorities of its membership. Little mention was made in the report of the political advocacy of FENAC and its role in resolving legal and land reform related problems of its members, as this was not a central part of the OPG. The Federation's activities in these areas were, however, substantial.

It is AIFLD's belief that this type of hybrid grass roots organization, political and economic in nature, can make a far greater contribution to the ultimate welfare of its members than could a cooperative or strictly politically-oriented organization. We would hope that in the future A.I.D. will consider putting more of its resources into this type of venture, not in lieu of, but as a necessary complement to its investments in government programs and "apolitical" cooperative projects. Such a mixed approach could go far in advancing the economic welfare objectives of development as well as tacitly aiding and abetting the progress of the Dominican Republic and other countries like it towards the evolution of freer, more stable democratic societies.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

17. Outputs

Second Year (4/80-3/81)

Evaluation Yeach Marks: OPG 517-0136 (USAID/DR - ADEC)

Goal: Twenty percent (20%) increase in average net income from agriculture activities.	Base 2/79	3/82 Target	Performance 3/82	Performance / Target	Percentage Improvement Over Base
	330	$ 400	$1,405	3.50	325%
Objectives:					
I. Production Credit Program:					
a. Percent loans received late.	75%	10%	53%	0.19	38%
b. Average trips required to negotiate loans.	5.3	2	3	0.66	43%
c. Average cost of negotiating loans.	$ 11.00	$ 5	$ 15	0.33	(36%)
d. Percent members using institutional credit	45%	95%	73.5%	0.77	63%
e. Number of associations receiving group loans from Banco Agricola	18	50	60	1.20	233%
f. Number of associations with unsupervised lines of credit	0	25	2	0.08	-
g. Total loan volume ($000) (per annum)	$ 500	$1,500	$2,000	1.33	400%
II. Marketing Systems					
a. Volume marketed through FENAC ($000)	$ 65-70	$2,000	$ 500	0.25	614%
b. Member capitalization ($000)	$ 20	$ 75	$54.30	0.72	172%
b. Regional marketing centers established	0	3	1	0.32	-

$\frac{P}{T}$ = 1 (achieved); (+) 1 (Exceeded); (-) 1 (Partially Achieved)

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Second Year (4/80-3/81)

Evaluation Bench Marks: OPG 517-0136 (USAID/DR - AIFLD)

Objectives: (continued)	Base 2/79	3/82 Target	Performance 3/82	Performance/ Target	Percentage Improvement Over Base
III. Expansion of On-Going Program:					
a. Number of beneficiaries	5,000	25,000	25,665	1.03	433%
b. Number of associations	45	125	125	1.00	178%
c. Number of activists	4	10	10	1.00	150%
d. Number of agricultural promoters	20	250	75	0.30	275%
e. Number of female promoters	0	2	1	0.50	-
IV. Training Program: Outputs					
a. Technical Agricultural Courses	0	18	4	0.22	
b. Production Credit and Marketing	0	18	18	1.00	
c. Management Techniques	0	18	18	1.00	
d. Promotion	0	27	23	0.85	
e. Activist Training	0	12	3	0.57	

P = 1 (Achieved); (+) 1 (Exceeded); (-) 1 (Partially Achieved)
T

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appendix A

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
Production and Income Statistics

Survey Number	Crop	Total Cost	Total Output	Price Received	Loan Costs	Net Income
1	rice	2,221.75	150	20	165	613
	rice	1,988.75	139	22.49	165	972
						1,585
2	rice	2,851.87	160	20	198	150
	rice	2,179.5	148	21.96	198	872
						1,022
3	rice	2,283.5	141	22.50	165	724
	rice	2,097.0	129	22.96	165	700
						1,424
4	rice	2,408.5	146	22.27	165	677
	rice	2,403.0	137	22.78	165	553
						1,230
5	rice	1,661.0	121	22.15	132	887
	rice	1,626.5	114	23.0	132	863
						1,750
6	rice	1,785.0	117	21.80	132	664
	rice	1,706.5	112	22.20	132	647
						1,311
7	rice	1,376.4	124	22.25	132	1,251
	rice	1,304.0	100	21.75	132	739
						1,990
8	rice	1,103.25	70	22.0	83	354
	rice	1,057.25	73	23.0	83	539
						893

Survey Number	Crop	Total Cost	Total Output	Price Received	Loan Costs	Net Income
9	rice	1,542.35	112	22.0	116	806
	rice	1,291.85	92	22.43	116	656
						1,462
10	rice	1,747.5	100	23.0	132	420
	rice	1,711.5	93	22.25	132	226
						646
11	rice	1,922	105	21.50	132	204
	rice	1,710.90	80	20.50	131	(202)
						2
12	rice	1,990	117	21.75	132	423
	rice	1,893.25	97	22.15	128	128
						551
13	rice	2,247	163	21.90	165	1,158
	rice	2,137.50	135	20.40	165	452
						1,610
14	rice	3,012.50	197	22.16	198	1,155
	rice	3,042	179	22.90	198	859
						2,014
15	rice	1,840.75	115	20.95	148.5	420
	rice	1,735.75	103	22.40	148.5	843
						1,263
16	rice	1,590.50	110	22.26	132	726
	rice	1,578	116	22.89	132	945
						1,671

9

Survey Number	Crop	Total Cost	Total Output	Price Received	Loan Costs	Net Income
17	rice	1,391.50	100	21.70	132	646
	rice	1,268.50	114	22.34	132	1,146
						1,792
18	rice	1,408.50	103	22.30	132	756
	rice	1,488	96	22.75	132	564
						1,320
19	rice	1,719	66	18	45	(576)
	yautia	407	41	12	-	85
						(491)
20	rice	1,855	70	19	66	(591)
	yuca	-	-	-	-	
						(591)
21	rice	966.25	27	19	66	(519.25)
	yuca	-	6	(8)	-	48
	yautia	18	16	13	-	190
						(281)
22	rice	984.05	56	19	34.81	45.14
	yuca	27	12.8	9	-	88.2
	name	-	11.6	10	-	116
						249
23	rice	629.70	56	18	43.58	334
	yuca	-	5.66	8	-	45.28
	corn	-	3.85	10	-	38.50
	yautia	39.30	11	14.50	-	120.20
						538

