

24 FEB 1979

IICA-CIDIA

PROGRAM LEVEL EVALUATION 1976-1977

Program VI.1 – Agrarian Reform

Program IV.4 – Agricultural Marketing



IICA
E70
274
E.I.

IICA





INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES - OAS

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

San José, Costa Rica

OAS/Ser.L/1
IICA/RAJD/Doc.142(16/77)
13 January 1977
Original: Spanish

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES - OAS

1976-77 PROGRAM-LEVEL EVALUATION^{1/}

I. INTRODUCTION

For the second time I have the pleasure to submit the program-level evaluation results to the Board of Directors for due consideration. The report includes the results of evaluation studies conducted during the current fiscal period.

I am particularly pleased to be able to present this report, for two main reasons: on the one hand, the evaluation of Program VI.1 (Agrarian Reform) and of Program IV.4 (Agricultural Marketing) clearly indicates that these programs were designed and carried out within the guidelines established and approved by the Board of Directors in the General Plan, and that their implementation has contributed significantly to the development of the Member States, in line with the amount of resources utilized; and on the other, both documents (Appendices 1 and 2 of this report) make concrete, viable proposals for program improvements.

In accordance with numeral 3. of Resolution IICA/RAJD/Res.41(15/76), I will comment on these proposals further on. However, before doing so, I would like to emphasize the timeliness of establishing this form of evaluation by the Board of Directors, as the results are increasingly useful to orient the actions of the organization for which I am responsible, as we gain experience and develop appropriate methodologies for conducting these studies.

1/ Director General's Report to the Board of Directors of IICA for consideration at the Sixteenth Annual Meeting to be held in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic from May 16 to 19, 1977. This report is presented in compliance with Resolution IICA/RAJD/Res.41(15/76) approved at the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Board of Directors.

I would now like to publicly acknowledge our appreciation to our external evaluators, Drs. Edward Betzig, Persio de Carvalho Junqueira, Luis Paz Silva and Harold Riley, who so willingly accepted the responsibility of examining our work in the sensitive fields of agrarian reform and agricultural marketing and of preparing the reports which I am pleased to submit at this time for due consideration by the Board of Directors.

The evaluation of IICA's programs is not an easy task. The extensive geographic dispersion of its actions; the markedly different and sometimes changing conditions in each country where these actions are undertaken; the need to adjust them so as to meet national needs and policies as well as maintaining them within the action philosophy defined for the Humanistic Rural Development Projection of IICA, are all factors to be taken into account for evaluation purposes, while overcoming other natural obstacles to this type of work, amongst which the limited time available is certainly not the least.

The outstanding competence and vast experience of our external evaluators are absolutely essential factors which have contributed to the success of their work, and are, therefore, the principal criteria used to select them. Our four external evaluators this year are certainly highly qualified in this respect. Nonetheless, these factors alone would not have produced such excellent results, if they did not also possess a clear, incisive comprehension of the problems which IICA attempts to resolve as well as outstanding human qualities and characteristics.

Included into this acknowledgement are the large number of people working in national institutions with which IICA has worked, who volunteered their time, knowledge and opinions to the evaluation teams, at the numerous interviews held for the purpose of these studies. Without their help, it would not have been possible to obtain all the necessary information nor to arrive at the valuable conclusions contained in the attached reports.

And lastly, I should like to mention that the opinions, ideas and suggestions of the external evaluators - those who helped us this year as well as those who did so last year - have been very useful to us for the formulation of the Medium-term Indicative Plan, being submitted for consideration to the Board of Directors at this meeting.

I am fully convinced, therefore, that the program-level evaluation established by the Board of Directors is increasingly useful to help orient IICA's actions in a pragmatic manner, and more than wholly justifies the rather limited amount of resources involved.

II. EVALUATION RESULTS

A. Proposals resulting from the evaluation of Program VI.1: Agrarian Reform

Before discussing this matter, I should like to comment on the note which heads the report prepared by Drs. Edward Betzig and Luis Paz Silva.

Resolution IICA/RAJD/Res.41(15/76) established that a total of seven programs were to be evaluated over a two year period: three in Line VI, one in Line IV and three in Line I. At the same time, I was authorized to select the programs to be evaluated each year.

It would have been possible and even logical, from a certain point of view, to evaluate the three programs of Line VI together. However, to ensure the coherence and uniformity of this work, it was advisable to entrust the study to one evaluation team only, allowing more time than employed to date for the evaluation of an isolated program. If this criteria had been adopted, we would only have been able to carry out one evaluation study during the year, thereby contradicting the essence of Resolution IICA/RAJD/Res.22(14/75) which was the basis of this type of evaluation in IICA. Moreover, we would have had to delay the analysis of the Hemispheric Marketing Program, in which a number of delegations attending the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Board of Directors, in Washington, D. C., were interested.

Thus, we decided to evaluate only program 1 of Line VI this year, which left time and resources to also analyze the marketing program.

In addition, it was felt that the evaluation of Program VI.1 would be facilitated by the existence of previous work in this direction, and in any case, it would always be possible to complete the over-all analysis of the Line during the 1977-78 period.

Amongst previous work already undertaken on this matter, we were confident that we would have the 'Evaluation report of Project 206 of the Technical Cooperation Program of the OAS', prepared by Dr. Rafael Moreno. This project was under IICA administration for over 10 years, and included most of IICA's work up to 1973, on structural change, agrarian reform and 'campesino' organization. Unfortunately, partly due to delays resulting from the move of the print shop up to the new IICA headquarters building, partly because the time available to the outside members of the evaluation teams made it advisable to carry on first the evaluation of Program VI.1, the above-mentioned report was not published until after the evaluation study had been concluded.

Thus, the evaluation team for this program was not able to consult this rather complete collection of data and background information, which had been favorably commented upon by the Secretary General of the OAS, Dr. Alejandro Orfila, upon receiving the report. At that time, he wrote me:

"In thanking you for the report, I should like to congratulate the institution which you so ably direct, for the work accomplished in such important fields for the development of our countries, such as agrarian reform and rural development. I am also most pleased to know that the significant activities undertaken within this project are not ending, but have been incorporated into IICA's regular program, thereby ensuring the uninterrupted benefit of the American people."

This and other reasons mentioned by Drs. Betzig and Silva, account for the presentation of their report as preliminary and for their recommendation that the evaluation and joint analysis of all Line VI programs be completed as soon as possible. This recommendation reflects the absolute integrity of the authors, and also indicates that they are the most suited persons to complete the task, which I expect to ask them to do in the next few months. They have already indicated their willingness to complete this study for us.

Nonetheless, I feel that the report which I am presenting for consideration by the Board far exceeds the preliminary nature assigned it by the authors, since it contains valuable reflections, suggestions and additional recommendations which I will comment upon below.

Based on a realistic appraisal of the current situation in most of our continent, the report recommends the following as related to structural change programs: a) to maintain and even intensify IICA's efforts in this field; b) to compile and analyze accumulated experiences of different type so as to make the most of them; and c) to intensify the use of reciprocal technical training possibilities, as needed. I feel this is the right orientation for the agrarian reform program, on a short-term basis, and I am pleased to be able to inform the Board that as of March 15, 1976, an Institutional Cooperation Unit for Agrarian Reform was established at the IICA office in Bogotá, Colombia. This unit includes research and advisory service functions, and is comprised of a small, high level, technical group capable of implementing the recommendations contained in the report and of providing coherence to analogous activities undertaken by other IICA operative units.

Concerning the political implications of the program, numeral 3 of the report recommends: a) providing a more extensive dissemination of the "IICA/FAO) Conceptual Framework for Agrarian Reform in Latin America"; b) providing all IICA personnel with training in the conceptual aspects of the program; and c) fostering actions in this field to be implemented by an inter-disciplinary team, to include a political science specialist.

It should be noted that the 'Conceptual Framework' was prepared in 1970 and approved in October of the same year by a Committee of Experts which met prior to the XI Regional Conference of FAO for Latin America. Once approved, it was given ample diffusion by means of different forms.

of information dissemination, and was also submitted for consideration by the Inter-American Conference of Agriculture (Lima, Peru, May 1971) which received it favorably, and recommended its rapid and ample diffusion. Nonetheless, in view of the length of time since this occurred, I consider that the recommendation to renew efforts to make this document more widely known is relevant, so that it may be understood and taken into greater account. We plan to put this idea into practice through our Public Information Office, instructing all our operative units to support these efforts.

Personnel training is the responsibility of our Personnel Office, which will be responsible for putting the corresponding recommendation into practice. This is an aspect which interests us greatly, not only with respect to this program, but as concerns all of IICA's actions. We are therefore studying the manner in which the Associate Deputy Director General's Office for Planning and Operations will best be able to back-stop the Personnel Office in this.

The utilization of inter-disciplinary teams to program activities, at Line of Action as well as Regional Office levels, is contemplated in the Medium-term Indicative Plan submitted for consideration by the Board at this Annual Meeting. At this moment, IICA does not have a political sciences specialist on the staff. The advisability of having a specialist in this field should be carefully analyzed, in general, over all terms. If at first instance it would appear advisable to have a specialist in this field, it would then be necessary to analyze whether it would be better to include the position into one of the technical teams, by Lines of Action, out in the field, or whether it would be best to have him at IICA headquarters so as to better serve all IICA's programs, as needed.

Numeral 4 mentions the problem of assistance provided by IICA specialists in countries, other than where they are stationed. The evaluation report on the marketing program has analogous comments, so I will discuss them together further on. As to the specific proposal contained in this numeral with reference to programming and preparing our activities, I feel that the Medium-term Indicative Plan is a valuable first effort to try and solve these particular problems. The Institutional Cooperation Unit for Agrarian Reform is also a partial response to this proposal, within the sphere of action of the evaluated program. If these internal mechanisms do not produce the expected results within a certain period of time, their functions will have to be revised and adjusted.

Numeral 5 refers to the 'Rodrigo Peña' library, an IICA-CIDIA service terminal located at our office in Colombia. Actually this aspect corresponds technically to Line I, even though the field of specialization of the library is closely related to Line VI, amongst others. Nonetheless, I feel that the observations made in this respect by the evaluation team are pertinent and of value, and will be taken into due account this year, when the programs of Line I will be evaluated.

Numeral 6, the last point of the report, refers to the effective integration of technical teams by Lines of Action. This aspect is also commented on in the report on the marketing program, and therefore will be discussed jointly, further on.

B. Proposals resulting from the evaluation of Program IV.4: Agricultural Marketing.

This report was prepared by Drs. Persio de Carvalho Junqueira and Harold Riley. It contains a brief, but clearly illustrative outline of the way the hemispheric marketing program originated and evolved, how the conceptual framework to orient the program's actions was formulated and put into practice, and the principal results obtained during the brief life span of this program.

This is the only program to be evaluated to date, which was begun and carried out entirely during the period in which our General Plan has been in force. I am confident, therefore, that the Members of the Board of Directors will find this outline an interesting and valid example of the application of Plan concepts and doctrine, with the aim of solving specific problems in a relevant priority area, as is agricultural marketing.

Although some of the analytical aspects are discussed repeatedly in the outline, they are summarized in the last chapter of conclusions and recommendations. I will therefore limit my comments to this chapter, taking the points in order presented.

The first point under heading A emphasizes the coherence of the Program with General Plan principles and therefore needs no further comment, except perhaps to reiterate the observation that the program was conceived and carried out totally within the life span of the Plan.

The second point mentions the need to reorient the instruments of action more directly toward small producer problems. I concur with this suggestion, and should like to emphasize that the Medium-term Indicative Plan has been designed precisely with this purpose in mind, and if approved by the Board as I expect, will serve as the basis for an in-depth revision of all of IICA's actions and not only those carried out within the marketing program.

In the following point, the team expressed concern over the possible difficulties of maintaining the high professional level of the technical personnel of this program. As Director General of the Institute, this is also one of my most serious and constant concerns, with respect to all our staff. The high qualitative level of our staff has not been easy to achieve in the past, and will not be so in the future. This is why a large proportion of my own personal efforts center on this matter. Moreover, we have established personnel training policy and program, which we permanently revise and up-date. To date, as the evaluation team acknowledges, we have been successful in these efforts and I am confident that if we continue along the same line, we will continue to be so in the future.

As mentioned in point 4, the hemispheric marketing program has developed an innovative and effective programming model. Upon applying this model, we have become increasingly convinced of the soundness of its essential characteristics, and the methodology has been used to formulate our country-level action plans and the Medium-term Indicative Plan. With the aim of ensuring the increased effectiveness and efficiency of our actions, we are closely following the results of the methodology developed for our intensive project in the Dominican Republic - referred to in point 5 - so as to be able to take full advantage of successful experiences, for other programs and countries.

The need for greater coordination between IICA's different Lines of Action is discussed in point 6. Although this has always been our aim, our internal planning system has only touched on marginal aspects of this point. The proposal set forth in the Medium-term Indicative Plan, to organize a substantial part of our actions in each country into integral and complementary projects, is directed precisely towards introducing specific elements into the planning system, so as to facilitate this coordination and make it more effective. Since the country-level action plans include these elements, and therefore comprise the central element for coordination purposes, the IICA Directors in each country, with the supervision and support of the Regional Directors, will be the key elements in the process as suggested by the evaluation team.

Point 7 covers the same aspects as numeral 4 of the evaluation report concerning the agrarian reform program, and will be commented on further ahead.

Point 8 emphasizes the conclusion that the most important impact of the hemispheric marketing program has been in developing professional skills and institutional capacity. This wholly justifies IICA's emphasis on training as a principal instrument of action, and on institution building as its basic strategy. No further comment would seem necessary. However, it seems an opportune moment to remark on the complementarity, of rather asymmetrical character, between the instrument and the strategy. It would indeed be difficult to find a specific case where institution building can be accomplished without training. It is quite possible, however, to think in terms of considerable training efforts with little or no institution building effects, or where it is achieved only through a very indirect, protracted manner. IICA therefore assigns high priority to this strategy, while emphasizing the use of this instrument only as needed to implement the strategy.

To increase the availability of non-quota resources to finance IICA's actions - referred to in point 9 with respect to the hemispheric marketing program - has been one of our permanent concerns. I refer once more to the Medium-term Indicative Plan, where a considerable increase in this type of funding is contemplated, and a frame of reference is presented for its application, within the objectives, policies and strategies already

approved by the Board of Directors. Without a frame of reference of this type, it could be possible that a large, affluent volume of non-quota resources applied to attaining other objectives and implementing different actions than those contemplated in the General Plan, could hinder attaining the Plan's objectives per se, which would be contrary to the mandate entrusted to us by the Member States.

