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1. Executive Summary

The IDB envisions a robust agricultural sector in Haiti that delivers economic growth as well as addresses challenges to enduring social and environmental problems. The IDB has prioritized support for strong Haitian ownership through investment in local institutions, cooperatives, private sector actors who form the long term permanent infrastructure and can reach critical populations - women, rural youth.

To help the IDB make an informed decision about where to place their investment in local institutions to support agricultural cooperatives Counterpart International completed three tasks:

1) reviewed the needs of the cooperative sector by assessing 29 agricultural cooperatives,
2) assessed the capacities of potential local partners who can support cooperatives' organizational and technical needs and
3) developed a series of recommendations on capacity building investments that can strengthen the agricultural sector in Haiti.

A capacity assessment to support agricultural cooperatives was carried out in Haiti in May and June of 2016. The purpose of the landscape assessment was to: 1) more clearly understand the current state of Haitian agricultural cooperatives, and 2) identify and evaluate intermediary service organizations (ISOs) that can provide support to strengthen agricultural cooperatives in Haiti. A total of 29 agricultural cooperatives spread across 8 of Haiti’s 10 departments and representing over 13,000 farmers were assessed using the Cooperative Capacity Assessment Tool created by Counterpart International and viewed as the standard in assessment tools for cooperatives. The assessment included a thorough evaluation of the leading local agricultural capacity-building ISOs in Haiti. In total, a group of over 300 service providers was compiled of which 33 completed self-assessment surveys and 7 were evaluated using Counterpart International’s ISO capacity assessment tool.

2. Introduction

With a population of 10.4 million people living in an area of 27,750 Km2, Haiti is one of the most densely populated countries in Latin America and the Caribbean. The wealth generated by the country is largely inadequate to meet the needs of the population and Haiti’s per capita gross domestic product is among the lowest in Latin America and the Caribbean. It is therefore not surprising that most of the population in the country is extremely vulnerable to natural disasters. In fact, the 2010 earthquake caused irreparable economic, psychological, and physical damage, and despite the higher levels of official development assistance and a substantial influx of resources following this event, the promise of “building back better” has largely gone unfulfilled. While the post-earthquake assistance was robust and rapid, the country’s institutions and civil society organizations (CSOs) were ill-equipped to utilize the assistance in a systematic, transparent, equitable and durable fashion. Against this backdrop some 3.6 million Haitians are facing food insecurity, among them more than 1.5 million people are severely food insecure. This was a key finding from an Emergency Food Security Assessment (EFSA) conducted in April 2016 by the World Food Programme (WFP), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO).

In 2016 Haiti is entering into their third year of drought. The main 2015 harvest fell below average with losses of up to 70 percent in some areas. Cereal crops were the most affected with losses up to 90 percent according to the FAO. This is a severe blow to food security in Haiti, where agriculture employs half of the working population and 75 percent of people live on less than US$2 per day. The important crop losses resulted from severe drought plunging the poorest
population into a highly vulnerable situation. The CSNA predicts that more Haitians will see their situation worsen during this El Nino induced drought as the country is forecast to continue experiencing extremely warm and dry conditions through summer 2016. (OCHA, 31 Aug 2015).

Among Haiti’s country-specific challenges is an underdeveloped private agricultural sector. Assistance focused on increasing production of key crops, by effectively incorporating small producers in value chains, to foster import substitution, increase food security, and promote rural development is critical to the development of a more resilient population. The role of agricultural cooperatives is critical in this context, as a vehicle for mobilizing farmers, aggregating their production for sale to larger market players and organizing training activities. A robust agricultural cooperative network is therefore important for the sustainability of rural development efforts in Haiti over the long term.

### 2.1 Agricultural Cooperative Landscape

According to the Foundation for International Development Assistance (FIDA), the cooperatives movement in Haiti has an estimated 1300 cooperatives of which 260 are in the agricultural sector. These figures were confirmed with the CNC which registers cooperatives. The average farmer in Haiti cultivates 0.33 hectares of land. A typical farmer faces many challenges ranging from access to finance, access to technical services, lack of technology, lack of financial education, access to information, transportation, and post-harvest infrastructure. Therefore, as profitable as a particular crop might be, the individual members of the cooperatives will not benefit from it by operating independently. This aggregation of efforts and resources to benefit every member is the main purpose the cooperatives. This reflects perfectly what Haitians call “Unity makes strength” (l’Union fait la Force).

While farmers in cooperatives cultivate a range of crops, the oldest, largest and best known are in the coffee and cocoa value chains. Women and men have been active in coffee and cocoa exports for decades. Newer cooperatives cultivate a more varied group of crops. The networks of cooperatives in Haiti are operational in the South East, The Central Plateau, the North, and the Grande Anse departments. A few cooperatives are also operational in the Northwest, but their activities lack visibility in both the local and international markets. In the coffee and cocoa value chain, cooperatives were created to standardize the products of their members by ensuring post-harvest treatment and quality control. Each cooperative is in turn linked to a larger union which specializes in a particular crop. The unions are the primary way cooperatives connect with the larger market and through unions the cooperatives receive financial and market support.