Survey Number	Crop	Total Cost	Total Output	Price Received	Loan Costs	Net Income
24	rice	410.40	45	18	37.10	378.70
	yautia	-	28	15	-	420.00
	yuca	-	8	8	-	64.00
						867
25	rice	1,859.90	70	18.50	66.90	(618.85)
	yuca	-	19	8	-	152.00
	maiz	-	7	10	-	70.00
						397
26	rice	995	55	18.50	49.69	(27.19)
	yautia	21	23	13	-	278.00
						251
27	rice	948	60	18	69.99	71.01
	yuca	68.50	30	30	-	244.50
	habichuela	82.60	4	30	-	37.40
						353
28	name	498.79	81	-	34.10	87.11
	yuca	-	6.4		-	57.6
	plantan	63.80	6.6	40		304.20
						449
29	name	1,173	112		82.75	(461.75)
	habichuela	24.30	3			95.70
						(366)
30	name	836	91		27.02	(169)
	yuca	-	9		-	69
	patata	-	1.32	9.60	-	12.67
						(87)
31	name	901	145		70.58	119
	yautia	32	34		-	391

Survey Number	Crop	Total Cost	Total Output	Price Received	Loan Costs	Net Income
32	name	1,311	152		88.33	(308)
	yuca	25	26		-	76
						233
33	yautia	513	79	13	50.31	464
	yuca	-	18	4	-	72
						536
34	rice	1,891	134		80.3	531
	platanos	-	2.2	40	-	88
						619
35	rice	1,849	137	19	76	678
	platanos	-	950	.06	-	57
	patata	-	450	.09	-	41
						776
36	rice	2,039	153		83	742
	habichuela	-	200.36		-	100
						842
37	yuca	185	150	8	-	1015
38	yuca	420	200	7	-	980
39	yuca	105	50	5	-	145
	habichuela	183	12	30	-	177
						322
40	yuca	130	45	7.50	-	207.50
	mani	475	45	20		425
						633
41	yuca	110	35	8.50		187.50
	corn	149	45	7		160

19

Survey Number	Crop	Total Cost	Total Output	Price Received	Loan Costs	Net Income
42	corn	137	60	8		343
	yuca	145	65	7.50		342.50
						686
43	yuca	160	90	6		380
	habichuela	525	30	30		375
	habichuela	265	60	33		1,715
						2,470
44	yuca	160	120	9		920
	habichuela	410	30	25		340
						1,260
45	maiz	252	50	8.99		198
	yuca	205	75	7.99		394
						592
46	yuca	185	40	7		95
	rice	377	60	23		1,003
						1,098
47	yuca	535	300	7		1,565
	rice	560	35	25.99		350
						1,915
48	yuca	448	360	9		2,792
49	yuca	520	500	9	81	3,980
50	yuca	750	700	8	60	4,790
	corn	138	10	8		(58)
						4,732

Survey Number	Crop	Total Cost	Total Output	Price Received	Loan Costs	Net Income
51	yuca	545	250	5	41	705
52	habichuela	535	20	40		265
53	name	575	65	20		725
	corn	364	100	(9)		536
						1,261
54	habichuela	235	10	35		115
	yuca	615	300	6		1,185
						1,300
55	habichuela	87.50	2	60		33
	ajo	181.50	20	70		1,218
						1,251
56	remolacha	2,382.50	70	75		2,612
	tomatoes	2,686	1,000	40		3,731
						6,343
57	habichuela	760	36	60		1,400
	repallo	1,039	30,000	.10		1,961
	remolacha	482.50	26	60		1,077
						4,438
58	coffee	1,110	80	80		5,290
	corn	224	80	9		496
						5,786
59	mani	1,047	85	20		653
	yuca	114	40	10		286
						939
60	habichuela	492	20	40		308
	yuca	217	150	8		1,291
						1,599

12

Survey Number	Crop	Total Cost	Total Output	Price Received	Loan Costs	Net Income
61	habichuela	296	24.5	31		464
	yuca	147	200	8		1,453
						1,917
62	habichuela	169	24	36		695
	yuca	71	100	8		729
						1,424
63	habichuela	271	34	46	.66	1,292
64	habichuela	93	6	40	.17	147
	corn	2	10	10		98
						245
65	habichuela	114	12	40	-	366
	corn	57.50	30	12	-	302
						668
66	habichuela	219	16	40	-	421
	corn	143	10	20	-	5.7
						427
67	habichuela	244.25	27	135	26.87	934
	mani	1,047.50	90	20	0	752
						1,686
68	habichuela	320	41	160	11.73	1,298
	yuca	502	100	10	25.00	4,368
						5,666
69	habichuela	987	320	40	36.19	11,777
	corn	840	160	9	-	600
						12,377

Survey Number	Crop	Total Cost	Total Output	Price Received	Loan Costs	Net Income
70	-	161.50	9	120		918
71	-					
72	-					
73	-					
74	-					
75	-					
76	-					
77	-					
78	-					
79	-					
80	-					
81	-					
82	-					
83	-			180		
84	-					

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982/ SURVEY RESULTS

NOMBRES DE LAS ZONAS DE FENAC/ FENAC ZONE NAMES

ZONA FENAC	NUMERO/NUMBER	PORCENTAJE/PERC
1 = NAGUA (NE)	12	13.6 %
2 = RIO SAN JUAN (NE)	6	6.8 %
3 = SAMANA (NE)	19	21.6 %
4 = DUARTE (NE)	3	3.4 %
5 = SANTIAGO RODRIGUEZ (NO)	6	6.8 %
6 = DAJABON (NO)	9	10.2 %
7 = MONTI CRISTI (NO)	3	3.4 %
8 = LA VEGA (NC)	7	8.0 %
9 = JARABACOA (NC)	9	10.2 %
0 = BONAO (NC)	14	15.9 %
SUMA/TOTAL	88	100.0 %

CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 1
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 98.9 %

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / SURVEY RESULTS

LAS ASOCIACIONES QUE PARTICIPARON EN LA ENCUESTA DE FENAC

NOMBRE DE LA ASOCIACION	NUMERO/ NUMBER	PORCENTAJE/ PERCENT
01 = SAN MIGUEL	3	3.4 %
02 = AMANTE AL PROGRESO	3	3.4 %
03 = AMANTE PROGRESO	3	3.4 %
04 = LA NUEVA ESPERANZA	3	3.4 %
05 = LA UNION	3	3.4 %
06 = SAN JUAN	3	3.4 %
07 = ABRAZO Y PAZ	4	4.5 %
08 = AMAR ES ENTREGARSE	6	6.7 %
09 = EL ESFUERZO	4	4.5 %
10 = LA NUEVA IDEA	3	3.4 %
11 = DESARRO. DE LA COMUNIDAD	3	3.4 %
12 = LA NUEVA UNION	3	3.4 %
13 = GREGORIO VARGAS	3	3.4 %
14 = JUAN BAUTISTA	3	3.4 %
15 = JUAN BAUTISTA GOMEZ	3	3.4 %
16 = LAS CLAVELLINAS	3	3.4 %
17 = DESIDERIO ARIAS	3	3.4 %
18 = LUCHA Y PROGRESO	3	3.4 %
19 = SANTA ANA	3	3.4 %
20 = AGRICOLA LAS CRUCES	3	3.4 %
21 = UNION SOCIAL	3	3.4 %
22 = LA PROGRESISTA	3	3.4 %
23 = AGRICUL. CRUCERO ARRIBA	3	3.4 %
24 = MAURICIO BAEZ	3	3.4 %
25 = FEM. UNION Y PROGRESO	3	3.4 %
26 = FEMENINA MAMA TINGO	3	3.4 %
27 = CAMPESINA LOS SUFRIDOS	3	3.4 %
28 = C. SIN TIERRA EN MARCHA	3	3.4 %
= FALTAN DATOS	0	0.0 %
SUMA/TOTAL	89	100.0 %

CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 0
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 100.0 %

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982/ SURVEY RESULTS

REGIONES Y ZONAS DE FENAC/ FENAC REGIONS AND ZONES

REGION FENAC - (X AXIS)

- - - - BY - - - -

ZONA FENAC - (Y AXIS)

NUMBER / ROW % / COLUMN % / TOTAL %	NORDESTE 1	NOROESTE 2	NORCENTRAL 3	ROW TOTALS
LA VEGA (NC) 8	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	7 100.0 23.3 8.0	7 8.0
JARABACOA (NC) 9	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	9 100.0 30.0 10.2	9 10.2
BONAO (NC) 0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	14 100.0 46.7 15.9	14 15.9
COLUMN TOTALS	40 45.5	18 20.5	30 34.1	88 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 176
DEGREES OF FREEDOM = 18
PROBABILITY OF CHANCE = 0.000
CRAMER'S V = 1.000
CONTINGENCY COEFF. = 0.816

VALID CASES = 88
MISSING CASES = 1
RESPONSE RATE = 98.9 %

CAUTION: CHI SQUARE INCLUDES 26 CELLS WHERE THE EXPECTED FREQUENCY IS LESS THA

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982/ SURVEY RESULTS

REGIONES Y ZONAS DE FENAC/ FENAC REGIONS AND ZONES

REGION FENAC - (X AXIS)

- - - - BY - - - -

ZONA FENAC - (Y AXIS)

NUMBER ROW % COLUMN % TOTAL %	NORDESTE 1	NOROESTE 2	NORCENTRAL 3	ROW TOTALS
N'GUA (NE) 1	12 100.0 30.0 13.6	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	12 13.6
RIO SAN JUAN (NE) 2	6 100.0 15.0 6.8	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	6 6.8
S MANA (NE) 3	19 100.0 47.5 21.6	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	19 21.6
DUARTE (NE) 4	3 100.0 7.5 3.4	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	3 3.4
S NTIAGO RODRIGUEZ (NO) 5	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	6 100.0 33.3 6.8	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	6 6.8
DAJABON (NO) 6	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	9 100.0 50.0 10.2	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	9 10.2
M NTI CRISTI (NO) 7	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	3 100.0 16.7 3.4	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	3 3.4

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982/ SURVEY RESULTS

CULTIVOS EN LAS REGIONES / CROPS IN EACH REGION

REGION FENAC - (X AXIS)

- - - - BY - - - -

CULTIVO 1 - (Y AXIS)

	NUMBER ROW % COLUMN % TOTAL %	NORDESTE 1	NOROESTE 2	NORCENTRAL 3	ROW TOTALS
ARROZ1	01	29 100.0 72.5 32.6	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	29 32.6
AR OZ2	02	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0
ZUCA	03	1 7.1 2.5 1.1	13 92.9 72.2 14.6	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	14 15.7
HALICHUELA	04	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	2 14.3 11.1 2.2	12 85.7 38.7 13.5	14 15.7
ZANTIA	05	2 100.0 5.0 2.2	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	2 2.2
AME	06	6 100.0 15.0 6.7	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	6 6.7
A Z	07	2 40.0 5.0 2.2	2 40.0 11.1 2.2	1 20.0 3.2 1.1	5 5.6

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982/ SURVEY RESULTS

CULTIVOS EN LAS REGIONES / CROPS IN EACH REGION

REGION FENAC - (X AXIS)

- - - BY - - - -

CULTIVO 1 - (Y AXIS)