The first point under heading B. refers to the need to adjust IICA's actions to the changing needs and situations in the countries, beneficiaries of these actions. This is a valid suggestion and we have given considerable thought to this matter. In the five-year projections made, we have maintained a high degree of flexibility at the behest of the Board. More important though, is the fact that in the methodology for formulating the country-level action plans, necessary mechanisms have been included to assure this flexibility, so as to adjust our actions to the changing conditions and needs of each country.

Point two presents two matters of considerable interest, by mentioning two possible levels for IICA action. The first concerns national planning and policy formulation levels and obviously exceeds marketing aspects per se. In this case, we can formulate integral projects in interested countries, within Line VII's sphere of action. In fact, we already have some of these projects underway which could easily admit other complementary projects which would be concerned specifically with marketing. This, of course, does not preclude the formulation of integral projects within the pertinent program in those countries interested mainly in marketing planning aspects. The project underway in the Dominican Republic is a good example.

The second level at which IICA could act, is on the design and implementation of specific projects. IICA has acquired considerable experience in these aspects, and given the necessary resources, could extend this type of action to a greater number of countries. It is mainly for this type of project that our medium-term programming contemplates a group of technicians to be employed for specific tasks and for limited periods of time only. This would allow IICA to call on the assorted technical competence needed to design different types of projects. Increased efforts towards obtaining non-quota resources would also be directed towards the implementation of these projects.

In point C.1, the evaluation team mentions the need for additional technical competence within the Institute's technical teams, so as to adequately attend complementary aspects such as post-harvesting handling and agroindustry. I cannot possibly deny the validity of this statement. However, I should like to mention that if the proposed Line and program policies are maintained, we should at least have technical assistance available in agroindustry, within Line V. Moreover, in the projections to 1981-82, it may be noted that we should have 21 permanent and 4 temporary technicians in Line IV, by that year, and 14 permanent and 3 temporary

staff members in Line V. This would provide us with a total of 35 permanent and 7 temporary technicians for the two Lines, which should be enough to maintain basic interdisciplinary teams in each of these fields of action, particularly since the temporary technicians will vary, thereby contributing to different areas of competence.

The next point emphasizes the need to continue with training activities, which has been done. As to strengthening marketing education aspects at the university level, this is an aspect to be covered by Line II programs, in the measure that it is needed and therefore justified.

Research aspects developed to date have been useful, as indicated in point C.3, contributing to the development of programs and projects in the countries as well as maintaining and improving the levels of competence of our technical personnel. Although it is possible to combine both aspects to a certain extent, a balance must be maintained at all times, between the amount of time our technicians dedicate to research and to providing direct services to the countries. This particular concern is not a new one for us, since it is linked with the efficient use of our human resources. The most valuable amongst our available resource. I believe that the establishment of truly interdisciplinary teams at the zone and Line of Action levels, will be a great step forward so as to facilitate the simultaneous performance of both functions.

Similar comments could be formulated concerning point C.4 which refers to the amount of time which our technicians can spend on preparing publications. I would only add that we are confident in the ability of our Regional Directors to supervise, coordinate and support the work carried out within their respective Zones, including such aspects as ensuring that the members of their technical teams distribute their work load as rationally as possible.

Practically from the start, IICA has attempted to establish a file of information on the talent available throughout the continent, with similar aims in mind as those proposed by the evaluation team in point C.5 specifically for the marketing program. Although considerable progress has been made, it is not an easy task. The creation of a Personnel Office is partly due, amongst other reasons, to the need for the appropriate instrument for this purpose. Although I feel that this is the right way to go about it, I think this particular task requires specialized competence in several very diverse fields. We are therefore considering the possibility of strengthening the Personnel Office in this area, by means of support from technical personnel at the Executive Offices particularly the Line of Action coordinators, and the other IICA operative units, and perhaps establishing an 'ad-hoc' mechanism within our information system.

The urgent need for an hemispheric coordinator for the marketing program is discussed in point D.1 of the report. Although this particular point has been considered for all IICA's programs, the appointment of technicians to act mainly as program coordinators would drastically limit

the number we could place in the field of the direct service of the countries. Therefore we have preferred to concentrate on Line of Action-level coordination, adding these tasks to those of officers working at Headquarters. In this manner, an improved coordination between Lines is also assured. The application of this criteria is more feasible now, since the Medium-term Indicative Plan limits the number of programs in each Line to two, with one exception. If the Plan is approved by the Board of Directors, I feel that we should first test and strengthen this coordination mechanism. If experience indicates that it is inadequate or insufficient in the case of some specific program, we shall have to study the advisability of establishing program-level coordinators. Even so, I feel that only a few programs might need specific coordination stationed in a country, without in any way prejudicing his work in the countries.

Points D.2 and D.3 refer to aspects that are similar to others taken up in the evaluation report on the agrarian reform program, and so I will comment on them jointly, later on.

Heading E. refers to only one point, concerned with the expansion of the marketing program through the use of non-quota resources. In comparison with other IICA programs, I feel that the marketing program is the one that has worked hardest and been most successful at this. For the 1976-77 fiscal period, outside contributions to this program total slightly more than 310 thousand dollars, as compared to the 320 thousand dollars of regular resources. This does not include an additional 250 thousand dollars of the Simon Bolivar Fund, tentatively allocated to marketing, agroindustry and post-harvesting projects, but which were not definitively assigned during the present fiscal period. Worthy of mention is the fact that one of the projects of this type programmed within the Simon Bolivar Fund, was finally financed from other sources. Although I feel that the situation is quite satisfactory, in no way does this mean that we should limit or reduce our efforts to obtain additional non-quota funds. On the contrary, we have been able to clearly confirm the interest of countries and the existence of sources of financing willing to channel funds into this type of well formulated project, with reasonable possibilities for success. What we must do, then, is to augment our capacity to program and manage good projects, and to participate in their implementation with necessary counterpart contributions. To this end, we have started a project on studies and training in the administration of projects with AID assistance. Moreover, our programming capacity will assuredly increase with the application of the Medium-term Indicative Plan. The suggestion put forth by the evaluation team is most pertinent, I feel, and back-stops our efforts in this direction, encouraging us to persevere and develop them, even further.

Heading F. contains two points concerned with the coordination and collaboration with other international agencies and selected universities. With respect to international agencies, we are expanding and intensifying our relationships with some of them through bilateral contacts, and understandings, and through our participation in the IGAD/LA. We are also

strengthening our cooperation with selected universities. Recently we have established - or made progress towards doing so - extensive cooperation agreements with three groups of universities in the United States. With some, we are already working on the preparation and implementation of joint projects. We expect to establish similar relationships in the near future with universities in Canada, Latin America and the Caribbean. To this end we have the assistance of the Advisor for External Coordination. However, as contacts turn into concrete actions, the need to have a specific follow-up mechanism becomes more evident, so as to maintain up-to-date information on the status of our commitments, to analyze how they affect the over all program of the Institute, and to provide effective support on the implementation of joint projects. The solution to this problem - which is currently subject to internal study - will help us put the evaluation team's suggestion into practice, in the best possible manner.

The establishment of research and training centers in different fields - IICA's as well as national ones - has long been a concern of the Institute. We agree with the opinions of the evaluation team as expressed in heading G. of their report, in the sense that there is a real need for this type of center in agricultural marketing, and other fields. We also agree that efforts along these lines in the past, have had rather uneven results, particularly when centers have been established as 'ad hoc' instruments to solve specific and transitory problems, without enough attention being given to their having permanent and institutionalized functions. This problem is being analyzed within IICA's Line II, which is concerned, within its new orientation, with the establishment and operation of integrated educational systems to serve the specific development needs of each country. Nonetheless, the need for special attention being given to solve specific problems will continue to exist - at least until these systems are properly integrated and functioning adequately - such as the one mentioned by the evaluation team. I quite readily accept the suggestion, therefore, to carefully consider the alternatives for providing a solution to this problem.

C. Proposals resulting from the evaluation of both programs

The two evaluation reports prepared this year, repeatedly refer - in similar terms - to two aspects which I feel are of interest to all of IICA in general and not just the two programs being evaluated. As there is a certain concomitance to both aspects, I have preferred to comment on them jointly.

The first refers to the integration and maintenance of truly interdisciplinary technical teams that will function in a coordinated manner at Line and program levels; the second refers to technical personnel management and concerns the problems which appear on projects carried out in a given country under the responsibility of a technician who is stationed in a different country.

A constant concern at IICA has been to have good interdisciplinary teams. Although in all cases, perhaps, we have not been able to use them in the most effective manner, I should like to cite at least two excellent examples where we have gained considerable experience by means of different alternatives. One is our experience at IICA-CIRA where most of the team were located at the same office which facilitated the necessary interactions to ensure work coherence. The second is the case of the hemispheric marketing program, which was able to maintain a close inter-relationship despite the dispersion of team members in different countries. Several mechanisms were used to this end, including annual meetings of all team members. This would imply that there are different ways to maintain the coherence and coordination of an interdisciplinary team's actions. There is yet another factor, however, common to both examples, which has contributed to the smooth functioning of these teams. I refer to the fact that both teams worked on the basis of a clearly defined concept concerning the problem being tackled by each team, which included the mode, means and strategies to be used to resolve it.

We have profited from this lesson in the Medium-term Indicative Plan which contemplates the integration of interdisciplinary teams by Lines of Action, and outlines policies by Line and program so as to ensure the coherence of each one. As these policies become a part of the country-level action plans, the conditions will be established to gather regional teams around a conceptual unit. Evidently, this must be complemented with mechanisms that facilitate team interaction. Annual meetings are useful for this purpose, but are expensive. An alternative could be regional-level meetings, and biennial or triennial hemispheric meetings instead of annual ones, or a combination of both. One way of reducing costs is to gather together team members on those occasions when their activities include the provision of joint services to the countries. It must also be remembered that because of their different characteristics, the various Lines and programs require different solutions to this problem. Although I agree with the suggestion put forth by both evaluation teams, I feel we must try out different ways of applying it and that, for the moment, it should be sufficient for Line coordinators to handle it. Eventually, if experience proves it to be advisable, we could think in terms of unifying and regulating a methodology for this purpose.

I admit that we are not able to completely resolve the problem of the technician working on projects in other countries, but I am not too sure whether it is really necessary. We cannot possibly station a technician in each country for each Line and program; neither can we deny requested services just because we do not have the given specialist in that country, particularly if one is stationed in the neighboring country and we can provide the service at a reasonable cost. I therefore interpret the evaluation teams' suggestion to mean that actions of this type should be limited to those which are really useful, and linked to other more permanent ones, so as to avoid diluting or nullifying their effect.

I am in complete agreement on this point, and I should like to emphasize that this is precisely one of the reasons why we have assigned - within our internal organization - the responsibility for implementing and supervising all projects underway in their respective countries to the Directors of IICA's national offices. This responsibility is not minimized by delegating the implementation of a project to a specialist. It is therefore up to these Directors to ensure that all activities underway within their jurisdiction - particularly those being carried out by technicians from other countries - meet the above-described characteristics or requirements. Moreover, the movement of technicians from one country to another is authorized and coordinated by the Regional Director, who supervises these activities with the same aim. The integration of interdisciplinary teams at zones and Line of Action levels is a third measure, which we are now strengthening, to which the other two may have recourse when specific technical competence is needed. I believe that this form of internal organization, together with the more clearly defined Line and program policies contained in the Medium-term Indicative Plan, will be more than adequate to reduce disperse, transitory-type actions to a minimum, a problem which has concerned both evaluation teams.

D. Results of the 1976-77 program-level evaluation studies

The reports produced this year indicate in general terms, that the programs evaluated conform with General Plan guidelines, and are being implemented in accordance with national policies of the countries where they are being carried out. There are, of course, a number of aspects which can be improved. It is quite a satisfaction to be able to confirm that we were already concerned about most of the aspects so indicated, and therefore a number of the suggestions received have been incorporated into the Medium-term Indicative Plan, as mentioned above. A few need further study however, and we need more experience, testing several alternative solutions, before adopting a definitive one.

Briefly, the results of these efforts may be considered most satisfactory, as they have served to confirm the correct orientation of our work, as well as to suggest several proposals of practical value, to improve our actions and make them more effective. These proposals are being put into effect by means of pertinent internal dispositions. The approval of the Medium-term Indicative Plan as a frame of reference for our future actions will permit my getting these dispositions underway with the important backing of the Board of Directors.

III. 1977-78 PROGRAM-LEVEL EVALUATION

As the Board of Directors has already indicated the programs to be evaluated, we are preparing the evaluation studies to be conducted during the next fiscal period.

These studies will include: a) Programs VI.2 and VI.3, together with an over all appraisal of progress achieved in this Line; and b) the information and documentation programs which comprise all of Line I, within the restructured organization.

As already mentioned, the first study is a logical complement to the evaluation of Program VI.1 carried out this year. We hope to have the same outside evaluators so as to ensure due continuity to this work, and we are compiling more complete information than we were able to provide last time. Moreover, we are now able to present the policies which will orient this Line's actions during the next five years, and the first pertinent revision in this respect, will be the main task of the evaluation team.

Line I is one of IICA's oldest lines, dating back to the activities of the Scientific Information Service when the Institute was still located at its original center, in Turrialba. The evolution of these services has been constant, culminating in the formulation of the policies and programs which appear in the Medium-term Indicative Plan. The objective of this Line is to: 'Foster and support the maintenance of a permanent flow - production, integration, dissemination and use - of information related to the agricultural sector so as to facilitate the decision making process and to orient the actions of those responsible for programming and implementing activities directed towards fostering rural development.'