Haitian agricultural cooperatives have received varying degrees of technical and financial assistance over the years. The interventions are normally provided by international entities providing technical assistance and training to cooperatives, generally achieving modest incremental improvements in their performance. Despite this assistance, cooperatives still face challenges that prevent them from being sustainable and independent. Although they have received assistance from donors such as the IDB, the European Union, World Bank, international NGOs, and others for over 15 years, they remain weak in terms of institutional capacity, orientation, technical skills, and governance. The majority of cooperatives focus on one crop which represents only \( \frac{1}{4} \) of the crops in the farms of their members. Further hampering their relevance, the activities of the cooperatives are limited to the 4 to 5 months corresponding to the season of their particular primary crop. In sum, efforts for sustainable economic and social empowerment have not been successful.
A concerted effort to implement a strategic and sustainable capacity building effort on a nationwide basis is critical not only for the economic development of the country, but also to facilitate better implementation of agricultural value chain projects supported by the MIF and other donors.

2.2 Service Provider Landscape

From emergency to recovery, and the subsequent period of reconstruction, the provision of capacity development services is a new burgeoning industry in Haiti. With the post-earthquake emergency period ending in 2012, many donors operating in Haiti have shifted their focus towards building the capacity of local development actors, while also reducing funding for and reliance on international firms and agencies. As a result, donors are seeking to hire local development firms and service providers to implement contracts in an effort to strengthen Haiti’s overall systems, rationalize the use of resources and, ultimately, to improve the Haitian development landscape as a whole.

To better understand this trend, USAID/Haiti undertook a preliminary local capacity assessment and mapping process. One of the key results emerging from this exercise is the confirmation that Haitian service providers are technically sound in their areas of expertise, with the strongest organizations appearing to be in the health, agriculture, and democracy and governance sectors. In addition, the mapping exercise looked at the availability of institutional and sectoral capacity development services and expertise in Haiti. Overall, the study revealed that the majority of current capacity development efforts are led by international development organizations which in turn, sub-contract or sub-grant to local organizations. In addition, the development community in Haiti has encouraged the growth of local capacity services providers that tend to specialize in specific fields such as financial management, human resources, and training. The foundation exists for a program to support cooperatives that works with and through local capacity building firms and organizations.

For this report, service providers are called “Intermediary Support Organizations” or ISOs, reflecting their role between the lead organization and the ultimate targets of a program. In the case of the analysis below, ISOs may provide services to both agricultural cooperatives or to the cooperatives’ members directly.
3. Research Methodology

This section describes the primary research questions, methodology, information sources, data collection instruments, and data analysis and quality assurance approach undertaken to produce the landscape assessment.

### 3.1 Cooperatives Assessment Process

Below is a description of how the cooperatives were selected and a summary of the assessment process. The assessment team worked from the official list of registered agricultural cooperatives provided by the National Council of Cooperatives. The cooperatives selected represent a range of observed capacities (some seem to be the strongest in their region/value chain - strongest being measured by both economic value generated as well as adoption of the 7 Principles - while others are medium to low capacity but meet other criteria below). This range is important so we can see what the capacity needs are for not just the strongest but those with potential for growth and consolidation.

Given the goal of matching capacity building needs (both technical and organizational) with capacity building services the criteria for selecting the cooperatives included:

1. Previously expressed interest for capacity building support - based on past experience this willingness to engage is a crucial element to success
2. Regional and crop diversity (coffee, cocoa, rice, mango, beans, essential oils, greens with both local and international market/market potential)
3. Importance of type of crop by region
4. Minimum size (at least 100 members)
5. Accessibility (contact person, level of accessibility by road)
6. Minimum experience in the field of at least 5 years
7. Minimum founding date minimum 5 years
8. Part of the list of cooperatives recognized by the CNC.
From the list of 260 cooperatives from the CNC the team selected 29 cooperatives to assess. The final list of cooperatives assessed can be found in Annex 1. Assessments were conducted via field visits by two teams of two evaluators over a 4-week period in June 2016. The team utilized the Counterpart Organizational Capacity Assessment tool and methodology customized with questions to measure adherence to the 7 Principles of Cooperatives\(^1\). See Annex II for the final version of the cooperatives assessment tool.

The cooperatives were scored on the following seven categories:
- Leadership and Strategic Management
- Program Management
- Financial Management & Accounting
- Financial Sustainability
- Human & Material Resources
- External Relations & Communications
- Technical Capacities

### 3.2 ISO Assessment Process

Below is a description of how the ISOs were selected and a summary of the assessment process.

The assessment team conducted a literature review and interviews with existing capacity building program implementers to develop a database of 300 capacity building organizations which included private companies, non-profits, and academic institutions working with the agriculture sector in Haiti.