NUMBER ROW % COLUMN % TOTAL %	NORDESTE 1	NOROESTE 2	NORCENTRAL 3	ROW TOTALS
08	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0
09	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0
10	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	1 100.0 3.2 1.1	1 1.1
11	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0
12	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	1 100.0 3.2 1.1	1 1.1
13	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	1 100.0 3.2 1.1	1 1.1
14	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	1 100.0 3.6 1.1	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	1 1.1

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982/ SURVEY RESULTS

CULTIVOS EN LAS REGIONES / CROPS IN EACH REGION

REGION FENAC - (X AXIS)

- - - BY - - - -

CULTIVO 1 - (Y AXIS)

NUMBER ROW % COLUMN % TOTAL %	NORDESTE 1	NOROESTE 2	NORCENTRAL 3	ROW TOTALS
15	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0
DATOS	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	15 100.0 48.4 16.9	15 16.9
COLUMN TOTALS	40 44.9	18 20.2	31 34.8	89 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 147.04
DEGREES OF FREEDOM = 20
PROBABILITY OF CHANCE = 0.000
CRAMER'S V = 0.909
CONTINGENCY COEFF. = 0.789

VALID CASES = 89
MISSING CASES = 0
RESPONSE RATE = 100.0 %

: CHI SQUARE INCLUDES 26 CELLS WHERE THE EXPECTED FREQUENCY IS LESS THAN 5
NOT INCLUDED IN CHI SQUARE CALCULATIONS

ULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982: REP. DOMINICANA

MERO DE TAREAS SEMBRADAS

: TAREAS SEMBRADAS: CUL 1

MINIMUM	=	1
MAXIMUM	=	60
RANGE	=	59
SUM	=	1902
MEAN	=	26.055
MEDIAN	=	20
MODE	=	40
VARIANCE	=	224.518
STANDARD DEVIATION	=	14.984
STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN	=	1.766
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN	=	22.594 - 29.5
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN	=	21.508 - 30.6

NBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIANCE	=	227.636
STANDARD DEVIATION	=	15.088

DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS	=	.446
KURTOSIS	=	-.701

LID CASES = 73
SSING CASES = 16
SPONSE PERCENT = 82.0 %

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982: REP. DOMINICANA

ERO DE TAREAS SEMBRADAS

TAREAS SEMBRADAS: CUL 2

MINIMUM	=	1
MAXIMUM	=	60
RANGE	=	59
SUM	=	1259
MEAN	=	21.339
MEDIAN	=	20
MODE	=	20
VARIANCE	=	277.614
STANDARD DEVIATION	=	16.662
STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN	=	2.188
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN	=	17.051 - 25.6
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN	=	15.705 - 26.9

NBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIANCE	=	282.401
STANDARD DEVIATION	=	16.805

ATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS	=	.679
KURTOSIS	=	-.735

ID CASES	=	59
SING CASES	=	30
PONSE PERCENT	=	66.3 %

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Encuesta FENAC '82

VI Evaluacion

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / SURVEY RESULTS

VI EVALUACION: SERVICIOS RECIBIDOS DE FENAC / SERVICES RECEIVED

NUMBER OF CASES = 89

	COUNT	PERCENT
VI A.INSUMOS	16	18.0 %
VI A.ASISTENCIA CREDITICIA	52	58.4 %
VI A.SERVICIOS DE MERCADEO	37	41.6 %
VI A.APOYO LEGAL	74	83.1 %
VI A.PROGRAMA DE EDUCACION	81	91.0 %
VI A.OTROS	21	23.6 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / SURVEY RESULTS

DATOS GENERALES: NUMERO DE AFILIADOS / NO. OF MEMBERS

NUMERO DE AFILIADOS

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 3

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 61

LIMITES/RANGE = 58

SUMA/SUM = 2341

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 27.869

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 27

MODO/MODE = 20

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 153.662

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 12.396

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = 1.361

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 25.202 - 30.536

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 24.365 - 31.373

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 155.513

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 12.47

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = 1.104

KURTOSIS = 1.152

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 84
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 5
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 94.4 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / SURVEY RESULTS

VI EVALUACION: SUS NECESIDADES MAS URGENTES / IMPORTANT NEEDS

NUMBER OF CASES = 89

	COUNT	PERCE
VI B.NECESIDADES DE TIERRA?	51	57.3
VI B.NECESIDADES DE CREDITO?	53	59.6
VI B.NECESIDADES DE AGUA?	39	43.8
VI B.NECESIDADES DE INSUMOS	70	78.7
VI B.NECESIDADES DE MERCADEO	67	75.3
VI B OTROS NECESIDADES?	15	16.9

Encuesta FENAC '82

IV Credito Agricola

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / JULY '82 SURVEY

GASTOS PARA OBTENER CREDITO / EXPENSES IN OBTAINING CREDIT

IV I GASTOS DE TRANSPORTE (1)

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 2

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 99

LIMITES/RANGE = 97

SUMA/SUM = 826

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 17.957

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 15

MODO/MODE = MULTI-MODAL

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 227.433

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 15.081

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = 2.248

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 13.55 - 22.363

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 12.168 - 23.745

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 232.487

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 15.248

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = 3.745

KURTOSIS = 16.551

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 46
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 43
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 51.7 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / JULY '82 SURVEY

CREDITO: FUENTES DE PRESTAMOS / CREDIT: LOAN SOURCES

IVC FUENTE DE PRESTAMO (1)	NUMERO/NUMBER	PORCENTAJE/PERCENT
1 = BANCO AGRICOLA	43	86.0 %
2 = SIC	1	2.0 %
3 = FENAC	3	6.0 %
4 = CEA	3	6.0 %
SUMA/TOTAL	50	100.0 %

CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 39
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 56.2 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / JULY '82 SURVEY

CREDITO: FUENTES DE PRESTAMOS / CREDIT: LOAN SOURCES

IVC FUENTE DE PRESTAMO (2)	NUMERO/NUMBER	PORCENTAJE/PERCENT
1 = BANCO AGRICOLA	20	83.3 %
2 = SIC	1	4.2 %
3 = FENAC	2	8.3 %
4 = CEA	0	0.0 %
0 =	1	4.2 %
SUMA/TOTAL	24	100.0 %

CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 65
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 27.0 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / JULY '82 SURVEY

CREDITO: TASAS DE INTERES PAGADO / CREDIT: INTEREST RATES PAID

IVD INTERES ANUAL (1)

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 0

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 14

LIMITES/RANGE = 14

SUMA/SUM = 505

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 9.902

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 11

MODO/MODE = 11

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 10.794

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 3.285

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = .465

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 8.991 - 10.813

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 8.706 - 11.098

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 11.01

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 3.318

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = -2.464

KURTOSIS = 4.594

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 51
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 38
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 57.3 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / JULY '82 SURVEY

CREDITO: TASAS DE INTERES PAGADO / CREDIT: INTEREST RATES PAID

IVD INTERES ANUAL (2)

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 0

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 11

LIMITES/RANGE = 11

SUMA/SUM = 222

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 9.652

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 11

MODO/MODE = 11

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 12.14

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 3.484

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = .743

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 8.196 - 11.108

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 7.739 - 11.565

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 12.692

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 3.563

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = -2.206

KURTOSIS = 2.887

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 23
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 66
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 25.8 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / JULY '82 SURVEY

CREDITO: PLAZOS DE PRESTAMOS / CREDIT: LENGTHS OF LOANS

IVE PLAZO (1)	NUMERO/NUMBER	PORCENTAJE/PERCENT
0 = UN AÑO	9	18.0 %
6 =	30	60.0 %
9 =	1	2.0 %
4 =	10	20.0 %
SUMA/TOTAL	50	100.0 %

CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 39
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 56.2 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / JULY '82 SURVEY

CREDITO: CANTIDADES ADEUDADOS / CREDIT: AMOUNTS OWED

IV J CANTIDAD ADEUDADO (1)

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 0

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 3004

LIMITES/RANGE = 3004

SUMA/SUM = 16913

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 384.386

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 138

MODO/MODE = 0

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 365554.624

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 604.611

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = 92.202

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 203.67 - 565.103

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 146.965 - 621.807

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 374055.895

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 611.601

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = 2.407

KURTOSIS = 6.577

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 44
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 45
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 49.4 %

Encuesta FENAC '82

V RECURSOS

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / JULY '82 SURVEY

TIERRA: TEREAJE / AMOUNT OF LAND FARMED (IN TAREAS)

VA 2.NUM. TAREAS

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 1

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 150

LIMITES/RANGE = 149

SUMA/SUM = 3400

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 50

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 47.5

MODO/MODE = 40

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 591.823

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 24.327

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = 2.972

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 44.175 - 55.825

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 42.347 - 57.653

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 600.657

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 24.508

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = 1.06

KURTOSIS = 3.534

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 68
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 21
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 76.4 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / JULY '82 SURVEY

TIERRA REGADA / IRRIGATED LAND

VA 3. TAREAS BAJO RIEGO

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 3

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 76

LIMITES/RANGE = 73

SUMA/SUM = 1547

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 41.811

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 40

MODO/MODE = 40

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 296.368

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 17.215

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = 2.869

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 36.187 - 47.434

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 34.423 - 49.199

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 304.601

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 17.453

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = -.21

KURTOSIS = .168

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 37
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 52
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 41.6 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / JULY '82 SURVEY

CANTIDAD PAGADO POR AGUA: RATE PAID FOR WATER

VA 3.USO DE AGUA

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 0

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 85

LIMITES/RANGE = 85

SUMA/SUM = 588

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 18.968

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 17.5

MODO/MODES (BIMODAL)= 14 & 20

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 180.431

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 13.432

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = 2.452

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 14.161 - 23.774

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 12.653 - 25.283

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 186.446

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 13.655

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = 3.736

KURTOSIS = 16.086

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 31
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 58
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 34.8 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982/ SURVEY RESULTS

INVENTARIO DE ANIMALES: GANADO LECHERO / NO. OF MILK COWS

VB GANADO LECHERO

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 1

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 12

LIMITES/RANGE = 11

SUMA/SUM = 48

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 3.429

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 2.5

MODO/MODES (BIMODAL)= 1 & 3

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 9.816

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 3.133

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = .869

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 1.725 - 5.132

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 1.191 - 5.666

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 10.571

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 3.251

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = 1.719

KURTOSIS = 1.832

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 14
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 75
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 15.7 %

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982/ SURVEY RESULTS

INVENTARIO DE ANIMALES: GANADO DE CARNE / NO. OF BEEF CATTLE

B GANADO DE CARNE

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 2

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 8

LIMITES/RANGE = 6

SUMA/SUM = 40

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 3.636

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 2

MODO/MODE = 2

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 5.14

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 2.267

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = .717

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 2.231 - 5.042

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 1.79 - 5.483

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 5.655

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 2.378

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = 1.109

KURTOSIS = -.345

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 11
ASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 78
ORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 12.4 %

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982/ SURVEY RESULTS

I. INVENTARIO DE ANIMALES

VI GANADO CAPRINO

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 1

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 9

LIMITES/RANGE = 8

SUMA/SUM = 96

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 4

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 3.5

MODO/MODES (BIMODAL)= 3 & 4

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 5

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 2.236

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = .466

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 3.086 - 4.914

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 2.799 - 5.201

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 5.217

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 2.284

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = .962

KURTOSIS = .06

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 24
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 65
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 27.0 %

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / JULY '82 SURVEY

INVENTARIO DE ANIMALES: AVES DOMESTICAS / NUMBER OF CHICKENS

VB AVES DOMESTICAS

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 1

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 40

LIMITES/RANGE = 39

SUMA/SUM = 779

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 11.456

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 10

MODO/MODE = 10

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 43.777

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 6.616

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = .808

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 9.872 - 13.04

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 9.374 - 13.537

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 44.431

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 6.666

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = 1.408

KURTOSIS = 3.56

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 68
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 21
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 76.4 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982/ SURVEY RESULTS