Although this objective, and the three programs designed to attain it, clearly define what IICA proposes to do during the next five years, there are a number of alternate ways of doing it. The selection of the most appropriate way, in relation to costs, requires defining some of the aspects which would permit a simultaneous appraisal of their possible effectiveness. For instance, the identification of information users, and the type of information they need; the role of national information systems and IICA's strategy to strengthen them; IICA-CIDIA's role, its relationships with national systems and the organization and equipment it should have to adequately carry out its functions. At first glance, it would seem that the information system established will be of greater use the larger the scope in which these aspects and other pertinent ones are considered. However, the system could become inoperable due to excessive complexities and high costs. The problem therefore consists in setting precise limits to our policies, so as to be able to establish a system which satisfies essential national needs, at a cost which can be adequately financed with available internal and external resources. An example will clearly

demonstrate this idea. Evidently, the establishment of good national information systems is the basis and key to the establishment of an hemispheric system. The countries are interested in IICA's support on the establishment and development of these national systems, as is evident, for instance, from the recommendations made at the VII AGRINTER Round-table. To date, IICA has been quite successful in its task of promoting and supporting the establishment of these systems, through IICA-CIDIA. However, we feel that the time has come to reinforce these actions by means of specialists stationed in certain countries, thereby providing more effective support on national efforts while at the same time permitting IICA-CIDIA to carry out more specific tasks.

Within this framework then, the task of the evaluation team would be to provide us with an impartial appraisal of work accomplished to date and its results, as well as to advise us on the best way to put these policies into practice.

IV. 1978-79 EVALUATION

So as to assure the adequate and opportune programming of our work, it is up to the Annual Meeting to indicate the areas to be evaluated during the 1978-79 fiscal period.

In this respect, it should be remembered that the following statement appeared in Appendix 2 of the Report of the Special Meeting of the Special Committee of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Board of Directors (IICA/RAJD/Doc.63(14/75) rev.1):

- "I. The Special Committee will analyze the General Plan on the basis of the actual situation and tendencies of the rural development process of the hemisphere, for the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Board and subsequently, every three years."

If the phrase 'every three years' is strictly interpreted in terms of calendar years, an analysis of the General Plan similar to the one conducted at the Annual Meeting of the Board of Directors held in Ottawa, Canada in 1975, is due for the coming year of 1978. This would mean that no program-level evaluation would be carried out that year, since our technical capacity and resources allocated for evaluation purposes would be used to prepare necessary documents for the over all analytical study of progress achieved on the General Plan.

However, if the phrase is interpreted to mean that the analysis of the General Plan will be repeated after three years of program-level evaluations, this analysis would be scheduled for 1979-80, and the programs to be evaluated during the 1978-79 period would have to be defined at this time.

For several reasons, I am personally inclined towards the second interpretation. On the one hand, changes in the current situation and tendencies of the rural development process have not been so rapid as to justify the first. Moreover, the VII Inter-American Conference on Agriculture is to be held this year. Rural development problems throughout the hemisphere will be analyzed at that time, and proposals will be made to solve them. Thus, if there have been significant situation and tendency changes, fairly clear indications for IICA's future actions should result from this Conference, and it is doubtful if in less than one year, enough new elements would have accumulated so as to justify modifications. And lastly, program-level evaluation studies are, in fact, an in-depth analysis of partial aspects of the General Plan. It would therefore seem logical to give enough time for this type of analysis to be carried on a sufficient number of aspects before proceeding with a new over all revision of the General Plan.

If the above is acceptable to the Board, I would suggest that the programs to be evaluated during the 1978-79 period be those in Line VII (Formulation and Administration of Agricultural Policy).

On making this suggestion, I have taken the experience acquired on the previous evaluation studies into account, that is, that it is advisable to analyze all programs of one same Line of Action at the same time. One obvious advantage to this, is that a revision of Line and program policies would be possible, and with this, the progressive adjustment of our Medium-term Indicative Plan. Moreover, we could make use of a larger team of outside evaluators for periods of time similar to those used for the previous evaluations, or a reduced team over a longer period of time. This would give us the needed flexibility to adjust evaluation procedures to the characteristics of the corresponding Line of Action. In addition, the idea of evaluating two programs a year does not change, since the Indicative Plan contemplates two programs per Line, with the exception of Line I, which has three. And lastly, the problem of having to divide the study of a Line of Action over a two-year period will be avoided, as occurred in the case of Line VI.

In addition to its actual importance, the selection of Line VII (Formulation and Administration of Agricultural Policy) is based on the fact that it is the only Line, except for Line V which is practically new, which has not as yet been analyzed either totally or partially, in these annual evaluation studies. Thus, Line I will be evaluated this year; Line II was analyzed, as a whole, at the behest of the Board, in 1976-77; Line III was also evaluated that year, although the study was limited to the Northern Zone; the hemispheric marketing program of Line IV was analyzed this year, and the analysis of Line VI will be completed this year. Therefore, if Line VII is evaluated in 1978-79, we will have evaluation reports on most of IICA's actions, which could serve as a basis for the next over all analysis of the General Plan.

APPENDIX 1

REPORT OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

PROGRAM VI.1 (AGRARIAN REFORM)

Luis Paz Silva

Eduardo Betzig

October, 1976

10/10/10

10/10/10

10/10/10

10/10/10

10/10/10

10/10/10

NOTE

IICA's Program VI.1 - Agrarian Reform was started up approximately ten years prior to the period covered by this evaluation study (1971-72 through 1975-76). An appraisal of the accomplishments of the past five years cannot be undertaken without first taking the previous decade into consideration. The Evaluation Team was unfortunately unable to consult a report containing most of this information, as it was in the printing press while this evaluation was underway.

Over the past five years, Program VI.1 included such aspects as 'campesino' organization and 'campesino' community enterprises as well as those strictly related to agrarian reform. The former, which complement the latter, were later separated into Programs VI.2 and VI.3, although this was not effected in all the Zones of IICA, at the same time. On the basis of instructions received, and the limited time available to the Evaluation Team, these new programs were not studied in any detail, and their evaluation is contemplated for the next fiscal year.

Hence, this report should be considered of a preliminary nature only, and conclusions arrived at will have to be revised when the over all evaluation of Line of Action VI is completed, as foreseen for the 1977-1978 period.

The following conclusions and recommendations have therefore been formulated, taking the above-mentioned limitations into due account.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Taken as a whole, IICA's work in the field of agrarian reform in the past would seem to have been considerable, as compared to the amount of resources utilized. More recently, the same level of effort has been kept up in the Northern Zone, particularly by means of PRACA, but would appear to have diminished somewhat in the other Zones, of which only the Andean Zone was actually visited.

It was not apparent to the team members whether this is a result of a lack of interest in agrarian reform on behalf of the countries or IICA, or if it is a question rather of having sub-divided the work into three programs, of which only one was actually analyzed by the Evaluation Team.

It is therefore recommended:

a. To complete the over all analysis of all Line of Action VI Programs, in order to gain a more complete and thorough understanding of IICA's work in this field, so as to be able to formulate more precise recommendations as to the continuation of this work.

2. Due to the current situation in several countries throughout the continent and some rather unsuccessful experiences, there appears to be less interest in IICA's work in this field than in the past. Nonetheless,

the Evaluation Team believes that the problem of structural change continues to be critically important for the development process in Latin America, and renewed interest in IICA's assistance in this field may soon recur, at continental levels. The various initiatives undertaken to date in this field however -despite rather uneven results with numerous partial or total successes- provide a wealth of experience which can be utilized to serve as a basis to perfect the technical and conceptual approach to the reform process, so as to orient it in a more effective and realistic manner.

In view of the above, the following recommendations are made:

- a. To maintain and where possible intensify IICA's work in Line of Action VI so that interested countries may count on effective and efficient technical assistance in this field, when needed.
- b. To make an in-depth study of the way in which the reform process has been implemented in the countries of this continent, analyzing those factors which have had a significant bearing on results obtained, as a means to capitalize on accumulated experience, making the information available to interested countries.
- c. To intensify, program and evaluate the use of reciprocal technical training services as an effective means to achieve the transfer of useful experience and knowledge, so as to have a multiplier effect through reports and other means of information dissemination, which adequately reflect this knowledge.

3. Program VI.1, more than any other IICA program, has strong political implications and is therefore exposed to controversial criticism. In this sense, the very diversity of the situations in space and the variations in time throughout Latin America exposes IICA's work in this field to frequent interruptions and abrupt reversals which could be avoided, at least partially, by acting more flexible and coherently within an agrarian reform conceptual framework, such as the rather excellent one prepared by IICA and FAO, to be complemented in each country or specific case, by a projection analysis which would take socio-political as well as technical factors into consideration.

In this respect the, the following recommendations are made:

- a. To assure an even more extensive dissemination of the "Conceptual Framework (IICA-FAO) for Agrarian Reform in Latin America", and with this as a basis, inform the public in general, particularly governments, of the nature and characteristics of the support which IICA could provide the reform processes contemplated within the political decisions that are a sovereign attribute and prerogative of each country.
- b. To instruct all IICA personnel, particularly the country office directors, so that they are amply aware of the existing relationships between agrarian structures and the development process, so as to assure their complete comprehension of the matter and hence their competent support for reform programs underway or about to begin in the countries where they work.

- c. To program IICA's agrarian reform actions, at all times, with the competent participation of an interdisciplinary team capable of tackling such a complex problem. It was felt that such a team should include a specialist in political sciences, the coordinator of the pertinent Line of Action, and the director of IICA's office in the country, in addition to the specialists in the different technical fields, as needed.

4. At the request of the countries, IICA has provided support on national agrarian reform programs on several occasions, assigning temporarily one of its staff members for the purpose or providing short-term consultants. The Evaluation Team feels that this type of isolated action, although it may well satisfy immediate needs of a transitory nature, is only relatively effective if the specialist or consultant - as is frequently the case - has no historical background on the evolution of the reform process in question, and lacks precise information concerning the current state of the process and the framework within which acceptable recommendations could be proposed for specific actions in each country.

Hence it is recommended:

- a. To foster studies in interested countries, that will permit long range projections of agrarian structural problems, and to collaborate on carrying out these studies.
- b. To prepare an IICA program for each currently or potentially interested country, to serve as a frame of reference and thereby ensure the coherence and effectiveness of the Institute's permanent or occasional actions in this field.
- c. To ensure in all cases that the technicians or consultants sent to a country on a short-term basis, receive prior instructions and information in each case, so as to allow them to adjust their work to the reality of each case, concerning the historic process and the specific stage of reform implementation in that country, so as to assure the coherent support of IICA to national efforts underway, and to obtain, therefore, more effective results.

5. The IICA-CIRA library in Bogota, Colombia has compiled and organized an excellent, extensive bibliography of material pertaining to agrarian reform. There probably is no better collection in Latin America in this field. A collection of this type of information is of great value and is potentially useful to all students, technicians, functionaries and politicians in Latin America interested in structural change processes. However, the use of this material seems to be confined mainly to the local or very highly specialized public, but is not sufficiently accesible to other publics, and its range of possibilities are practically unknown to the functionaries and authorities of other countries.

In view of the above, it is recommended:

- a. To maintain a sustained, growing library capacity to acquire and organize specialized information, intensifying efforts to compile all information pertaining to past and present experience in Latin America in the field of structural reforms and related aspects.
- b. To up-grade the library so as to expand its service program - qualitative as well as quantitatively - providing it with the necessary means to ensure the diffusion of these user services throughout the continent.
- c. To more extensively ensure an awareness of the availability and characteristics of these services so that all potential users may have access to them, particularly technicians, functionaries and authorities of institutions responsible for programming, conducting and implementing national reform processes.

6. The existence of IICA-CIRA allowed IICA to consolidate a small but highly qualified interdisciplinary technical core which made valuable conceptual and pragmatic contributions to the agrarian reform in Latin America. The transformation of this Center into IICA's national office for Colombia, in accordance with the policies approved by the Board of Directors, implied a certain degree of dispersion of this core to several countries, thereby affecting the integration and coherence of the technical team which has less opportunities now to discuss problems, exchange ideas and mutually reinforce each others' actions. Without attempting to discuss the relative advantages or disadvantages of concentrating actions at topic or Line of Action levels as compared with national levels, the Evaluation Team feels that the effective integration of an interdisciplinary technical team is essential, particularly in the case of Line VI, so as to successfully tackle the vast and very diverse types of structural change problems.

In view of the above, it is recommended:

- a. To ensure the means and establish or reinforce the necessary mechanisms so as to assure that the specialists IICA assigns to work in Line of Action VI, integrate into a really capable team to work within a coherent conceptual and technical framework, in a coordinated and complementary manner.
- b. To provide these specialists, particularly when located in different countries, with adequate opportunities for intellectual and technical exchanges of ideas and mutual training, so that their actions are not carried out in isolation, following different and sometimes incompatible orientations.
- c. To assure Line of Action VI an effective, high-level technical leadership, independently or in accordance with the administrative lines of authority, so as to ensure work quality and effectiveness and its adequate coordination with national needs and policies.

APPENDIX

INSTITUTIONS VISITED AND PERSONS INTERVIEWED BY COUNTRIES

EL SALVADOR

A. IICA

Julio Ringuelet, Director de la Oficina
Leopoldo Sandoval, Director del PRACA
Jorge Sariego, Especialista en Desarrollo Social Rural
Hernán González, Ingeniero Agrónomo

COSTA RICA

A. IICA

José Emilio G. Araujo, Director General

PANAMA

A. IICA

Noel García, Director de la Oficina
Iván Mojica, Especialista en Tierras y Aguas

B. MIDA (Ministerio de Desarrollo Agropecuario)

Bernardo Ocaña, Director de Proyectos Internacionales
(Enlace Nacional con el Equipo de Evaluación)
Jerry Wilson, Director de Desarrollo Social
Alfredo Acuña, Director de Reforma Agraria

C. CONAC (Confederación de Asociaciones Campesinas)

Manuel Gutiérrez, Secretario General de Organización Campesina

COLOMBIA

A. IICA

Mauro Villavisencio, Director
Ernesto Liboreiro, Especialista en Empresas Comunitarias
Mayo Vega, Especialista en Economía Agrícola
Guillermo Grajales, Especialista en Elaboración de Proyectos
Agrícolas (Perú)

Armando Cardozo, Especialista en Desarrollo Ganadero
Gerardo Naranjo, Especialista en Educación Agrícola
Maruja Uribe, Documentalista, IICA/CIDIA
Norman Ortiz, Co-Director, PNCA
Nizar Vergara, Profesor en Mercadeo, PNCA

B. INCORA (Instituto Colombiano de Reforma Agraria)

Joaquín Vanín Tello, Gerente General
Nohora Pérez, Subgerente de Asentamientos Campesinos
Alfonso Delgado, Subgerente de Planeación
Miguel Diago, Jefe, División Asesoría Agrotécnica
Hernando Rodríguez, Jefe, División Producción Agropecuaria
Bernardo Isaza, Gerente Regional Cundinamarca 1
Víctor Villamil Ortiz, Gerente Regional Costa Pacífico
Carlos Linares, Jefe Programas Asentamientos Cundinamarca
Eduardo Restrepo, Jefe Oficina de Planes y Programas
Aníbar Salazar, Jefe Oficina de Información y Estadística
(Enlace Nacional con el Equipo de Evaluación)

C. CECORA (Central de Cooperativas de Reforma Agraria)

Jorge Alberto Villamizar C., Gerente General
Eduardo García L., Subgerente de Operaciones

D. FANAL (Federación Agraria Nacional)

Helf Arambulo Castañeda, Presidente Comité Ejecutivo
Gilberto Cordávil García, Secretario General
Luis A. Palacios, Secretario de Asuntos Internacionales

E. ANUC (Asociación Nacional de Usuarios Campesinos)

Antonio Padilla, Miembro del Comité Nacional
Dagoberto Barros, id.
Francisco Quintero, id.
Isidoro Bautista, id.
Ana de Rodríguez, id.