A review of secondary sources was followed by the administration of an online survey with relevant stakeholders. Data was collected for each entity through the online survey and via

---

\(^1\) The Seven Principles are Voluntary and Open Membership, Democratic Member Control, Member Economic Participation, Autonomy and Independence, Education, Training and Information, Co-operation among Co-operatives, Concern for Community
follow-up communication to verify collected data and obtain more nuanced information. A database was subsequently built. It was used to assign scores according to a set of pre-determined context-specific criteria including:

- Registered in Haiti with a stand-alone bank account
- Main focus of their work
- Type of involvement in the agriculture sector
- Types of capacity building support they offer
- Project management and grant implementation experience
- Experience with gender inclusion
- Experience with monitoring and evaluation of program activities and results

A ranking system, based upon assigned scores was used to filter through the large number of organizations surveyed and shortlist seven service providers to undergo in-depth assessments.

Based on scores from the survey, which ranged from 0 to a maximum of 184, the following organizations were selected for in-depth analysis:

1. Accounting and Financing Corporation (ACFINCO)
2. Agribusiness & Development (Agridev)
3. Fédération des Chambres d’Agriculture Nord (FECHAN)
4. Haitian Foundation for Sustainable Agricultural Development (FONHDAD)
5. Productive Cooperatives Haiti (PCH)
6. Partenariat Pour le Développement Local (PDL)
7. Université Caraïbe

Assessments of the seven ISOs were conducted via office visits by a team including both a capacity building expert and an agronomist. The team utilized the Counterpart ISO Capacity Assessment customized with questions to measure their experience and expertise working in the agriculture sector. See Annex III for the ISO assessment tool.

The ISOs were scored on the following seven categories:

- Leadership and Strategic Management
- Program Management
- Financial Management & Accounting
- Financial Sustainability
- Human & Material Resources
- External Relations & Communications
- Technical Capacities

### 3.3 Scoring

Both Cooperatives and ISOs were assessed on two levels, 1) Understanding: The extent to which the organization understands why the practices, systems, and procedures included under the sub-category are in place and how they are implemented in the organization, and 2) Presence/Completeness: The extent to which those practices, systems, and procedures are complete and being implemented within the organization.

Each category included 3-12 sub-categories. For each sub-category the cooperative was assigned a score of 0 to 4 based on the following scale:
- 0 = No Capacity. No aspect of the ideal is present;
- 1 = Poor. There is minimal understanding of the ideal and substantial revisions and work needed;
- 2 = Fair. There is partial understanding/implementation of the ideal with a significant number of revisions necessary;
- 3 = Good. Understanding/implementation of the ideal with minimal revisions necessary;
- 4 = Very good. Perfect understanding/implementation of the ideal with no revision necessary

Each question was assigned a coefficient of 1. For each subsection, an average score was calculated based on the number of questions under the given subsection. For each section/category, the average score was determined by calculating the average score across subsection. For example, section 1 on “Leadership and Strategic Management” has 6 subsections and each subsection has a specific number of questions, each with a coefficient of 1. Subsection 1.1 has two questions therefore, if cooperative X scores a score of 4 on the first question and a score of 2 on the second question; its score for subsection 1 will be 3 (average of 4 and 2). The same calculation is done for each subsection and an average score is determined for each subsection. The subsection scores are then averaged to determine a section score. For example, if the same cooperative X has a score of 3 for subsection 1.1, a score of 4 for 1.2, a score of 2 for 1.3, a score of 3 for 1.4, a score of 3 for 1.5 and a score of 2 for 1.6, all 6 scores are averaged to determine its overall score for section 1, which would be 2.83 (17 divided by 6).

Each subsection was weighted equally, regardless of the number of questions in that subsection to ensure consistency across subcategories and reduce the chance to inflate or deflate the weight of a subsection. The total average score was determined by averaging the score of all seven sections/categories. Referring to the same example above with cooperative X, assuming cooperative X has a score of 2.83 for section 1, 3 for section 2, 4 for section 3, 4 for section 4, 4 for section 5, 3 for section 6 and a score of 4 for section 7, cooperative X will therefore have an average score of 3.55 overall (24.83 divided by 7). The same calculations are done for each cooperative to determine their overall score.

3.4 Validation, Quality Assurance and Recommendation Development

A complete analysis of all gathered data was undertaken to complete this report and the recommendations herein. The team calculated the mean, median, mode, maximum and minimum for the scores and also for the demographic information collected in order to identify patterns. The team also conducted a sensitivity analysis, removing the categories with the lowest scores in order to assess the impact on the overall score and results. Lastly, the team conducted a text analysis of all qualitative and interview information.

The team validated findings in several ways including conducting secondary interviews with past and current donors and partners of the ISOs, interviews with organizations currently providing support to the cooperatives and an internal peer review of the assessment findings for both ISOs and cooperatives. The team also completed a document review of other capacity assessments to validate the findings and gain a deeper understanding of the various capacity building initiatives and needs of a wider group of cooperatives.