INVENTARIO DE ANIMALES: BUEYES DE TRABAJO / NO. OF OXEN

VB BUEYES DE TRABAJO

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 1

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 9

LIMITES/RANGE = 8

SUMA/SUM = 24

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 1.714

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 1

MODO/MODE = 1

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 4.204

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 2.05

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = .569

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = .6 - 2.829

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = .25 - 3.179

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 4.527

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 2.128

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = 3.172

KURTOSIS = 8.399

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 14
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 75
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 15.7 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982/ SURVEY RESULTS

NUMERO DE CABALLOS, MULAS O BURROS / NO. HORSES, MULES, BURROS

VB CABALLOS, MULAS O BURROS

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 1

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 4

LIMITES/RANGE = 3

SUMA/SUM = 84

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 1.615

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 1

MODO/MODE = 1

VARIACION/VARIANCE = .737

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= .858

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = .12

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 1.38 - 1.851

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 1.306 - 1.925

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = .751

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= .867

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = 1.373

KURTOSIS = 1.122

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 52
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 37
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 58.4 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / SURVEY RESULTS

PRODUCCION ANIMAL: LITROS DE LECHE ANUAL / LITRES OF MILK

VB 2 PRODUCCION DE LECHE (BOTELLAS/LITROS)

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 1

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 6570

LIMITES/RANGE = 6569

SUMA/SUM = 28884

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 1925.6

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 1440

MODO/MODES (BIMODAL)= 600 & 1500

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 3555408.048

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 1885.579

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = 503.942

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 937.873 - 2913.327

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 627.949 - 3223.251

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 3809365.766

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 1951.76

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = 1.325

KURTOSIS = .623

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 15
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 74
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 16.9 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / SURVEY RESULTS

PRODUCCION ANIMAL: HUEVOS / EGG PRODUCTION

HUEVOS (#)

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 3

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 999

LIMITES/RANGE = 996

SUMA/SUM = 22032

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 361.18

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 275

MODO/MODE = MULTI-MODAL

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 73017.723

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 270.218

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = 34.885

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 292.806 - 429.555

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 271.351 - 451.009

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 74234.685

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 272.46

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = 1.177

KURTOSIS = .514

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 61
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 28
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 68.5 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / SURVEY RESULTS

PRODUCCION ANIMAL: CARNE (RES/CHIVO) / MEAT PRODUCTION

VB 2 CARNE	NUMERO/NUMBER	PORCENTAJE/PERCENT
3 = 50-150 LBS	0	0.0 %
5 = 151-200 LBS	2	20.0 %
6 = 201-300 LBS	2	20.0 %
7 = 1-2 QQ	3	30.0 %
8 = 3-4 QQ	1	10.0 %
9 = 5-6 QQ	1	10.0 %
0 = 7-10 QQ	1	10.0 %
SUMA/TOTAL	10	100.0 %

CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 79
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 11.2 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / SURVEY RESULTS

NUM. DE CERDOS ANTES DE LA FIEBRE PORCINA/ NO. OF HOGS (BEFORE)

VB 3.CERDOS (ANTES)

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 1

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 50

LIMITES/RANGE = 49

SUMA/SUM = 614

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 8.187

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 6

MODO/MODES (BIMODAL)= 4 & 8

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 47.725

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 6.908

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = .803

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 6.613 - 9.761

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 6.119 - 10.255

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 48.37

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 6.955

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = 3.301

KURTOSIS = 15.931

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 75
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 14
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 84.3 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / SURVEY RESULTS

FIEBRE PORCINA: RECIBIO PAGO DEL ESTADO? / WERE YOUR PAID?

VB 3.RECIBIO PAGO?	NUMERO/NUMBER	PORCENTAJE/PERCENT
1 = SI	14	50.0 %
2 = NO	14	50.0 %
SUMA/TOTAL	28	100.0 %

CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 61
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 31.5 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / SURVEY RESULTS

FIEBRE PORCINA: CUANTOS CERDOS MURIERON?/ NO. OF HOGS THAT DIED

CUANTOS CERDOS MURIERON?

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 0

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 13

LIMITES/RANGE = 13

SUMA/SUM = 26

PROMEDIO/MEAN = .619

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 0

MODO/MODE = 0

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 5.569

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 2.36

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = .369

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = -.103 - 1.341

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = -.33 - 1.568

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 5.705

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 2.389

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = 4.22

KURTOSIS = 17.421

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 42
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 47
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 47.2 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / SURVEY RESULTS

FIEBRE PORCINA: CERDOS QUE MATO PARA CARNE / HOGS KILLED

VB 3.CUANTOS CERDOS MATO?

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 1

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 48

LIMITES/RANGE = 47

SUMA/SUM = 447

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 6.041

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 4

MODO/MODE = 4

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 36.336

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 6.028

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = .706

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 4.658 - 7.423

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 4.224 - 7.857

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 36.834

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 6.069

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = 4.693

KURTOSIS = 29.119

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 74
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 15
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 83.1 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / SURVEY RESULTS

EQUIPO AGRICOLA / LISTING OF EQUIPMENT

NUMBER OF CASES = 89

	COUNT	PERCENT
VC TRACTOR	6	6.7 %
VC BOMBA	7	7.9 %
VC MOTOR	18	20.2 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / SURVEY RESULTS

EQUIPO AGRICOLA: NUMERO DE TRACTORES / NO. OF TRACTORS

VC TRACTOR

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 1

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 2

LIMITES/RANGE = 1

SUMA/SUM = 9

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 1.5

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 1.5

MODO/MODES (BIMODAL)= 1 & 2

VARIACION/VARIANCE = .25

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= .5

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = .224

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 1.062 - 1.938

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = .924 - 2.076

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = .3

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= .548

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = 0

KURTOSIS = -2

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 6
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 83
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 6.7 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / SURVEY RESULTS

EQUIPO AGRICOLA: BOMBAS / NO. OF PUMPS

VC BOMBA

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 1

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 1

LIMITES/RANGE = 0

SUMA/SUM = 7

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 1

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 1

MODO/MODE = 1

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 0

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 0

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = 0

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 1 - 1

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = 1 - 1

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = 0

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= 0

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 7
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 82
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 7.9 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / SURVEY RESULTS

EQUIPO AGRICOLA: EN COMUN O PARTICULAR / CO-OP OWNERSHIP?