F. OTROS

Antonio García

G. Visitas a Terreno

Empresas Comunitarias La Victoria y la Esperanza

ECUADOR

A. IICA

Ignacio Ansorena, Director
Bolívar Navas, Esp. en Educación y Ciencias Sociales
Nelson Suárez, Especialista en Comercialización Agrícola

B. Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería

Gral. Oliverio Vásquez, Ministro de Agricultura y Ganadería
Francisco Ceballos, Director de Desarrollo Agrícola
Gonzalo Jaramillo, Director de Desarrollo Rural
(Enlace Nacional con el Equipo de Evaluación)

C. IERAC (Instituto Ecuatoriano de Reforma Agraria y Colonización)

Manuel Franco, Director Ejecutivo
Freddy Silva, Director de Colonización
Efraín Chávez, Director de Reforma Agraria

D. Banco Central

Juan Casals, Gerente Técnico

E. CESA

Fausto Jordán, Director

F. Visitas a Terreno

Asentamiento Campesino en Cayambe y Camey 1

PERU

A. IICA

Pompeyo Ríos, Director Regional Zona Andina

Hugo Torres, Coordinador, Plan de Acción del IICA en el Perú
Guillermo Grajales, Esp. en Elaboración de Proyectos Agrícolas

B. Ministerio de Agricultura

Hernán Basulto, Director General de Apoyo a las Empresas
Campesinas

Javier López, Director General de Reforma Agraria

C. SINAMOS (Sistema Nacional de Movilización Social)

Germán Carrasco, Director General de Organizaciones Rurales

**D. CENCIRA (Centro Nacional de Capacitación e Investigación en
Reforma Agraria)**

Tnte. Crnl. EP. Max Velarde Bellina, Presidente Ejecutivo

Marita Montes de Oca, Directora de Investigación

Daniel Martínez, Director de Capacitación

Julio Herrera, Jefe de la Oficina de Planificación

APPENDIX 2

Original: English

**REPORT OF THE EVALUATION TEAM
FOR PROGRAM IV.4 (AGRICULTURAL MARKETING)**

**Harold Riley
Persio de Carvalho Junqueira**

December 1976

4. 1954

1. 1954
2. 1954
3. 1954

1. 1954
2. 1954

1. 1954

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. BACKGROUND	
A. Action to establish PHC	1
B. Request for Evaluation by the Board of Directors	1
C. Objectives of the Evaluation	1
D. Procedures	1
II. PHC STRATEGY AND OBJECTIVES	3
A. Antecedents	3
B. Objectives of PHC	3
C. The Evolution of PHC	4
III. PHC PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	4
A. Phase 1, 1972-1974	4
B. Phase 2, 1975-1976	6
IV EVALUATION OF PHC 1972-76	7
A. Alignment of PHC with IICA General Plan	7
B. PHC Staff Capacity and Qualifications	8
C. PHC as a New Programming Model within IICA	8
D. PHC Operations at the Country Level	9
E. The Dominican Republic Project	10
F. Coordination with Other International Agencies	11
G. The Image of PHC among IICA Staff	11
H. The Image of PHC among National Institutions	12
I. Observations regarding the Re-orientation of PHC towards Small Farmers as a Target Group	12
J. Some Results of PHC	14
K. Effectiveness of Resource Use in the PHC	15

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	16
A. Conclusions regarding the PHC, 1972-76	16
B. Future needs of Member Countries for Technical Cooperation	17
C. PHC Strategy and Priority Areas for Program Activities	18
D. Program Coordination and Development	19
E. Financing PHC Program Expansion	20
F. Coordination and Collaboration with Other International Agencies with Selected Universities	20
G. Centers for Agricultural Marketing Research and Training	20

APPENDIX 1

Institutions Visited and Persons Interviewed, by Countries

APPENDIX 2

Interview Guideline

APPENDIX 3

List of Papers, Reports and Publications of IICA's Marketing Program

APPENDIX 4

Number of Training Activities and of Trainees by the PHC, by Countries and Zones, according to the type of training.

I. BACKGROUND

A. Action to establish PHC

In May of 1971, the Board of Directors of IICA recommended that the Director General of the Institute conduct the necessary studies to formulate a project to establish a Hemispheric Agricultural Marketing Program. In fulfillment of this resolution, IICA prepared a project which was presented to the XI Annual Meeting of the Board of Directors in May 1972. The project was approved by the Board and officially began in October 1972 when the General Coordinator of the Program was contracted. The Program became known as the Hemispheric Agricultural Marketing Program of IICA.

B. Request for Evaluation by the Board of Directors

At its Fifteenth Annual Meeting, the Board of Directors approved the Resolution IICA/RAJD/Res.41(15/76) requesting that the following programs be evaluated during the 1976-77 and 1977-78 periods: (1) the programs of Line VI; (2) the marketing program of Line IV, and (3) programs of Line I.

According to the authorization in paragraph 5 of the same Resolution, the Director General decided that the marketing program of Line IV should be included among those to be evaluated during 1976-77 and consequently appointed the Evaluation Team responsible for this report.

C. Objectives of the Evaluation

At the beginning of its task, the Evaluation Team received a briefing at the IICA Headquarters, in San José, Costa Rica.

The Team was clearly instructed that, according to the Resolution IICA/RAJD/Res.22(14/75) "the evaluation of the programs will be carried out for the purpose of ensuring the Board of Directors' support to the Executive Offices, so that programs may increasingly be brought in line with the provisions of the General Plan, the objectives of the Line of Action to which they belong and the particular needs of each Member State".

This was the main objective that the Evaluation Team kept in mind during its work and, especially, in preparing its conclusions and recommendations.

D. Procedures

In preparation for the evaluation, the former PHC Coordination drafted a background document (Documento de Antecedentes para el Equipo de Evaluación del Programa IV.4). This document along with other selected materials

on IICA policy and programs were sent to the external members of the Evaluation Team several weeks prior to the actual review.

Upon arrival in San José, Costa Rica, the external team members were briefed by Dr. Alfonso Castrónovo, Director of Evaluation, IICA. The Evaluation Team had an opportunity to interact with several members of the Dirección General. Visits were then made to six country offices (Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Venezuela, Colombia, Perú and Argentina). A list of individuals interviewed by country can be found in Appendix 1 of this report.

The same work format was used for each country in order to obtain comparable information for elaborating the final report. An initial interview was conducted with the PHC specialist responsible for the marketing activities in the country or region. The discussion was based on a summary document prepared by the PHC specialist that presented the activities developed, progress, entities benefited, number of persons trained, reciprocal cooperation activities conducted and other data of importance for the evaluation. Other reports and publications were also made available to the Evaluation Team.

This was followed by a set of interviews with selected executives and professionals in national agencies and institutions that have received technical cooperation from PHC. These visits were structured around an "interview guide" which posed a set of questions that the Evaluation Team believed would be useful and which provide comparable information from the various institutions (see Appendix 2).

The Evaluation Team also had an opportunity to meet with IICA Country Directors or their designated representatives. Some of the Country Directors took an active role in the evaluation. Near the end of each country visit the external members of the Evaluation Team met privately with the local PHC technician to clarify certain points that had arisen in the review proceed, to obtain the technician's own personal views and concerns about PHC, and to consider any other matter relevant to the evaluation.

The Evaluation Team report was prepared in Buenos Aires. In retrospect it probably would have been more effective had the Evaluation Team been able to present its report and discuss it with the Dirección General of IICA.

In conducting the evaluation the Team agreed that there were certain basic organization constraints within IICA which we would take as given. These were as follows:

- a) That IICA possesses a system of planning and programming that is oriented by the General Plan of IICA that has pre-defined objectives;

- b) That the coordination of programs is accomplished through the Lines of Action of IICA and by regions and countries;
- c) That the technical and administrative decisions of these programs is made by Regional Directors and Country Offices, which affect the time of technicians, assign geographic work areas, approve their external trips and the time each technician can spend in other programs.

The Team assumed that these conditions were exogenous to the evaluation of PHC, although it was agreed that all have an important influence on program effectiveness.

Finally, the evaluation of PHC was carried out within rather severe time constraints. The Team visited six countries and evaluated 10 country programs in a period of 3 1/2 weeks. Under these circumstances, the evaluation deals only with the more global aspects of the program and does not attempt to make detailed country by country conclusions and recommendations.

II. PHC STRATEGY AND OBJECTIVES

A. Antecedents

The process of economic development is complex and usually implies a major transformation of rural agriculturally based economies into more urban and industrially based economies. As this occurs there is a growing need for a more highly organized system of marketing to link agricultural production with food processors and increasingly complex urban food distribution systems. As agricultural production becomes more specialized by regions and by farm producing units there is growing demand for agricultural inputs and consumers goods, including food, which flows from the large cities to rural trading centers.

The transformation and modernization of agricultural production and marketing systems can be facilitated through effective participation of national institutions. But the effectiveness of these institutions is often hampered by the lack of trained personnel and inadequate coordination of activities among the various agencies and institutions that are involved in marketing programs.

B. Objectives of PHC

The PHC was created by IICA to respond to the apparent needs of member countries as they attempt to improve their agricultural and food marketing systems. The initial objectives adopted by PHC were as follows:

1. Generate a more profound and broader knowledge as to the role that improving the marketing system can have in achieving more rapidly the national goals of socioeconomic development.
2. Cooperate with national institutions in diagnosing agricultural and food marketing problems and in the formulation of strategies, programs and specific projects in order to improve the performance of the marketing system.
3. Cooperate in the development of human and institutional capabilities in the member countries, in order to achieve continued progress towards greater efficiency in the marketing system.
4. Contribute to the development of a marketing information exchange network among countries, and promote the development of institutions and educational programs that accelerate an expansion in the number of trained marketing technicians.

C. The Evolution of PHC

The planning of PHC was divided into four phases. The first phase was the establishment of goals and the development of a coherent action strategy that would consider the most common marketing problems and the related institutional system.

The second phase was the diffusion of the program to national institutions and the identification of projects and/or the readjustment of existing projects.

The third phase was the actual implementation of projects that would contribute to the specific objectives of the country and of PHC. The process of project identification, development and implementation, was the principal method of cooperating with national institutions to improve their activities in agricultural marketing.

The fourth phase was the evaluation of feed-back regarding the projects. This phase relates closely with the third. Emphasis was placed on project reviews, dissemination of the results and modification of the strategy, if deemed necessary.

III. PHC PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

A. Phase 1, 1972-74

The activities carried out by PHC during the period 1972-73 were directed towards the clarification of the program strategy, recruiting personnel and integrating these personnel into a PHC team. During the fiscal year 1973-74 the program was operationalized in the four regional zones of IICA.

The first technical activity was to clearly identify the specific objectives of PHC and develop a short and long-run strategy of implementation. Simultaneously, the formation and integration of the technical staff was carried out along with the development of methodologies to analyze the involvement of public institutions in national systems of marketing. Contacts were also made with national, regional and international institutions.

During the 1972-73 period, a mini-nucleus of technicians was formed consisting of the PHC Coordinator and two marketing specialists. This group was attached to the Deputy Director General of Planning Office, in San Jose. The purpose of the mini-nucleus was to develop methodologies for identifying and selecting key institutions in national marketing systems and to further develop methodologies for PHC.

By July of 1973, all the PHC specialists were contracted, and the program became operational in all four regional zones of IICA. Each specialist applied the methodology of identifying and selecting national marketing institutions which were to be recipients of PHC technical cooperation.

The first of four annual technical meetings of PHC was held in April, 1973, in San Jose, Costa Rica, to analyze and review PHC progress.

PHC is implemented through national and multinational projects which are carried out by country specialists, under the supervision of Country and Regional Directors and the PHC Coordinator.

In 1973-74, there were eight PHC technicians located in the following countries: Costa Rica, Venezuela, Peru, Ecuador, Argentina, Haiti and the Dominican Republic. Additionally, IICA administered the National Agricultural Training Program in Colombia, which has two marketing specialists. Also two national marketing specialists were associated with PHC in Argentina and Haiti.

The activities of PHC during the period 1972-74 can be divided into the following categories:

- a) Coordination activities, consisting of planning the development of the program, recruiting and integrating the marketing team, developing methodologies and publications, and the diffusion of the program throughout the Hemisphere.
- b) Country level activities by the marketing specialist, consisted of a diagnostic study of the marketing institutional sub-system, identification and selection of projects, implementation and adjustment of activities to be more in line with the PHC technical policy.

- c) Identification and formulation of an intensive "impact" project in the Dominican Republic.
- d) Annual technical meetings of PHC. The first (1973) was attended by professionals from 15 Latin American countries, several international organizations and U.S., and Latin American universities. The second annual meeting (1974) was attended only by PHC specialists and one high level consultant.

B. Phase 2 - 1975-76

1. Revision of objectives and strategies

As a result of the continued interaction of the PHC group, a revised program strategy has been evolving. This began to take more definite form at the third annual PHC meeting held in Santo Domingo in 1975. The revised strategy places greater emphasis on the development of marketing systems that will more directly benefit small farmers and contribute to broader goals of rural development.

This revised strategy was subsequently approved by IICA administrators although it was understood by the PHC group that considerable additional investigation will be required to clarify various concepts and to more clearly identify opportunities for new projects.