Both teams also conducted internal peer reviews to discuss and validate findings and a key findings meeting was held where both teams, along with a CI representative met to share research findings, compare initial analysis of their respective evaluation results and create initial programming recommendations.
3.5 Research Team

To conduct the assessment of the ISOs Counterpart worked with Ayiti Nexus, a women-owned consulting firm offering technical, logistical and advisory services in communications, business development and program support in key regions of Haiti. For the assessment of cooperatives Counterpart worked with Productive Cooperatives Haiti (pcH). pcH is the Haitian arm of FIDA. FIDA has actively been promoting the productive agricultural cooperative model in Haiti since 1984.
4. Research Findings

This section presents the research and analysis resulting from the data gathered from the participating agricultural cooperatives and ISOs. The key findings and programmatic recommendations listed above are drawn from this body of research and represent the conclusions the team made from the extensive collection of data and analysis undertaken during this assessment.

4.1 Agricultural Cooperatives Findings

The 29 cooperatives included in the assessment represent 13,389 farmers in eight of the ten Haitian departments. Of the total, 11 (38%) focus on coffee, six (20%) focus on cocoa, and 13 (42%) focus on other crops (grains and vegetables).

The oldest cooperative, CACGAVA, was established in 1955, and the newest two (COPACSE and COPACMI) registered in 2012. For our sample, 11 of the 12 oldest cooperatives are involved in the coffee and/or cocoa crops, while vegetables, mango and vetiver cooperatives are more recent cooperatives, with the majority created in the last 15 years.

The 29 agricultural cooperatives were evaluated based on the seven critical capabilities as defined by Counterpart International’s cooperatives development model. The total score possible across the categories was 232. Each sub-section had a different total possible score. The cooperatives were not compared against each other and their scores compare them against a standard for cooperatives and do not denote strength or weakness against the others.

The agricultural cooperatives were evaluated through the lens of the recognized standards and 7 principles of cooperatives which are illustrated below.

The following graph on pages 13-14 represents the ranking of cooperatives by their overall total score and includes their scores by sub-category
7 Principles of Cooperatives

1. Voluntary & Open Membership
   Cooperatives are voluntary organizations open to all persons able to use their services and willing to accept the responsibilities of membership, without gender, social, racial, political or religious discrimination.

2. Democratic Member Control
   Cooperatives are democratic organizations controlled by their members, who actively participate in setting policies and making decisions. The elected representatives are accountable to the membership. In primary cooperatives, members have equal voting rights (one member, one vote) and cooperatives at other levels are organized in a democratic manner.

3. Member’s Economic Participation
   Members contribute equitably to, and democratically control, the capital of their cooperative. At least part of that capital is usually the common property of the cooperative. Members usually receive limited compensation, if any, on capital subscribed as a condition of membership. Members allocate surplus for any or all of the following purposes: developing the cooperative, possibly by setting up reserves, part of which at least would be in indivisible benefitting members in proportion to their transactions with the cooperative; and supporting other activities approved by the membership.

4. Autonomy & Independence
   Cooperatives are autonomous, self-help organizations controlled by their members. If they enter into agreements with other organizations, including governments, or raise capital from external sources, they do so on terms that ensure democratic control by their members and maintain their cooperative autonomy.

5. Education, Training and Information
   Cooperatives provide education and training for their members, elected representatives, managers, and employees so that they can contribute effectively to the development of their cooperatives. They inform the general public, particularly young people and opinion leaders, about the nature and benefits of cooperation.

6. Cooperation Among Cooperatives
   Cooperatives serve their members most effectively and strengthen the cooperative movement by working together through local, national, regional and international structures.

7. Concern for Community
   While focusing on member needs, cooperatives work for the sustainable development of their communities through policies accepted by their members.

Figure 2: Seven Principles of Cooperatives
### Ranking of Cooperatives: Overall Assessment Scores and Sub Category Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st CAB</th>
<th>2nd CAPB</th>
<th>3rd KOPKOMFG</th>
<th>4th CODEL</th>
<th>5th CACGAVA</th>
<th>6th CAIFUPBO</th>
<th>7th CAPUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAB</td>
<td>CAPB</td>
<td>KOPKOMFG</td>
<td>CODEL</td>
<td>CACGAVA</td>
<td>CAIFUPBO</td>
<td>CAPUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans, Millet, Corn</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Mango, Rice, Largue-Morne</td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>Coffee, Dondon</td>
<td>Coffee, Borgne</td>
<td>Coffee, Port-Margot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBMC</td>
<td>BMCA</td>
<td>MRM</td>
<td>RBL</td>
<td>CDG</td>
<td>CFU</td>
<td>CPUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Marc</td>
<td>Borgne</td>
<td>Gross-Morne</td>
<td>Lestrierre</td>
<td>Dondon</td>
<td>Borgne</td>
<td>Port-Margot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Leadership and Strategic Management (LSM)
- **CAB** 3.9 HRO
- **CAPB** 3.7 PMQC
- **KOPKOMFG** 3.7 LSM
- **CODEL** 3.6 FS
- **CACGAVA** 3.5 LSM
- **CAIFUPBO** 3.7 PMQC
- **CAPUP** 3.2 ERC