LOS POSEE EN COMUN?	NUMERO/NUMBER	PORCENTAJE/PERCE
1 = EN COMUN	35	39.3 %
2 = PARTICULAR	13	14.6 %
= FALTAN DATOS	41	46.1 %
SUMA/TOTAL	89	100.0 %

CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 0
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 100.0 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / SURVEY RESULTS

EQUIPO AGRICOLA: NUM. DE MOTORES / NO. OF MOTORS

VC MOTOR

MINIMO/MINIMUM = 1

MAXIMO/MAXIMUM = 3

LIMITES/RANGE = 2

SUMA/SUM = 24

PROMEDIO/MEAN = 1.333

MEDIANO/MEDIAN = 1

MODO/MODE = 1

VARIACION/VARIANCE = .556

DESVIACION STARDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= .745

ERROR STANDARD DEL PROMEDIO/STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN = .181

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 95%/
95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = .979 - 1.688

INTERVALO DE CONFIANZA 99%/
99 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AROUND THE MEAN = .868 - 1.799

* CALCULOS IMPARCIALES DE LA POBLACION/UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION *

VARIACION/VARIANCE = .588

DESVIACION STANDARD/STANDARD DEVIATION= .767

* COEFICIENTES DE DISTRIBUICION DE DATOS/DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS *

SKEWNESS = 1.789

KURTOSIS = 1.2

CASOS VALIDOS/VALID CASES = 18
CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 71
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 20.2 %

RESULTADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / SURVEY RESULTS

EQUIPO AGRICOLA (PEQUENO) / AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS (SMALL)

NUMBER OF CASES = 89	COUNT	PERCEN
VC PALA DE MANO	42	47.2
VC COLIS	36	40.4
VC PICO	20	22.5
VC SERRUCHO O ASADA	24	27.0

Encuesta FENAC '82

VI EVALUACION

Que tipo(s) de servicio(s) de la FENAC cree usted que le seria(n) de mas beneficio?

SAN MIGUEL

Educación, tiendas de insumo y consumo y obtención de préstamos.

AMANTE AL PROGRESO

Educación, tiendas de insumo y consumo y obtención de prestamo.

AMANTE PROGRESO

Educación, préstamo para comprar maquinaria para moler el arroz.

LA NUEVA ESPERANZA

Educación, tiendas de insumo y consumo.

LA UNION

Educación

SAN JUAN

Educación, tiendas de consumo e insumo, financiamiento.

ABRAZO Y PAZ

Seguro agrario, mercadeo.

EL ESFUERZO

Seguro agrario, educación,reconocimiento del sindicalismo.

LA NUEVA IDEA

Seguro agrario, reconocimiento del sindicalismo, financiamiento para la compra de maquinaria.

DESARROLLO DE LA COMUNIDAD

Seguro agrario, sindicalismo agrario, establecimiento de pequeña industria y financiamiento para compra de maquinaria.

LA NUEVA UNION

Seguro agrario, compra de un molino para el arroz, establecimiento de pequeña industria

GREGORIO VARGAS

Programa de rehabilitación de vivienda.

JUAN BAUTISTA

Programa de rehabilitación de vivienda

LAS CLAVELLINAS

Proyecto de rehabilitación de viviendas.

DESIDERIO ARIAS

Programa de rehabilitación de viviendas.

LUCHA Y PROGRESO

Programa de desarrollo, rehabilitación de viviendas.

SANTA ANA

Reforma agraria integral, crédito, tiendas de insumo y consumo.

AGRICOLA LAS CRUCES

Educación, crédito, asistencia técnica.

UNION SOCIAL

Educación, mercadeo, crédito, asentamiento campesino.

FEMENINA UNION Y PROGRESO

Educación, comercialización, insumo, mercadeo.

LA PROGRESITA

Asentamiento campesino, adquisición bomba de riego, programa de mercadeo, programa de vivienda.

AGRICULTORES DE CRUCERO ARRIBA

Educación, canalización de recursos para mejor organización, crédito agrícola.

ASOCIACION AGRICULTORES MAURICIO BAEZ

Educación, tiendas de insumo y consumo.

CAMPESINA MAURICIO BAEZ

Educación, tiendas de insumo y consumo, servicio de comercialización.

FEMENINA UNION Y PROGRESO

Educación, comercialización de crédito, desarrollo comunidad.

FEMENINA MAMA TINGO

Educación, comercialización, insumo, mercadeo.

CAMPESINA LOS SUFRIDOS

Educación, mercadeo, comercialización, insumo, tecnificación, crédito.

CAMPESINO SIN TIERRA EN MARCHA

Educación, comercialización, insumo.

ADOS DE LA ENCUESTA FENAC DE JULIO 1982 / SURVEY RESULTS

ACION DE FENAC

H D.SE HA BENEFICIADO DE FENAC?	NUMERO/ NUMBER	PORCENTAJE/ PERCENT
1 = MUCHO	59	66.3 %
2 = ALGO	21	23.6 %
3 = POCO	0	0.0 %
4 = NADA	0	0.0 %
= NO CONTESTAN	9	10.1 %
SUMA/TOTAL	89	100.0 %

CASOS QUE FALTAN/MISSING CASES = 0
PORCENTAJE QUE RESPONDEN/RESPONSE PERCENT = 100.0 %

Appendix B

Encuesta

F E N A C '80

I Datos Generales

Nombre de la Asociación: _____

Dirección:

_____

Paraje Sección Municipio Provincia

Fecha de Organización: _____
Mes Año

Numero de Afiliados: _____

Fecha de Afiliación a FENAC: _____
Mes Año

Zona FENAC: _____

Region FENAC: _____

Nombre de Activista de FENAC: _____

Esta hoja debe ser completada por el activista en conjunto con el presidente de la asociación.