The revised strategy has the following set of objectives:

- a) Promote the planning of marketing and agroindustry for rural development particularly with respect to small farmers and 'campesinos'.
- b) Cooperate in providing services necessary to increase and improve marketing infrastructure and rural agroindustry in benefit of small farmers, increasing income and rural employment.
- c) Promote in a flexible way groupings or associations of producers and 'campesinos' that would enable them to take advantage of scale economies in marketing and which would help them to take advantage of opportunities in expanding markets for their products.
- d) Cooperate with member countries in the development of rural agroindustry that will contribute to the overall development of the national economy and to rural development.
- e) Cooperate in the promotion of changes and reforms necessary in marketing and agroindustry that is specifically directed to reduce post-harvest losses and food products so as to increase the net availability of food for national consumption.

2. Activities related to the revised strategy

During the Annual Technical Meeting in Santo Domingo, the PHC team resolved to carry out two activities, during the fiscal year 1975-76, related to the revised strategy:

- a) Conduct applied research whenever possible, with national agencies, in order to clarify several elements of the strategy. The basic purpose was to determine the applicability of the strategy at the country level in the different zones of IICA.
- b) To reformulate existing project activities whenever possible to reflect a more direct impact of activities on the institutions with the responsibility of assisting small farmers through their marketing programs.

The basic instrumental objectives implicit in the revised strategy are directly focused towards rural development and concentrated on four related areas of action:

- a) Planning marketing for rural development.
- b) Development and improvement of marketing services for rural development.
- c) Development of rural agro-industrial at the local and regional rural levels.
- d) Reduction of post-harvest losses of food products.

IV. EVALUATION OF PHC - 1972-76

A. Alignment of PHC with IICA General Plan

It appears to the reviewers that PHC has been carefully conceptualized and developed within the philosophy and general objectives of the General Plan of IICA. The program described in the PHC promotional pamphlet (1973) clearly indicated that PHC would attempt to strengthen national institutions in the agricultural sector so as to increase their effectiveness in transforming existing systems of marketing agricultural products, food and inputs. It was anticipated that both agricultural producers and consumers would benefit from market system improvements and that this would contribute to the achievement of high priority development objectives among member countries. The program strategy, the areas of technical cooperation and the proposed instruments of actions were consistent with the IICA policies as described in the General Plan.

Since 1975, the PHC technical group has been evolving a revised program strategy that places greater emphasis on the development of marketing systems that will directly benefit small farmers. This revised program strategy moves the PHC into even closer alignment with the General Plan. It also reflects a growing concern in many member countries regarding rural development more generally and the need to improve the relative well-being of small farmers and the rural poor. The Evaluation Team sees the revised program strategy as a significant shift in emphasis that is much more relevant in some member countries than in others. Hence, we believe that the original conceptual framework for the program will continue to serve as a basis for PHC but that appropriate adaptations should be made as conditions change. Over the next five years, we anticipate that there will be definite need for PHC to give more attention to the development of marketing systems to better serve small farmers and to coordinate program efforts within integrated rural development projects. There will be a continuing need for applied research and technical cooperation on other aspects of market system improvement including national and regional planning and project development.

B. PHC Staff Capacity and Qualifications

The success of any technical cooperation program is very dependent on the capabilities of the professionals assigned to develop and carry out the program. IICA has assembled a relatively young, but highly qualified and well motivated group to carry out the PHC. The group consists of 10 professionals, 5 of which have completed, or nearly completed, Ph.D. programs in agricultural economics with special preparation in the area of agricultural marketing. Five have had M.S. level training and/or special post-graduate training in marketing. Initially some members of the group came to PHC with limited work experience in technical cooperation, but have since gained experience and are now becoming well-known as professional leaders in the field of marketing in Latin America. Some of these technicians will undoubtedly have excellent opportunities to move up within IICA or to consider employment elsewhere. Recently, the Coordinator of PHC was reassigned within IICA to a new position as Special Advisor for External Affairs. Meanwhile, one of the original regular PHC group has been shifted into a Country Director position.

C. PHC as a New Programming Model Within IICA

The availability of a substantial new source of regular funds (Canada) made it possible to initiate the PHC with a critical mass of professional talent.

A new (or modified) program model was effectively employed in the development of PHC. This included the following elements:

- A program coordinator at the hemispheric level.
- A temporary mini-nucleus of two technicians who assisted the program coordinator for about two years while the program was in the early stages of development. These technicians were also assigned country program responsibilities.
- Annual meeting of all PHC technicians contributed to the formulation of group solidarity, to the development of a conceptual framework for the program and a more coordinated set of country and regional project activities.

Specific country projects were developed and carried out within the IICA administrative framework. However, the continued close contact among the PHC group has been an element of strength in the program. Publications have been planned and collaboratively prepared by technicians in different countries; the specialized talents of individual staff members have been shared among several countries through seminars and short-term direct participation in project activities. In some instances this has resulted in excessive demands on the technicians' time and fragmentation of their efforts.

D. PHC Operations at the Country Level

PHC has developed a general methodology that has been very useful in identifying problems and related project activities that contribute to country objectives and are consistent with IICA policies and PHC program strategy. This has occurred although economic, political and social conditions are vastly different among Member countries (e.g., Argentina or Chile compared with Ecuador or Haiti).

The procedures for developing and carrying out projects have included the following elements:

- a) A descriptive analysis of marketing related functions carried out by different public institutions. This serves as a basis for identifying opportunities for technical cooperation with the key institutions involved with agricultural marketing.
- b) Review of available marketing studies.
- c) In some countries additional diagnostic studies have been conducted in collaboration with local institutions and their professional personnel.
- d) Work groups are often formed with appropriate local professional participation to further identify problems and to initiate the development of projects.

- e) Seminars are often held as a means of broadening perception of local professionals and political leaders and to contribute to the process of program and project development and implementation.
- f) Actual technical collaboration in program and project design.
- g) Technical cooperation in program implementation, evaluation and further project development.

The reviewers believe that this approach to technical cooperation is basically sound. It has the advantage of providing a rational basis for policy decisions and for the selection and design of projects that will produce the results desired by the country. Hastily and poorly conceived marketing improvement projects are frequently very wasteful in the use of resources and many produce unexpected and undesirable results.

E. The Dominican Republic Project

Over the past three years the IICA-PHC has been cooperating with the Secretary of Agriculture (SEA) in the development of a comprehensive long-term agricultural marketing program. The program is being supported through an AID agricultural sector loan. In 1974, IICA entered into a US\$ 285,000, twenty-eight month contract to provide technical assistance to SEA in support of the AID loan program.

The Dominican Republic (DR) project represents a concentrated effort by PHC to apply and to further develop and adapt the general methodology for country programs that was outlined in Part IV-D above. The project demonstrates the potential contribution of PHC where a core group of three resident IICA marketing technicians are reinforced by short-term participation of other PHC staff. The project has also served as an in-service training and staff development activity for the PHC group.

It appears to the reviewers that the DR project experience can be utilized in other countries where similar needs exist and where funding arrangements will permit such a concentrated approach to marketing system improvement. Meanwhile, it has been a valuable experience for the PHC group.

It is anticipated that IICA-PHC will have an opportunity to follow through from the diagnostic studies to the development and implementation of specific projects. In fact, PHC assistance has already been instrumental in a major restructuring of the market information system and in the strengthening of the Department of Agricultural Economics within SEA. PHC staff are also actively cooperating with SEA in the planning of several "rural service centers" which are an important part of the effort to improve marketing channels serving small farmers.

As the DR program moves into the development of additional specific projects, the PHC resident staff can be helpful in identifying qualified outside technical assistance to serve local needs that fall outside the area of IICA staff competence or which exceed IICA capacity to deliver cooperative assistance.

F. Coordination with Other International Agencies

IICA-PHC technicians are maintaining contacts with representatives of other international agencies operating in the various member countries. In a few instances there has been active collaboration on project activities (e.g., the Dominican Republic AID financed project).

In general, the reviewers believe that many member countries are having problems in effectively utilizing and coordinating the assistance of international agencies. The problem was described in detail by a representative of the national planning unit in one of the larger member countries. This suggests that the IICA-PHC group should be conscious of this problem and when it serves a useful purpose for the member country to take the initiative to facilitate collaborative, reinforcing technical assistance activities. As a minimum there should be occasional contacts between PHC technicians and other international agency personnel involved in programs related to marketing. Publication exchange should be encouraged. Joint planning of seminars and in-service training activities are also possibilities.

Country level contacts should be reinforced by active contact between IICA administrative staff and representatives of international agencies such as FAO, AID, CIDA, BID and the World Bank. This should facilitate the cooperation of IICA with these agencies, and in some instances there may be opportunities to obtain supplemental funding for the IICA-PHC program.

G. The Image of PHC among IICA Staff

The PHC team members have a good image of their own program. They feel that they are making useful contributions to marketing programs in the member countries. They also believe that PHC actually has an integrated team with opportunities to work jointly in the development of program strategies and in project activities. All team members place a high value on the annual meeting and the opportunities to participate in seminars and workshops in other countries. The exchange of information and publications has also contributed to their feeling of group accomplishment. Maintaining these interactions will be important to the continued success of PHC.

The IICA Country Directors that were interviewed by the Evaluation Team indicated that the PHC has been an important part of their country

programs. Some Directors felt that the 'Modus operandi' of PHC has been an important factor in consolidating IICA actions and has contributed to an overall positive image of IICA among national leaders. Some felt that they will like for PHC technicians to spend more time within the country, especially in those cases when the technician is assigned responsibilities in two or more countries. This concern was also shared by several of the PHC technicians.

II. The Image of PHC among National Institutions

In general, the PHC has made a very positive impression on representatives of national institutions. Clearly, all those interviewed confirmed that improved coordination of marketing programs and policies is a high priority concern. It was also evident that PHC technicians had been successful in bringing about a more informed conceptual approach to marketing problems. However, the reactions of national representatives varied somewhat with less favorable and less knowledgeable responses from professional and political leaders in countries where there are instability and frequent changes in personnel. In a few instances, it was clear that the individual had been in his position for such a short period of time that he was not intimately familiar with PHC.

In nearly all countries there was a clear indication that the national institutions would welcome additional technical cooperation, especially in the design and implementation of specific projects.

In those countries where PHC has operated for any appreciable period of time with the existing institutions, there were strong, positive statements acknowledging IICA contributions to the training of personnel and to the development of marketing improvement projects. The methodology of PHC, including diagnostic studies, workshops, seminars and in-service training looked upon with substantial approval.

Some of the national institution leaders suggested that it would be desirable from their point of view, if IICA would concentrate more of their resources on a few Lines of Action.

Several of the national institution representatives observed that PHC technicians were highly qualified, effective and hard working technical cooperators.

I. Observations regarding the Re-orientation of PHC towards Small Farmers as a Target Group

The reviewers have attempted to understand the rationale for the PHC program re-orientation that is emerging following careful consideration by the PHC group. Major points that the group has apparently taken into account are as follows:

- There has been a rising concern within several member countries and among international agencies working world-wide, that the benefits of development are not being distributed in an equitable manner. Small farmers and the rural poor make up a sizeable population group that have received little or no benefit from general economic development. Many have become worse-off in real terms.
- The PHC program resources are insufficient to maintain effective technical cooperation over the complete range of agricultural and food marketing problems. Hence, it is argued that there should be greater concentration of effort and that improving marketing channels for small farmers should receive high priority.
- The re-orientation of the PHC program toward small farmer marketing systems moves the PHC into even closer alignment with the General Plan of IICA and the evolving priorities in IICA programming.

The Evaluation Team finds these considerations persuasive and valid. However, in selecting and designing projects, we would urge that the PHC staff continue to utilize a broad food system framework of analysis. We believe that market system improvements can benefit small farmers but that major changes in their economic well-being are highly dependent on other factors such as land availability, production inputs, appropriate technologies, and infrastructure, especially roads. Several of these factors are covered by other IICA programs, a fact that emphasizes the need for coordination of Lines of Action at the country level. It also seems clear to us that improvements in marketing systems for small farmers will depend not only on activities such as the formation of farmer marketing groups, but also on changes in policies and programs at the national or regional level, regarding things such as price supports and operations, production credit, transportation, applied research, market information services, urban wholesale markets, etc. In most countries small farmers must continue to compete with a more modern, larger-scale production-marketing sub-system in providing low cost food for an expanding and politically powerful urban population. We are reminded also that the relative well-being of the rural poor, including small farmers, is affected by the availability of a low-cost food supply.

Finally, we have observed substantial differences among countries regarding the importance of the small farmer problem and the priority for special efforts to carry out marketing improvement programs directed toward a small farmer group. This indicated that some country programs of PHC will not be greatly affected by the revised PHC strategy, unless PHC staff are shifted towards those countries where small farmer marketing is a major concern.

J. Some Results of PHC

There are many practical difficulties of identifying and measuring the outputs of a technical cooperation program such as PHC. The PHC program has operated for less than five years, while the results should accrue over a much longer time period. As an international agency, IICA operates with a relatively "low profile" hence many of the program results are likely to be perceived as accomplishments of national institutions and the local professionals that are directly or indirectly influenced by the IICA technicians. Furthermore, there are many other intervening variables such as related program efforts by other international agencies, and the disruptions of program continuity associated with changes in political leadership. In spite of these difficulties, the evaluation team has attempted to identify some important program results or impacts.

The Evaluation Team has concluded that the most important and lasting impact of the PHC is the development of professional and institutional capacities to conceive, develop and carry out, marketing improvement programs. This is being accomplished through direct technical advisory assistance, seminars, short courses and various forms of in-service training. This impression by the review team was supported by numerous interviews with top level leaders and high level technical personnel in the national institutions where the PHC has been involved.

There was little evidence that PHC technicians were directly contributing to or participating in high level policy decision making but many key professionals in national institutions conceded that the indirect contributions of PHC staff to program and project development have been of real importance. In several countries, PHC staff have collaborated in efforts to develop a more coherent and effective national plan for agricultural marketing. In most instances, this has involved a rather systematic diagnosis of problems, the identification of priority areas for the development of specific programs and projects and the role of different institutions in carrying out a coordinated set of marketing improvement activities.

The more immediate and tangible results of PHC can be accounted for by the large number of publications which the group has produced and distributed (see Appendix 3), the number of seminars that have been organized and the number of national professionals that have been involved in some type of in-service training (see Table 1).