#### Technical Capacity (TC)
- **CAB** 3.7 HRO
- **CAPB** 3.7 LSM
- **KOPKOMFG** 3.6 FS
- **CODEL** 3.5 LSM
- **CACGAVA** 3.5 LSM
- **CAIFUPBO** 3.0 FS
- **CAPUP** 2.9 PMQC

#### Financial Sustainability (FS)
- **CAB** 3.7 HRO
- **CAPB** 3.7 LSM
- **KOPKOMFG** 3.0 FMA
- **CODEL** 3.2 TC
- **CACGAVA** 2.8 HRO
- **CAIFUPBO** 2.7 PMQC
- **CAPUP** 1.8 ERC

#### Program Management and Quality Control (PMQC)
- **CAB** 3.7 PMQC
- **CAPB** 3.0 FMA
- **KOPKOMFG** 3.0 ERC
- **CODEL** 2.9 PMQC
- **CACGAVA** 2.0 ERC
- **CAIFUPBO** 1.6 PMQC
- **CAPUP** 0.6 ERC

#### Human Resources & Operations (HRO)
- **CAB** 3.9 HRO
- **CAPB** 3.9 HRO
- **KOPKOMFG** 3.3 TC
- **CODEL** 3.4 FMA
- **CACGAVA** 3.4 LSM
- **CAIFUPBO** 2.9 FMA
- **CAPUP** 1.4 ERC

#### External Relations & Communications (ERC)
- **CAB** 3.2 ERC
- **CAPB** 2.4 FS
- **KOPKOMFG** 2.3 PMQC
- **CODEL** 2.7 FS
- **CACGAVA** 2.3 ERC
- **CAIFUPBO** 1.8 HRO
- **CAPUP** 0.9 ERC

---

### Other Cooperatives
- **8th CAJBC** (Cocoa, Grés Rivière du Nord, Arcachon)
- **9th CUPEC** (Stockage, Arcachon)
- **10th SOKAM** (Rice, Petit Rivière de l’Artibonne, Dame Marie, Beaumont)
- **11th CAUD** (Cocoa, COCAC)
- **12th COCACA** (Coffee, COCA)
- **13th SOCAPCOL** (Coffee, Thiote)
- **14th CAPACMI** (Corn, Millet, Transformation et Commercialisation, Mirabalais)
Ranking of Cooperatives: Overall Assessment Scores and Sub Category Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15th COLUC</th>
<th>16th COSAHEC</th>
<th>17th CAMDEC</th>
<th>18th SOKOBELAM</th>
<th>19th COPACSE</th>
<th>20th COPAS</th>
<th>21st COPCOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Beans, Pigeon Peas)</td>
<td>(Coffee)</td>
<td>(Coffee)</td>
<td>(Vegetables)</td>
<td>(Beans, Millet, Corn)</td>
<td>(Vegetables)</td>
<td>(Cocoa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcahaie</td>
<td>Carice</td>
<td>Thiottie</td>
<td>Pétion-Ville</td>
<td>Saut d'Eau</td>
<td>Marigot</td>
<td>Chambellan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.5 TC</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5 LSM</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.8 TC</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.4 FMA</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.9 FS</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.0 HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.9 FMA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.0 LSM</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.3 TC</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.6 FMA</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.8 LSM</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.6 HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.7 TC</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.6 FS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.9 FS</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5 LSM</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.3 LSM</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.7 PMQC</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.0 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.6 FMA</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.0 TC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.4 PMQC</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.4 PMQC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.9 FMA</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.6 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.6 PMQC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.6 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.9 PMQC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3 HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.6 FMA</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.5 PMQC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.3 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.3 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.5 HRO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.8 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.8 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2 HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0 HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.8 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0 HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.9 ERC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.5 HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.8 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.3 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.3 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.5 HRO</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22nd SOCAD</th>
<th>23rd CAFUMO</th>
<th>24th NCOCABA</th>
<th>25th CAB</th>
<th>26th COPVIAPS</th>
<th>27th COTRAS</th>
<th>28th COPVED</th>
<th>29th KOPAKGM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Coffee)</td>
<td>(Coffee)</td>
<td>(Coffee)</td>
<td>(Coffee)</td>
<td>(Coffee)</td>
<td>(Coffee)</td>
<td>(Coffee)</td>
<td>(Coffee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thiottie</td>
<td>Mont-Organise</td>
<td>Baptiste</td>
<td>Port-Salut</td>
<td>Baptiste</td>
<td>Baptiste</td>
<td>St-Jean Sud</td>
<td>Gros Morne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.7 TC</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.1 LSM</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.2 LSM</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.0 LSM</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.2 LSM</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5 LSM</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.7 LSM</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.2 LSM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3 LSM</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.7 TC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.8 TC</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.7 TC</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.0 HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.0 TC</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.9 LSM</strong></td>
<td><strong>- PMQC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.7 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.4 FMA</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.9 PMQC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.3 HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.3 PMQC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.3 HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.3 PMQC</strong></td>
<td><strong>- FMA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.5 PMQC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.3 PMQC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.1 HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0 FMA</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2 HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0 FMA</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.1 FMA</strong></td>
<td><strong>- FS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.5 HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2 FS</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0 HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.7 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6 FS</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6 FS</strong></td>
<td><strong>- HRO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.5 FMA</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.8 HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.1 HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.1 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.4 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.5 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.3 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>- ERC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.9 FS</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.5 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0 ERC</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6 FS</strong></td>
<td><strong>- HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>- HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>- HRO</strong></td>
<td><strong>- TC</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 2: Cooperative Scores**
All of the cooperative scores were normalized around a capacity scale with a maximum score of 4, and a minimum score of zero. Of note, nearly half (48%) of the 29 cooperatives examined scored at or above 2.5 out of a total score of 4 – a good base for building additional capacity. There is also significant room for improvement: only 7% of cooperatives scored at or above a 3 on overall capacity, and over 25% had scores below 2.