ENCUESTA/FENAC '80

II Cultivos

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
A. # de Siembras:					
B. Mes (s) de Siembra:					
C. # de Tareas Sembrada:					
D. Gastos (RD$): (por siembra)					
1. Preparación Tierra					
2. Compra Semilla					
3. Fertilizante					
4. Pesticida/Insecticida					
5. Herbicida					
6. Mano de Obra:					
6a. Siembra					
6b. Limpieza					

Encuesta/FENAC '80

II Cultivos (con't)

	Nombre de Cultivo				
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5
6c. Cosecha					
E. Otros Gastos (detalle):					
1. Agua					
2. Chapeo					
3.					
4.					
5.					

Encuesta/FENAC '80

III Rendimiento

Nombre de Cultivo

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
A. Mes (es) Cosecha					
B. Cantidad Cosechada					
1. Primera Cosecha (unidad)					
2. Segunda Cosecha (unidad)					
3. Tercera Cosecha (unidad)					
C. Destino					
1. Uso Semillas (cantidad)					
2. Comida (cantidad)					
3. Venta (cantidad)					

Encuesta/FENAC '80

III Rendimiento (con't)

Nombre de Cultivo

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
D. Precio Obtenido (unidad)					
1. Primera Cosecha					
2. Segunda Cosecha					
3. Tercera Cosecha					

Encuesta/FENAC '80

IV. Credito Agricola

	Nombre de Cultivo				
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
A. Monto:					
1. Primera Siembra					
2. Segunda Siembra					
3. Tercera Siembra					
B. Destino:					
1. Semilla					
2. Preparación de Tierra					
3. Fertilizante					
4. Pesticida/Insecticida					
5. Herbicida					

Encuesta/FENAC '80

IV. Credito Agricola (con't)

	Nombre de Cultivo				
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
6. Otros Insumos					
7. Mano de Obra:					
7a. Siembra					
7b. Limpieza					
7c. Cosecha					
7d. Otra					
8. Gastos Personales:					
8a. Medicina					
8b. Comida					
8c. Otros					

Encuesta/FENAC '80

IV. Credito Agricola (con't)

	Nombre de Cultivo				
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
C. Fuente (s) de Prestamo (s)					
1. Primera Siembra					
2. Segunda Siembra					
3. Tercera Siembra					

(siembra)	1.	2.	3.	1.	2.	3.	1.	2.	3.	1.	2.	3.	1.	2.	3.
D. Interes Anual															
E. Plaso															
F. Fecha Solicitado															
G. Fecha Aprobado															
H. Fecha Recibido															
I. Gastos Personales para Obtener Credito															
1. Transporte															
2. Otros															
J. Cantidad Adeudado															
Actual o en Mora															

ENCUESTA/FENAC '80

V RECOURSOS

A. Tierra: (Numero)

1. Cuantos terrenos separados utiliza usted actualmente, incluyendo terreno propio, terreno arrendado o por el cual usted no paga?

Tareas

2. De estos terrenos, cual es el tereaje?

Tareas

3. a. De estas tareas cuántos estan bajo reigo? a.

b. Cuánto pagó usted por el uso de agua? b. $_____.00

4. Tenencia: De las tareas que usted actualmente utiliza, cuanto son -

a. de su propiedad? a.

b. arrendado con pago en efectivo? b.

c. arrendado con pago en especie? c.

d. parcela de Reforma Agraria? d.

e. ocupado sin titulo (del Estado ó particulares)? e.

f. otras formas de tenencia (especifique). f.

g. arrendados a otras personas? g.

h. cedidos a otros sin pago? h.

B. Inventario de Animales: Numero

1. Cuantos animales de los siguientes tipos posee usted?

a. ganado lechero a.

b. ganado de carne b.

c. ganado caprino c.

d. bueyes de trabajo d.

e. aves domesticas e.

f. cerdos f.

g. caballos, mulas ó burros g.

h. otros h.

Best Available Document

2. Producción animal: Cantidad

a. leche (al año) a.

b. carne (res/chivo) b.

c. huevos c.

d. (otra) d.

3. Fiebre Porcina Africana:

a. Cuantos cerdos posefa antes de la fiebre porcina? a.

b. Cuantos cerdos entregó ud. al estado? b.

1. Recibió pago por estos? 1.

2. Cuantos cerdos murieron de la fiebre porcina? 2.

3. Cuantos cerdos mató usted para carne antes de que el estado o la fiebre porcina hiciera cargo de ellos? 3.

C. Equipo Agricola:

1. Posee usted equipo agricola? Si: _____ No: _____

Tipo de equipo:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Lo(s) posee en comun (1) o particularmente (2)?

En comun, con cuantos más? _____

_____

ENCUESTA/FENAC '80

VI EVALUACION

A. Cuales servicios ha recibido de FENAC?:

1. Insumos: _____

2. Asistencia Crediticia: _____

3. Servicios de Mercadeo: _____

4. Apoyo Legal: _____

5. Programa de Educación: _____

6. Otros: _____

B. Cuales son las necesidades más urgentes que siente ud. ahora mismo?

1. Tierra: _____

2. Credito: _____

3. Agua: _____

4. Insumos: _____

8V

Encuesta/FENAC

VI Evaluacion

5. Mercadeo: _____

_____

_____

6. Otros: _____

_____

_____

C. Que Tipo (s) de servicio (s) de la FENAC cree usted que le seria (n) de más beneficio?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____