Table 1.- Training Activities, PHC, 1972-1976*/

Type of Activity	Number of Activities	Number of Trainees
Courses	14	383
Reciprocal Technical Cooperation	22	75
Seminars and Workshops	23	1075
In-service Training	7	54
TOTAL	66	1537

*/ See Appendix 4 for more detailed data by region and by country

K. Effectiveness of Resource Use in the PHC

During the three year period 1973-74 through 1975-76, the annual allocation of regular IICA funds to PHC was relatively stable in a range of US\$ 345,000 to US\$ 365,000, including the cost of program coordination. In 1975-76, the program received and used approximately US\$ 220,000 in additional funds from sources external to IICA, the largest amount being US\$ 135,000 through the AID financed contract project in the Dominican Republic. In 1976-77, external funding had increased to more than US\$ 500,000 which included US\$ 250,000 to finance projects through the Simon Boliyar Fund.

The Evaluation Team did not attempt to make a detailed analysis of the program expenditures. However, our review of program activities for 1973-76 period indicates to us that the program funds have been effectively utilized in a global sense, to work toward the objectives of the program as approved by the Board of Directors.

To the extent that the outside reviewers have additional observations regarding use of program resources it is to raise questions regarding the future development of staff technicians and program strategy. Interviews with representatives of national institutions indicated a strong preference for a full-time resident technician as compared to a part-time technician who might be assigned to cover two or three countries. PHC staff also expressed concern over their ability to effectively carry out programs in several countries, especially if one

or more was one of the larger member countries. Within the constraints of existing staff, it is impossible to cover all countries with a full-time staff technician. Hence, the alternatives are to leave some countries without PHC project activity or to be very selective in the type of technical cooperation that is offered to second or third country assignments. At the same time, the reviewers have observed a very effective use of PHC staff making short-term inputs into country programs where a full time PHC staff person is in residence.

More basic question could be raised regarding the effective use of resources available to the PHC. Should the program have been oriented more strongly to technical cooperation on narrowly defined project activities as contrasted to the broader based attempt to develop educational programs regarding food system organization and a pragmatic diagnostic approach to the development of national programs to improve agricultural marketing systems? The reviewers are strongly in support of the program strategy that was chosen and approved by the Board of Directors. We believe that this approach has much greater potential for real contributions to long-term improvement in agricultural marketing systems as contrasted to a set of rather unrelated small projects which may not be consistent with larger-term program needs.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Conclusions regarding the PHC, 1972-76

1. The PHC has been carefully conceptualized and carried out within the overall philosophy, the objectives and strategy of the General Plan of IICA.
2. A revision in PHC objectives that began evolving in 1975, places greater emphasis on cooperative assistance directed toward marketing improvements that will benefit small farmers and contribute to the more rapid development of rural areas. This revision in objectives is closely aligned with similar adjustments in other Lines of Action being carried out within the general objectives of IICA. A major implication of the revision is that the IICA-PHC must reorient the instruments of action to more directly address the problems of small farmers, e.g. applied research on marketing problems serving small farmers.
3. The success of the PHC program requires staff members that are highly qualified individuals with an ability to operate effectively in a complex social, economic and political environment. The PHC group that has been assembled meet these requirements. The Evaluation Team considers it of utmost importance to maintain the high professional level of personnel which may be a difficult task in the future.

4. The PHC has developed an innovative and effective programming model that merits consideration in organizing other IICA programs.
5. The PHC group has developed a methodology for assisting member countries in the development of comprehensive national agricultural marketing plans. This methodology is being applied in an intensive project in the Dominican Republic. Major elements of this methodology are being developed, adapted and utilized in other countries.
6. The PHC technical staff has a very positive image of their own program and the contributions they are making towards the improvement of marketing systems of member countries. IICA Country Directors spoke of the importance of the problems being addressed by the PHC but it appears to the Evaluation Team that there is a need for further coordination of the PHC with other IICA activities (Lines of Action) at the country and regional levels. The Directors of IICA country offices must play a key role in this integration.
7. Representatives of national institutions confirmed that marketing was a high priority concern and IICA-PHC is making valuable contributions to the development of better marketing systems. There was a general expression that they would like to have additional technical cooperation from IICA-PHC with a preference for full-time resident technicians as contrasted to non-resident part-time assistance.
8. Due to the observed disruptions of program continuity associated with changes in political leadership in some countries, the reviewers conclude that the most important and lasting program impact of PHC is the development of professional and institutional capabilities.
9. The PHC has made effective use of the resources that have been available for the development of program activities. IICA should give careful consideration to possibilities for expanding the PHC program through external funding and to greater concentration of resources in selected countries when there are real needs and where the potential for program accomplishment appears promising.

B. Future Needs of Member Countries for Technical Cooperation

1. IICA programs must continually be adapted to widely different conditions among member countries and to changes in these conditions over time. The Evaluation Team observed that technical cooperation needs in the more developed countries differ significantly from the needs in the less developed countries. Also, political re-alignments continue to bring about changes in institutional arrangements and approaches to development problems. This indicates a need for considerable flexibility in IICA programming overall and especially in the PHC which deals with problems that are often politically sensitive.

2. The Evaluation Team believes that the IICA-PHC program can be of greatest assistance in meeting member country needs for technical cooperation by offering assistance at two levels:

a) At the national planning and program development level where the major policies are formulated. It is at this level that assistance can be instrumental in the development of a coordinated approach to market system improvements and to a set of policies which effectively contribute to broader national development objectives.

b) At the project design and implementation level. This requires assistance in the practical aspects of carrying out specific projects so that the intended results are achieved. However, some of the more technical aspects of project implementation should be handled by specialized professionals other than the regular PHC group.

C. PHC Strategy and Priority Areas for Program Activities

1. The PHC objectives for 1976-77 reflect not only a greater emphasis on small farmer marketing problems but also additional specific objectives regarding post-harvest handling of agricultural products and the development of agricultural industries. The Evaluation Team believes that both post-harvest handling and agro-industrial development are activities that can and should be integrated into the existing PHC program. However, additional staffing competence will be required to develop effective programs in these new areas.

2. The PHC should continue to give the highest priority to project activities which develop national capabilities to design and implement effective marketing programs. The training of professionals continues to be a high priority need in all countries visited by the Evaluation Team. Considerable emphasis should be placed upon in-service training activities including seminars, short courses and supervised participation in on-going projects. Indications are that carefully organized trips to observe and study marketing programs in other countries, have been very useful in the development of national professional capabilities. Continued efforts by PHC staff to strengthen the marketing training being offered in universities is also important over the longer run.

3. It is important that PHC staff continue to be involved in applied research which will contribute directly to program and project development in particular countries. These studies will also assist in the further development of the PHC program. Currently, there is a need to study alternative ways of improving marketing systems for small farmers in the context of broader goals for rural and national

development. Active participation in applied problem solving research is essential to the continued effectiveness and innovation of the PHC.

4. The PHC should be giving a higher priority to the preparation of publications. The staff has now accumulated considerable experience and would be able to prepare some very useful publications that would extend the influence of PHC and IICA. At their last annual meeting the PHC staff formulated plans for four significant publications. IICA administrators should give support and encouragement to the completion of these and other selected publications. An important consideration is allocating staff time to work on publications. This has not been adequately arranged in the past four years.
5. It is recommended that the PHC give serious consideration to the establishment of an informal network of professionals interested in and actually involved in agricultural marketing work. The network could serve several purposes:
 - a) a roster of qualified people who might be recommended for special technical assistance assignments in member countries;
 - b) a group that might be invited to participate in national or international seminars or workshops to review and plan research;
 - c) a group that would be on the mailing list for selected PHC publications and who would send their own publications to PHC staff and other interested professionals.

D. Program Coordination and Development

1. Program Coordinator: A hemispheric coordinator should be designated as soon as possible to provide leadership in the further development, planning and coordination of PHC. The coordinator would assist the Director General in the development of new projects; in seeking external funding to expand the program; in the recruitment and evaluation of projects and technical staff; in integrating the program with other Lines of Action.
2. Annual Meetings: IICA should support and institutionalize annual meetings of the PHC staff to facilitate group participation in program development and the planning of further projects and related activities.
3. Coordination with other IICA Programs: The PHC has established an identity within IICA. It now appears desirable to give greater attention to the coordination of PHC with other programs and to better integrate PHC projects across "Lines of Action" and especially with Lines VI and VII.

E. Financing PHC Program Expansion

1. The PHC has had regular funding to support a core staff of qualified technicians. In the past two years, the PHC has attracted increasing amounts of external funding through contracts and the special Simon Bolivar fund. The Evaluation Team would encourage further expansion of the PHC through external funds. There is a potentially large demand for additional technical cooperation in marketing among member countries. We would, of course, anticipate that externally financed project opportunities would be selected so as to conform the objectives and strategies of PHC and the General Plan. The Simon Bolivar Fund has the potential to support the development of proposals for projects that might be submitted for external funding. Apparently, it has not as yet been utilized for that purpose.

F. Coordination and Collaboration with Other International Agencies and with Selected Universities

1. IICA should intensify its coordination with other international agencies so as to: (a) interact and coordinate activities whenever possible in order to accelerate the improvement of national agricultural and food marketing systems; (b) generate opportunities to obtain supplemental funding for the IICA-PHC program; (c) facilitate member countries of IICA to effectively utilize and coordinate the assistance of international agencies.
2. Collaborative activities with selected universities should be considered as a means of increasing the quantity and quality of research directed toward important marketing problems in member countries.

G. Centers for Agricultural Marketing Research and Training

1. The Evaluation Team believes that there is a real need for several agricultural marketing research and training centers in Latin America. These centers could make an important contribution to the training of professionals for positions in public institutions responsible for planning and implementing agricultural marketing programs. IICA should encourage and assist member countries in organizing centers which can serve their particular needs. Given past difficulties in developing and sustaining this type of centers, we would recommend that several alternatives be carefully considered.

INSTITUTIONS VISITED AND PERSONS INTERVIEWED, BY COUNTRIES

COSTA RICA

A. IICA

José Emilio G. Araujo, Director General
Carlos Madrid S., Sub-director General
Ubaldo C. García, Sub-director General Adjunto de Planificación
Malcolm MacDonald, Sub-director General Adjunto de Operaciones
José A. Torres, Coordinador Plan de Acción en Costa Rica
Pablo Torrealba, Especialista en Comercialización
Norberto Frigerio, Especialista en Comercialización

B. PIMA (Programa Integral de Mercadeo Agropecuario)

Rufino Gil, Director

C. CNP (Consejo Nacional de Producción)

Mario Carvajal, Gerente
Ronald Vargas, Jefe Unidad de Investigación Económica
Roberto Jiménez, Coordinador con Organizaciones Agropecuarias

D. OPSA (Oficina de Planificación Sectorial Agropecuaria)

Alejandro Quesada, Director
Eduardo Ramírez, Enlace Nacional con el Equipo de Evaluación

E. Escuela de Economía Agrícola, Facultad de Agronomía, Universidad de Costa Rica

Guillermo Iglesias, Decano Facultad de Agronomía
Alvaro Cordero, Director Escuela de Economía Agrícola
Francisco Montero, Profesor

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

A. IICA

Michel Montoya, Coordinador Plan de Acción en Rep. Dominicana
Jerry La Gra, Especialista en Comercialización
Néstor Morales, Especialista en Comercialización
Gilberto Mendoza, Especialista en Comercialización

B. DEA (Departamento de Economía Agropecuaria; SEA)

Joaquín Nolasco, Director (Enlace Nacional con el Equipo de Evaluación)

C. USAID

William Janssen, Rural Development Office
Ronald Pollock, Marketing Adviser

D. INESPRES (Instituto Nacional de Estabilización de Precios)

Eugenio Miranda, Director, Departamento de Estudios Especiales

E. SEA (Secretaría de Estado de Agricultura)

Manuel de Js. Viñas Cáceres, Secretario de Estado
Juan Núñez, Subsecretario de Estado de Agricultura en Planificación

HAITI (The following persons were interviewed in Dominican Republic)

Lucien Duvivier, Director del Plan Quinquenal Agropecuario,
Unidad de Planificación, DARNDR (Departamento de
Agricultura, Recursos Naturales y Desarrollo Rural)
Verdy Duplan, Director, SENACA (Servicio Nacional de Comercializa-
ción Agrícola del DARNDR)

VENEZUELA

A. IICA

José Luis Pando, Especialista en Comercialización

B. CMA (Corporación de Mercadeo Agrícola)

Luis Alfonso Avendaño, Adjunto al Gerente Técnico (Enlace
Nacional con el Equipo de Evaluación)
Francisco Suárez, Jefe, Depto. de Mercadotecnia
David Quintero, Jefe, Sección Desarrollo y Proyectos

C. OPSA (Dirección General de Planeamiento Sectorial Agropecuario)

Vicente Sánchez Piña, Director, Dirección de Planificación
y Estadística
María Auxiliadora Alvarado, Dirección de Economía Agrícola

COLOMBIA

A. IICA

Augusto Donoso, Especialista en Planificación de la Producción
Agrícola (a cargo Dirección Oficina del IICA
en Colombia)
Nelson Suárez, Especialista en Comercialización
Ismael Peña, Director, PNCA (Programa Nacional de Capacitación
Agropecuaria)

B. Universidad Nacional

Alvaro Silva, Profesor
Jorge Torres, Profesor

C. Departamento Nacional de Planeación

Jaime Novoa, Director, Departamento de Mercadeo

D. OPSA (Oficina de Planificación Sectorial Agropecuaria, M.A.)

Absalón Machado, Director

Hernán Cardozo, Jefe del Grupo de Mercadeo (Enlace Nacional con el Equipo de Evaluación)

PERU

A. IICA

Hugo Torres, Especialista en Comercialización, Coordinador del Plan de Acción en el Perú

B. Ministerio de Alimentación, Dirección General de Comercialización

Julio Ocampo, Director General

Miguel Chamochumbi, Director Adjunto

Jorge Wong, Director de Normalización de Servicios

Aída de Espada, Directora de Asistencia Técnica

Carlos Vega, Dirección de Normalización de Servicios

Armando Cobian E., Dirección de Normalización de Servicios

C. OSPAL (Oficina Sectorial de Planificación Alimentaria)

Gonzalo Silva Santisteban, Director de Proyectos y Cooperación Técnica Internacional

Fernando del Risco S., Director de Planes y Programas

ARGENTINA

A. IICA

Agustín Merea, Director Encargado

Carlos Fletschner, Especialista en Comercialización

B. CONINAGRO (Confederación Intercooperativa Agropecuaria)

Juan Carlos Basaños, Asesor Económico

C. SEAG (Secretaría de Estado de Agricultura y Ganadería)

Humberto Pereira, Asesor

Luis A. Cuccia, Director del Servicio Nacional de Economía

D. UNBA (Universidad de Buenos Aires)

Antonino Vivanco, Profesor

PARAGUAY (The following person was interviewed in Buenos Aires)

Virgilio Rolón, Director de Comercialización, Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería

URUGUAY (The following person was interviewed in Buenos Aires)

Raúl Grille, Jefe de la Sección Comercialización de la Dirección de Investigaciones Económicas, Ministerio de Agricultura y Pesca.