Overall, this confirms that despite significant investments by donors in the agricultural cooperative sector over the years in Haiti, there is still significant opportunity to strengthen cooperatives and benefits to be realized from increasing their capacity. Given the sample mainly included cooperatives at least 5 years of age, younger cooperatives not included in the study may have even greater gains to be had from capacity investments. The table below presents the average score for each category across all 29 cooperatives assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scored Categories</th>
<th>Average Score (maximum 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and Strategic Management</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management and Quality Control</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management and Accounting</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Sustainability</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources and Operations</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Relations and Communications</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Capacity</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table below presents major demographic information and the average score for each category across all 29 cooperatives organized by crop type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Coffee</th>
<th>Cocoa</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cooperatives Assessed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age of Cooperative</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>4909</td>
<td>3299</td>
<td>5397</td>
<td>13605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Scores**

| Criteria 1: Leadership & Strategic Management | 3.1 | 3.2 | 2.7 | 2.9 |
| Criteria 2: Project Management, Evaluation, Learning | 2   | 2.1 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| Criteria 3: Financial Management            | 1.8 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 2.2 |
| Criteria 4: Financial Sustainability        | 1.6 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 2.0 |
| Criteria 5: Human & Material Resources      | 1.8 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 1.9 |
| Criteria 6: External Relations              | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| Criteria 7: Technical Knowledge             | 3.1 | 3.2 | 2.6 | 2.8 |

Due to one cooperative scoring 0 on the assessment (cooperative 22 KOPAKGM), the team understands that the analysis for the 13 cooperatives operating in the “other crops categories” might have been skewed. Therefore, the team analyzed the scores with and without the KOPAGM’s scores. The team concluded that the KOPAKGM’s scores do not have a significant impact on the analysis of scores across crop categories.

**Criterion 1: Leadership and Strategic Management = Average Score 3.0**

Criterion 1 measures cooperatives’ leadership and strategic management capacities, which focuses on how the mission and direction of the cooperative are planned, approved, and executed, with clearly defined roles for staff, leaders and the governing body. It also includes their ability to lead members to a new level of performance.

The overall score of 2.9 suggests that there is a basic foundation of leadership and strategic management across the board. Cocoa and coffee cooperatives scored slightly better than cooperatives cultivating other crops. This may be explained by the older age of cooperatives cultivating those crops and the past investment in capacity building of donors including the IDB and USAID with these cooperatives.
Cooperatives generally have statutes, internal regulations, and boards of directors that include oversight committees. Even with younger cooperatives, all but one have oversight committees. However, only in coffee and cocoa cooperatives were members of the oversight committees trained in their role and responsibilities. Cooperatives in the rice, mango and other grains sectors are further behind in this area.

The cooperatives scored well on their ability to establish clear criterion for membership, maintain membership rosters, and keep a transparent and accurate record of membership fees. These are all basic requirements for cooperative strategic management.

The weakest competency across all cooperatives in the Leadership and Strategic Management category is education of members. Providing for the education of members is a critical leadership function and links to a cooperative’s ability to improve outcomes for today’s members and to attract new members over time. Education services primarily focus on developing skills and practices around production, marketing, grading, land management, and more. Depending upon the demand of members, they focus on non-agricultural education, such as basic literacy and numeracy skills, which impact farm families’ ability to adapt new skills, use technology platforms, and undertake basic financial management of their enterprises. Less than half (40%) of the cooperatives assessed have an education committee. Among the 17 with an education committee, evidence of outreach and value to members is lacking. There is some variation by cohort of cooperatives. None of the vegetables cooperatives assessed have an education committee, while cooperatives in the coffee, cocoa, and other sectors are mixed. This is an area for future improvement.