APPENDIX 2

INTERVIEW GUIDELINE

1. Which are the main activities undertaken by your agency concerning the development of an improved marketing system?
2. Are there any special programs and projects oriented towards improving marketing systems and other essential services for the small producer? What are they?
3. What level of participation and cooperation of IICA technicians have you received in the field of marketing?
4. Has IICA's technical cooperation contributed to the formulation of important decisions concerning marketing policies, programming and projects?
5. What key, important contributions in marketing has IICA made?
6. Do you need future technical cooperation to develop your marketing system? Do you need IICA's assistance in this field?

INDEX

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Chapter I. The History of the English Language	1
Chapter II. The English Language in the Middle Ages	1
Chapter III. The English Language in the Modern Period	1
Chapter IV. The English Language in the Future	1
Chapter V. The English Language in the Present	1
Chapter VI. The English Language in the Past	1
Chapter VII. The English Language in the World	1
Chapter VIII. The English Language in the Home	1
Chapter IX. The English Language in the Church	1
Chapter X. The English Language in the State	1
Chapter XI. The English Language in the Army	1
Chapter XII. The English Language in the Navy	1
Chapter XIII. The English Language in the Education	1
Chapter XIV. The English Language in the Literature	1
Chapter XV. The English Language in the Art	1
Chapter XVI. The English Language in the Science	1
Chapter XVII. The English Language in the Philosophy	1
Chapter XVIII. The English Language in the Religion	1
Chapter XIX. The English Language in the Politics	1
Chapter XX. The English Language in the Economics	1
Chapter XXI. The English Language in the Law	1
Chapter XXII. The English Language in the Medicine	1
Chapter XXIII. The English Language in the Agriculture	1
Chapter XXIV. The English Language in the Industry	1
Chapter XXV. The English Language in the Commerce	1
Chapter XXVI. The English Language in the Transportation	1
Chapter XXVII. The English Language in the Communication	1
Chapter XXVIII. The English Language in the Entertainment	1
Chapter XXIX. The English Language in the Sports	1
Chapter XXX. The English Language in the Leisure	1

LIST OF PAPERS, REPORTS AND PUBLICATIONS OF IICA'S MARKETING PROGRAM

A preliminary list of the papers and publications prepared by the IICA marketing specialists is presented. These reports, etc., are the result of work of IICA technicians who have participated in IICA-organized activities, or of actions in which IICA has cooperated with national institutions.

1. **OBALLE DE ESPADA, A., TORREALBA, J.P. y TORRES, H.** Manual sobre centros de acopio. Publicación Miscelánea No. 116. IICA, Lima, mayo de 1974.
2. **FLETSCHNER, C.** Comercialización y precios agrícolas (sumario esquemático). IICA, Asunción, 1973. 40 p.
3. _____. Un marco de referencia para el diseño de políticas de comercialización agrícola. IICA, Santiago, 1973. Trabajo presentado a la XVIII Reunión del Consejo Técnico Consultivo del IICA, Santiago, Chile, 1973. 17 p.
4. _____. Comercialización de ganado en el Chaco. Resistencia, Argentina, 1975. 22 p.
5. _____. Comercialización agrícola en proyectos de colonización. Resistencia, Argentina, 1975. 11 p.
6. _____. Comercialización de productos perecibles. Asunción, 1974. 44 p.
7. _____. Comercialización en proyectos agrícolas. Santiago, 1974. 56 p.
8. _____. La comercialización en proyectos de desarrollo. Asunción, 1975. 6 p.
9. _____. Comercialización en proyectos de riego. Jujuy, Argentina, 1974. 17 p.
10. _____. Información de precios y mercados. Montevideo, 1974. 52 p.
11. _____. El papel del Estado en el sistema de comercialización. Santo Domingo, 1975. 15 p.
12. _____. Proyecciones y pronósticos de oferta y demanda. Buenos Aires, 1975. 3 p.

13. COSTA RICA. CONSEJO NACIONAL DE PRODUCCION. DEPARTAMENTO DE PLANIFICACION. Proyecto Nacional de Almacenamiento de Granos Básicos con la Asesoría del IICA. San José, enero de 1976.
14. FRIGERIO, N. y TORREALBA, J. P. Plan de mercados para Managua. San José, diciembre de 1973. Informe al señor Viceministro de Agricultura y Ganadería de Nicaragua.
15. _____. Diagnóstico del Subsistema Institucional de Comercialización de Costa Rica. San José, abril de 1974.
16. _____. Análisis de la Estructura Institucional de Comercialización en Costa Rica. Documento presentado en la Reunión Técnica Nacional de Mercadeo: Problemas y Políticas. San José, 15-18 de octubre de 1974.
17. FRIGERIO, N. y FIORI, E. Análisis y diagnóstico preliminar del subsistema institucional de comercialización y de la Dirección Nacional de Mercadeo Agropecuario del MIDA en Panamá. San José, marzo de 1975.
18. FRIGERIO, N. Conceptos básicos de comercialización; cómo enseñarlos. Documento preparado para el Seminario de Mercadotecnia de Productos Agropecuarios, Monterrey, México, 10-12 de junio de 1974.
19. _____. Planificación del desarrollo de mercados nacionales. Documento preparado para el Primer Seminario de Comercialización, Santo Domingo, República Dominicana, 7-9 de abril de 1975.
20. _____. El impacto potencial de los nuevos mercados mayoristas sobre los costos de distribución de alimentos en áreas urbanas. Documento preparado para la Reunión sobre Centrales de Abastecimiento en Barquisimeto, Venezuela, 20-23 de mayo de 1975.
21. LA J. The role of diagnostic research in strengthening agricultural marketing institutions. IICA, Port-au-Prince, 1974. 22 p. (editado en español e inglés).
22. _____. y SUAREZ, H. Informe a la Secretaría de Estado de Agricultura: cooperación técnica en comercialización agropecuaria. IICA, Santo Domingo, 1974.
23. _____. Proposal for integrated intensive projects in agricultural marketing in the Dominican Republic. Santo Domingo, setiembre de 1974. 57 p.
24. _____. JOSEPI, R.D. y FANINI, S. Cold storage and fumigation facilities. A coordinated study between COINAFEP and the OAS/Intf

25. HARRISON, K. y RILEY, H. La institucionalización de programas para el mejoramiento de la comercialización. Desarrollo Rural en Las Américas, VI N°2, mayo-agosto de 1974.
26. HARRISON, K. et al. Mejoramiento de los sistemas de comercialización de alimentos en países en vías de desarrollo. Experiencias de América Latina. Traducido y publicado por el IICA, San José, mayo de 1976.
27. INSTITUTO INTERAMERICANO DE CIENCIAS AGRICOLAS. Estructura del comercio de granos en la Argentina. Buenos Aires, 1975.
28. _____. Organización institucional de la comercialización agropecuaria en Argentina, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay. Montevideo, 1975
29. _____. Programa Hemisférico de Comercialización. San José, 1974. (español e inglés).
30. _____. Seminario de Análisis y Orientación del Programa Hemisférico de Comercialización del IICA. IICA/ADC-RTN. San José, 9-11 de abril de 1973.
31. _____, COMISION DE MERCADEO DEL CONSEJO AGROPECUARIO NACIONAL. Reunión Técnica Nacional de Mercadeo: Problemas y Políticas. San José, 15-18 de octubre de 1974.
32. _____, PROGRAMA HEMISFERICO DE COMERCIALIZACION. Metodología de identificación y selección de los organismos clave del subsistema institucional de comercialización. San José, julio de 1973.
33. _____. CENTRO INTERAMERICANO DE DESARROLLO RURAL Y REFORMA AGRARIA. Bibliografía selectiva sobre comercialización agrícola. Bogotá, 1971. 460 ref.
34. _____. ROCAP. Manual para el diseño de Sistemas de Información de Mercados y Pronósticos Agropecuarios, Manual No. 11. PIADIC No. 012, Mayo de 1976. Primer borrador.
35. _____. Comercialización agrícola: en particular lo referente a las relaciones productor-consumidor. Mesa Redonda del Consejo Técnico Consultivo, XVIII Reunión. Santiago, 1973. 67 p.
36. KRIESBERG, M. y STEEL, H. Mejoramiento de los sistemas de comercialización en los países en desarrollo, un enfoque para la identificación de problemas y el fortalecimiento de la asistencia técnica. Trabajo traducido y publicado por el IICA. Serie Desarrollo Institucional, No. 3. San José, abril de 1974.

37. MEDINA, E. y TORRES, E. Normas para la formación de comités de comercialización. Manual No. 42, Ministerio de Agricultura, mayo de 1974.
38. MORAN, M.J. Comercialización Agropecuaria: Dimensiones de un enfoque dinámico. IICA, Zona Sur. Santiago, 1973. 4 p. Preparado para la Mesa Redonda del Consejo Técnico Consultivo, XVIII Reunión, Santiago, 1973.
39. _____. Internal marketing structure requirements for fruit and vegetable exports: A new industry for Costa Rica. s.n.t.s.p. Trabajo preparado para un seminario organizado por ADC/RTN, Marketing Institutions and Services for Developing Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 1974.
40. _____. Mercadeo agropecuario y sistemas de producción agrícola. In Curso intensivo sobre sistemas de producción agrícola para el trópico, Turrialba, 1975. CATIE, Turrialba, 1975. s.p.
41. _____. Planificación del desarrollo de la comercialización en una sociedad cambiante. In Seminario Nacional de Comercialización para Ejecutivos, República Dominicana, 1975. IICA, s.l., 1975. s.p.
42. _____. Las políticas de precios agrícolas en una perspectiva de comercialización institucional. s.n.t.s.p. Trabajo preparado para el Seminario BID sobre Política Agrícola: Un Factor Limitante en el Proceso de Desarrollo, Washington, D.C., 1975.
43. _____. Considerations for an agricultural marketing policy aimed at small farmers. Paper prepared for ADC/RTN Workshop - Marketing Problems of Small Farmers, Experiences to Date, Policy Implications and Research Needs. Kollogg Center, Michigan State University, junio 6-7 de 1974.
44. _____. Food supply problems and national policies: estimated requirements and cost of marketing infrastructure in three selected countries. Estudio descriptivo preparado en cooperación con la Secretaría General de la OEA, en preparación del Estudio en Producción de Alimentos en América Latina. San José, julio de 1974.
45. _____. La comercialización agropecuaria y su significado para el desarrollo socioeconómico del campesino. Desarrollo Rural en Las Américas. Vol. VII, No. 2, mayo-agosto de 1975.

46. PANDO, J.L. Conceptos básicos sobre el componente dinámico de la comercialización agropecuaria. In Seminario para Instructores de Mercadeo: Problemas de Comercialización Agropecuaria, Coro, Venezuela, 1974. IICA, 1974. 25 p.
47. _____. Contenido y alcance de una política de mercadeo para ejecutivos del sector agropecuario de la República Dominicana. Santo Domingo, s.e., 1975. 3 p.
48. _____. Implicaciones para los productores agrícolas de sistemas alternativos de comercialización. In Seminario sobre Sistemas de Comercialización de Alimentos, Caracas, 1974. IICA, Caracas, 1974. 19 p.
49. _____. Modelo conceptual de un sistema descentralizado de comercialización. In Seminario para Instructores de Mercadeo; Problemas de Comercialización Agropecuaria, Coro, Venezuela, 1974. IICA, 1974. s.p.
50. _____, CHIN, S.B. y WEST, D.A. National and regional hog supply functions. Agriculture Canada. Economics Branch Publication No. 74/15, 1974. s.p.
51. _____. El significado de las centrales de abastecimiento en sistemas alternativos de comercialización agropecuaria. In Reunión Nacional sobre Instrumentos de Comercialización: Centrales de Abastecimiento 2a., Barquisimeto, Venezuela, 1975. IICA, 1975. 17 p.
52. _____. Significado de los mercados mayoristas en el proyecto de comercialización integral de la Corporación de Mercadeo Agrícola de Venezuela. In Reunión sobre Sistemas de Comercialización: Mercados Mayoristas, Lima, 1974. s.e., 1974. 9 p.
53. _____. Sistemas de comercialización de productos de origen animal. In Seminario Regional para profesores de Zootecnia en el Area de la Economía, Maracaibo, Venezuela, 1974. IICA, Informes de Conferencias, Cursos y Reuniones No. 35, 1974. pp. C3-2-1-C9-2-11.
54. MEDINA RUBIO, E., COBIAN, A. y TORRES, H. Estudio sobre estructura y comportamiento de los mercados mayoristas N. 1 y No. 2 de Lima. Diciembre de 1974.
55. MURRAY, G. Selected Aspects of the Internal Market System of the Dominican Republic. IICA, Santo Domingo, junio de 1974. 81 p.
56. _____. Dominican Peasants and Rural Traders: A project-oriented research methodology. IICA, Santo Domingo, enero de 1970. 40 p.

57. SUAREZ, N. Aspectos de comercialización de semillas forrajeras en el Ecuador. Preparado para el Seminario Nacional sobre Semillas de Forrajeras en el Ecuador. Quito, mayo 14-16 de 1975.
58. _____. Aspectos generales de comercialización agropecuaria. Curso Nacional para Elaboración de Proyectos de Reforma Agraria, IBARRA, marzo 11 - abril 5 de 1974.
59. _____. Aspectos de comercialización de productos agropecuarios. Curso de Administración de Proyectos de Reforma Agraria, Cayambe, febrero 24 - marzo 7 de 1975.
60. _____. Impacto de la reforma del mercado de CORABASTOS sobre el sistema de distribución de productos alimenticios en Bogotá, D.E. Preparado para la II Reunión sobre Instrumentos de Comercialización Agropecuaria en Venezuela, mayo 19-23 de 1975.
61. _____. Efecto de los programas de CORABASTOS sobre el subsistema detallista. Preparado para el Seminario Nacional de Comercialización Agropecuaria para Ejecutivos, Santo Domingo, abril 7-9 de 1975.
62. _____. Algunas consideraciones en relación con la comercialización de semillas forrajeras, In Seminario sobre Producción de Semillas de Forrajeras, Quito, 1975. IICA, Informes de Conferencias, Cursos y Reuniones No. 30, 1975. 4 p.
63. _____. Algunos aspectos de importancia de las Centrales Mayoristas de Abastecimiento en Colombia. Experiencia de la Central Mayorista de Bogotá, S.A. (CABSA). In Reunión sobre Sistemas de Comercialización: Mercados Mayoristas. Lima, s.e., 1974. 21 p.
64. _____. Experiencias obtenidas en algunos programas de mercadeo de alimentos en Colombia con referencia específica a los programas de la Corporación de Abastos de Bogotá (CORABASTOS). Fudico-Barquisimeto. In Reunión Nacional sobre Instrumentos de Comercialización, 2a., 1975. Bogotá, 1975. 32 p.
65. _____. Informe preliminar sobre la industrialización de productos agrícolas de carácter perecedero en Colombia. IICA, Quito, 1975. 31 p.
66. _____. Informe preliminar sobre la industrialización de productos agrícolas de carácter perecedero en el Ecuador. IICA, Quito, 1975. 50 p.

67. _____. Informe sobre el diagnóstico funcional de comercialización de productos agropecuarios en Colombia. IICA, Quito, 1975. 51 p.
68. _____. Informe sobre el diagnóstico funcional de comercialización de productos agropecuarios en el Ecuador. IICA, Quito, 1975. 59 p.
69. TORREALBA, J.P. Análisis de centros de acopio en zonas cafeteras como un medio de mejoramiento del sistema de producción y acopio de frutas y hortalizas. Federación Nacional de Cafeteros de Colombia, Programa de Desarrollo y Diversificación de Zonas Cafeteras, Bogotá, 1972. 120 p.
70. _____. El Desarrollo de la Comercialización en América Latina y sus Problemas Actuales. Desarrollo Rural en Las Américas, Vol VI, No. 1, Turrialba, enero-abril de 1974.
71. _____. Mercadeo de Frutas y Hortalizas en Nicaragua. Informe técnico preparado para la Unidad de Análisis Sectorial. San José, setiembre de 1973.
72. _____. Actividades para la formulación y ejecución de un plan de mercados para Managua. Documento preparado para la Unidad de Análisis Sectorial, Managua, Nicaragua. Marzo de 1974.
73. _____. Proyecto del subestudio de información en el área de comercialización agropecuaria. Documento preliminar preparado para la Reunión de Coordinación del Proyecto de Sistema Regional de Información. San José, marzo de 1974.
74. _____. Análisis del subsistema institucional de comercialización de Honduras. Tegucigalpa, abril de 1974.
75. _____. Análisis económico de centros de acopio. Documento preparado para la Reunión Nacional sobre Instrumentos de Comercialización, Mérida, Venezuela, 20-24 de mayo de 1974.
76. _____. Proyecto de instalación de un centro de servicios de comercialización agropecuaria en el Meseta Central. Documento presentado al Departamento de Planificación y Programación del Consejo Nacional de Producción, San José, junio de 1974.
77. _____. Investigación, diagnóstico y reformas integrales en comercialización agropecuaria y de alimentos. Documento preparado para el Seminario de Mercadeo para Ejecutivos del Sector Agropecuario de República Dominicana, Santo Domingo, 7-9 de abril de 1975.

73. _____ . La comercialización agropecuaria e industrialización de empresas comunitarias campesinas. Documento preparado para la Reunión Centroamericana de Dirigentes de Empresas Comunitarias Campesinas, San Francisco de Veraguas, Panamá, junio de 1975.
79. _____ . Bases para la formulación de un programa nacional de mercadeo. Documento preparado para presentarlo en la Sesión del Consejo Agropecuario Nacional, San José, 11 de junio de 1975.
80. TORRES, H. Cursos de mercadeo agrícola. Versión preliminar. IICA, Zona Andina, Lima, 1972. 1v., p. irr.
81. _____ . et al. Commercialisation. Core National en Préparation et Evaluation de Projets du Développement Agricole, Port-au-Prince, 1973. 67 p.
82. _____ . Guía para la preparación de proyectos de comercialización agrícola. BID, s.l., 1973. 13 p.
83. _____ . Fundamentos metodológicos del programa nacional de asistencia técnica en comercialización en el Perú. Preparado para la Reunión Técnica del Programa Hemisférico de Comercialización del IICA, San José, abril de 1974.
84. _____ . Aspectos de la comercialización de semillas de especies forrajeras. Preparado para el Simposio sobre Producción de Especies Forrajeras, Perú, junio de 1974.
85. _____ . El papel del mercadeo en el desarrollo económico. Implicaciones para la formulación de la política agrícola. Preparado para la Primera Reunión sobre Sistemas de Comercialización: Centros de Acopio y Mercados Mayoristas, La Paz, noviembre de 1974.
86. _____ . Plan Director de Comercialización en el Perú. Preparado para el Primer Seminario Nacional de Comercialización Agropecuaria para Ejecutivos. Secretaría de Estado de Agricultura. Santo Domingo, 7-9 de abril de 1975.
87. _____ . Diagnóstico del mercadeo y medidas de política. IICA, Bogotá, 1973. 47 p.
88. _____ y SILVA, A. Enfoques al estudio del mercadeo. IICA-CIRA, Bogotá, 1974. 6 p.

PROYECTOS DE INVESTIGACION

DIAGNOSTICO Y ANALISIS DEL SISTEMA INTERNO DE COMERCIALIZACION EN HAITI

1. MURRAY, G.F. y ALVAREZ, M.D. La Comercialisation des haricots en Haiti: une étude exploratoire. IICA, Port-au-Prince, junio de 1973. 64 p. (original en inglés).
2. LOCHER, U. La commercialisation interne des produits agricoles à Port-au-Prince. IICA, Port-au-Prince, abril de 1974. 108 p.
3. LAGRA, J. Fabrication de matériels d'emballage à Port-au-Prince. IICA, Port-au-Prince, junio de 1974. 12 p. (original en inglés).
4. DUPLAN, V. y LAGRA, J. Analyse du système de taxation des produits agricoles dans les marchés haitiens. IICA, Port-au-Prince, setiembre de 1974. 45 p.
5. INSTITUTO INTERAMERICANO DE CIENCIAS AGRICOLAS. Activités commerciales dans les zones rurales d'Haiti: une approche centrée sur une communauté. Port-au-Prince, octubre de 1974. 60 p. (original en inglés)
6. DORVILLE, R. Production et commercialisation des légumes en Haiti. IICA, Port-au-Prince, febrero de 1975. 53 p.
7. FATTON, D. Eléments d'information sur la production et la commercialisation du sisal en Haiti. IICA, Port-au-Prince, marzo de 1975. 95 p.
8. LAGRA, J., et al. Prix des produits agricoles dans les marchés haitiens. IICA, Port-au-Prince, marzo de 1975. 50 p. (edición en inglés y en francés).
9. WERLEIGH, G.E. y DUPLAN, V. Le système de commercialisation interne des produits agricoles au Cap-Haïtien, Haiti. IICA, Port-au-Prince, marzo de 1975. 74 p.
10. LAGRA, J. y DUPLAN, V. Enquête sur le transport des produits agricoles à l'entrée et à la sortie du Cap-Haïtien. IICA, Port-au-Prince, mayo de 1975. 47 p.
11. ————. Transport des produits agricoles vers Port-au-Prince, IICA, Port-au-Prince, junio de 1975. 91 p.

12. DUPLAN, V. Equivalents des unités de mesures et emballage utilisés pour le transport des produits agricoles. IICA, Port-au-Prince, junio de 1975. 22 p.
13. _____. Commercialisation des intrants agricoles en Haiti. IICA, Port-au-Prince, julio de 1975. 92 p.
14. GILAULT, C. y LAGRA, J. Caractéristiques structurelles de la commercialisation interne des produits agricoles en Haiti. IICA, Port-au-Prince, julio de 1975. 53 p.
15. DOEUVILLE, R. Production et commercialisation des fruits en Haiti. IICA, Port-au-Prince, agosto de 1975. 51 p.
16. LAGRA, J. et al. Les marchés publics d'Haiti. IICA, Port-au-Prince, novembre de 1975. 97 p.
17. JOHNSON, J.L. y LAGRA, J. Le Systeme Interne de commercialisation agricoles d'Haiti: une analyse de prix. IICA, Port-au-Prince, novembre de 1975. 31 p.

1. The first part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee.

2. The second part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee.

3. The third part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee.

4. The fourth part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee.

5. The fifth part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee.

6. The sixth part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee.

PROYECTO DE COMERCIALIZACION INTEGRADO SEA/IICA

1. SEA. DIVISION DE MERCADEO. Servicio de Información de Precios y Mercados: Plan de Operaciones. s.l., setiembre de 1975. 54 p.
2. MURRAY, G.F. Analisis del Flujo de Actividades: Una metodología de Investigación para Sistemas de Producción y Mercadeo Agrícolas. SEA/IICA, Santo Domingo, octubre de 1975. 21 p.
3. MURRAY, G.F., ALCANTARA, R. y PRINCE, L. Dónde reina la escasez: Un panorama analítico del Sistema de Mercadeo Agrícola de la República Dominicana. SEA/IICA, Santo Domingo, octubre de 1975. 28 p.
4. SEA/IICA. Encuesta de Entrada y Salida de Productos Agropecuarios a Santo Domingo. Santo Domingo, abril de 1976. 37 p.
5. ALCANTARA, R., PRINCE, L. y MURRAY, G.F. La Comercialización de Plátanos en la República Dominicana. SEA/IICA, Santo Domingo, abril de 1976. 165 p.
6. VASQUEZ, V., MENDOZA, G. y COLABORADORES. Diagnóstico del Mercadeo de la Papa en la República Dominicana. SEA/IICA, Santo Domingo, mayo de 1976. 26 p.
7. _____. Diagnóstico del Mercadeo de la Auyama y el Molondrón en la República Dominicana. SEA/IICA, Santo Domingo, mayo de 1976. 18 p.
8. DE LOS SANTOS, T., BURGOS, C. y MENDOZA, G. Diagnóstico del Mercadeo del Ganado y la Carne de Res en la República Dominicana. SEA/IICA, Santo Domingo, mayo de 1976. 37 p.
9. _____. Diagnóstico del Mercadeo de la Leche en la República Dominicana. SEA/IICA, Santo Domingo, junio de 1976. 23 p.
10. UREÑA DE MARTINEZ, R. y MENDOZA, G. Diagnóstico del Mercadeo de Huevos en la República Dominicana. SEA/IICA, Santo Domingo, junio de 1976. 19 p.
11. DE LOS SANTOS, T., BURGOS, C. y MENDOZA, G. Diagnóstico del Mercadeo del Pollo en la República Dominicana. SEA/IICA, Santo Domingo, junio de 1976. 21 p.
12. JIMENEZ, F., VASQUEZ, V. y MENDOZA, G. Diagnóstico del Mercadeo del Tomate en la República Dominicana. SEA/IICA, Santo Domingo, junio de 1976. 20 p.

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities.

2. It is essential to ensure that all data is entered correctly and consistently to avoid any discrepancies or errors.

3. Regular audits and reviews should be conducted to verify the accuracy and integrity of the information stored.

4. Proper security measures must be implemented to protect sensitive data from unauthorized access or theft.

5. The system should be designed to be user-friendly and easy to navigate for all staff members.

6. Training and support should be provided to ensure that users are comfortable and confident in using the system.

7. The system should be able to generate reports and summaries that are clear and concise, providing valuable insights into the data.

8. It is important to have a backup and recovery plan in place to ensure that data is not lost in the event of a system failure.

9. The system should be scalable and able to handle increasing amounts of data and users as the organization grows.

10. Finally, it is crucial to have a clear plan for the future development and maintenance of the system to ensure it remains up-to-date and effective.

11. The system should be designed to be flexible and adaptable to changing requirements and technologies.

12. It is important to have a clear communication plan in place to keep all stakeholders informed of the system's progress and any issues that arise.

13. The system should be designed to be secure and compliant with all relevant regulations and standards.

NUMBER OF TRAINING ACTIVITIES AND OF TRAINEES BY THE PHC, BY COUNTRIES AND ZONES, ACCORDING TO THE TYPE OF TRAINING

COUNTRIES AND ZONES	COURSES		RECIPROCAL TECHNICAL COOPERATION		SEMINARS, MEETINGS, WORKSHOPS		IN SERVICE TRAINING		TOTAL	
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
Bolivia	1	18	6	14	4	96	-	-	11	128
Colombia (3)	-	-	1	4	3	171	-	-	4	175
Ecuador	4	136	4	10	-	-	-	-	8	146
Perú	4	136	4	13	3	151	1	19	12	319
Venezuela	3	68	4	8	6	322	-	-	13	398
ANDEAN ZONE Subtotal	12	358	19	49	16	740	1	19	48	1166
Costa Rica	1	3	-	-	2	81	1	4	4	88
NORTHERN ZONE Subtotal	1	3	-	-	2	81	1	4	4	88
Haiti	-	-	1	3	-	-	1	26	2	29
Dominican Rep.	1	22	1	22	1	100	-	-	3	144
CARIBBEAN ZONE Subtotal	1	22	2	25	1	100	1	26	5	173
Argentina	-	-	-	-	1	15	2	2	3	17
Paraguay	-	-	1	1	2	65	1	2	4	68
Uruguay	-	-	-	-	1	24	1	1	2	25
SOUTHERN ZONE Subtotal	-	-	1	1	4	104	4	5	3	110
GRAND TOTAL	14	383	22	75	23	1025	7	54	65	1537(4)

(1) Number of activities.

(2) Number of trainees.

(3) Does not include data from the National Training Program of Colombia which, although carried over several courses in marketing, does not belong formally to the PHC.

(4) Several trainees participated in more than one activity, which brings the actual number to a lower figure. On the other hand, this figure does not include people trained through participation in research, diagnostics, project planning and implementation, development of methodologies and similar activities.

[



EDITORIAL IICA—