Data is weak on changes in cooperative membership and changes in members’ revenues over time, two metrics which reflect whether the cooperatives are serving their members well. These metrics are recommended for future tracking of cooperatives’ success and overall sector performance.

In general, there is significant room for investment in this area which is expected to bring in more members and strengthen the services for existing members. Second, while elements of complete governance structures may be in place (such as for oversight committees), there remains significant room to strengthen how they are operationalized for the good of the members. Establishment of education committees provides an immediate opportunity to strengthen cooperative leadership.

**Criterion 2: Program Management, Quality Control and Measurement, Evaluation and Learning = Average Score 1.9**

Criterion 2 is one of the most important capacity areas for cooperatives. It identifies the ability of the cooperatives to consistently deliver value to their members and to continually self-evaluate and adjust their services. At 1.9, Criterion 2 is the second lowest-scoring category in the analysis, and is roughly the same for all three cohorts of cooperatives:
Coffee: 2.0  
Cocoa: 2.1  
Other: 1.9

Broad findings include that Cooperatives do not conduct regular membership studies to identify which activities are desired and appropriate for their members (with particular gaps in coffee cooperatives). Cooperatives also do not set or track key performance indicators – which impacts quality control and measurement, evaluation and learning. In addition, cooperatives lack annual work-plans and do not have participatory program planning and management skills through which they involve members in the design, execution, and evaluation of activities. The majority of cooperatives rely heavily on unions for market analysis, which handicaps their ability to plan and advise members as markets continually change.

The majority of cooperatives rely on unions for financial planning and budgeting, and do not have access to key financial data and metrics to self-evaluate or provide regular financial information to their members. With exceptions in the rice and small grains sector, cooperatives have not successfully linked members to credit and loans, in part because of their own weak financial analytical skills.

Cooperatives have not created gateways for their members to access essential non-economic skills, such as literacy skills. This is considered a key barrier in Haiti to successful household engagement in markets and is part of the cooperative promise of social support.

All of the elements of Criterion 2 are priority areas for attention in future cooperative capacity building: they are at the center of the cooperatives’ ability to manage and grow a suite of services to their members that make good on their economic and social promise.

**Criterion 3: Financial Management and Accounting = Average Score 2.2**

Criterion 3 focuses on financial management and accounting skills, which are directly linked to the ability of cooperatives to make strategic decisions on where to invest their resources and how to support their members to be most productive.

Results across cohorts deviated more than in other areas:

Coffee cooperatives scored 1.75 on average, well below acceptable. This reflect that coffee cooperatives have ceded all financial data to their agricultural unions, limiting their ability to provide basic tools such as budgeting and financial reports to their members.

Cocoa cooperatives scored 2.8 on average, an acceptable score. The tools and approaches they use may provide a starting point for cooperatives in other crops.

Other cooperatives scored 2.3 over average, showing general functionality but room for improvement.

In general cooperatives lack accounting procedures, financial management systems and procedures needed to analyze financial transactions including contracting or subcontracting, and to ensure financial compliance and independent analysis. Basic tools including budgets and
financial reports are not regularly available and used in a systematic way. Many cooperatives could not provide their financial reports, and their unions were unwilling to provide these reports when requested. In short, the cooperatives are overly reliant on their specific agricultural unions for financial management and accounting services, especially in the coffee sector.

There are positive deviants, including both cocoa and small grains cooperatives, with better tools, procedures and templates and more control over their financial management systems. Most telling, the small grains cooperatives are not members of a union.

Investments in capacity in this area will disrupt the existing power relationships where unions are particularly strong. However, financial analysis and management are essential skills for any high-functioning agricultural cooperative.

**Criterion 4: Financial Sustainability = Average Score 2.0**

Criterion 4 focuses on whether cooperatives are able, through fees and other types of income, to cover their costs both in the short- and long-term. Experience in other countries is clear: there are many successful paths for agricultural cooperatives to achieve full financial sustainability with the right guiding and planning.

In general, the overall score of 2.0 on financial sustainability shows that this is an area where improved capacity is needed. This is especially true for coffee, as shown here:

Coffee: 1.6  
Cocoa: 2.7  
Other: 2.3

Across all 29 cooperatives, only five scored above a 3 (one in coffee; one in cocoa, and three in “other”). We recommend conducting positive deviant analysis on these five to assess options for sustainability.

One expected path to financial sustainability may be through crop diversification to allow multiple crop cycles of services to members. The benefits of diversification are discussed in more length in the Technical Capacity section below. Another expected path to financial sustainability is the delivery of various services by the cooperatives – including engagement in specific value-added services to members and buyers (inputs, technology, credit, storage, grading, processing, marketing, etc.) on a fee-for-service or percentage basis. This works as long as the cooperative is able to deliver a timely, high-quality service priced for the market.

To date, the most common value-added service is marketing of members products, offered by 55% of cooperatives. Only 24% had moved into other value-adding services such as input loans or sales, warrantage (inventory credit system), or crop transformation (such as milling grains).

There are specific cases of value-added services already appearing in cooperatives:

- In Dondon, **CACGAVA** now produces products from the transformation of coffee beans for sale. In the past, the cooperative only sold the coffee beans in their raw form.
• In Petion-Ville, SOKOBELAM launched a women-centered initiative to condition (clean and package) gardening products to be marketed, moving up in the value chain.
• In Carice, COSAHEC, a coffee-based cooperative, offers milling services (rice, maize, cassava) to their members and also to some other cooperatives. Last year, although they were unable to commercialize coffee, they had revenues of approximately 150,000 Gourdes.

Several cooperatives also expressed interest in regeneration and reforestation, which could be a source of income with the right partnerships and business model.

The cocoa cooperatives have significant opportunity for financial sustainability based solely on earning a small percentage of value to the total cost of production given their scale of marketed production. Total sales of cocoa through the cooperative sector are notable; 2015 sales of cocoa included $112K USD by CAFUPBO, $84.8k USD by CAPUP, $59.2K USD by CAJBC. Other crops also have such power, such as COPVED’s $160K USD in vetiver sales in 2015.

**Criterion 5: Human and Material Resources = Average Score 1.9**

Strong performance in this area implies that recruiting practices, selection and retention of talents underlie the cooperatives culture and practice. Weak performance points to organizational processes which carry substantial costs for cooperatives as employee turnover may be high and material resources (such as volunteers) either are lacking or misused.

Coffee: 1.8
Cocoa: 2.5
Other: 2.1

Overall, human and material resources received the second-lowest score of all categories. In particular, coffee and vegetables cooperatives lack the administrative procedures for employment that cocoa and small grains cooperatives have. The low scores in this category also reflect a lack of volunteer management and a lack of security and safety plans. Removing the security and safety sub-criterion only slightly improves the scores.

With the exception of rice, small grains and some coffee cooperatives, 52% of cooperatives do not make use of volunteer labor, in-kind contributions by members, students, and young people in the community. It is essential for cooperatives to rely on volunteers and reduce their reliance on paid services. This also increases their financial sustainability and helps with member (and next generation) recruitment.

Additional investments in human and material resources might include supporting cooperatives to develop volunteer engagement strategies especially ways to engage women and youth in productive enterprises.

**Criterion 6: External Relations and Communications = Average Score 1.3**

External relations and communications are some of the most critical skills for agricultural cooperatives to deliver the needed services to members. These skills include both ability to reach
out to engage potential partners in private sector and in government, and the ability to effectively engage (both to educate, to learn from, and to partner with) their members.

Overall, cooperatives scored lowest in this critical area, with an average score of 1.3. There was no difference between and sectors: all three scored 1.3. In particular, their ability to use media and technology to serve members and track/reach buyers scored very low (0.5 and 0.9, respectively).

This gap reflects overall weak infrastructure and information asymmetries in Haiti, and how that plays out in the cooperative sector. Solutions must take these realities into account. For example, online information platforms may not be as successful as face-to-face, low- or appropriate technology solution (such as SMS or radio). In addition, soft engagement is weak within cooperative tradition in Haiti, especially in areas of client- and member-based engagement.

**Criterion 7: Technical Capacity = Average Score 2.8**

Technical capacity is a broad set of skills, the core of which is the ability to maximize the quantity and quality of agricultural production while utilizing best practices in short- and long-term resource management.

Cooperatives were evaluated based on their managers’ technical skills and knowledge, with focus on knowledge of how to improve productivity and quality, address environmental and climate issues, and access agricultural inputs and markets. The overall score was 2.8, and by cohort, scores were:

- Coffee: 3.1
- Cocoa: 3.2
- Other: 2.6

In general, cooperatives appear to be providing technical assistance to their members on production techniques. While 83% self-reported positively on this metric, they also expressed their need to improve technical capacity of their staff and members in the areas of improved yields, processing, drought and disaster recovery, coffee reforestation, and crop diversification. This suggests that information provided to cooperative members is still relatively basic relative to the full spectrum of technical needs.

Cooperatives identified a larger set of member technical needs: access to agricultural inputs including fertilizers, quality seeds, crop protection products, transportation, and agricultural tools. Managers reported that members are willing to pay for these services but that the cooperatives had yet to find ways to deliver a solution to their members. This suggests a lack of skills and partnerships to create or broker real-time solutions for their members.

Third, the cooperatives reported an inability to bring agricultural loans to their members. One limiting factor may be the cooperatives’ knowledge about basic banking mechanics: half of the cooperatives reported being unable to complete a loan application.
Fourth, cooperatives identified technical gaps in their ability to build bridges for members to literacy and health services, reflecting the holistic set of issues confronting cooperatives and their members where agricultural activities and the rest of life intersect. It also reflects that cooperatives, by philosophy, serve as a nexus of the community on larger issues of community well-being. We would frame this as a technical skills issue around partnerships and how cooperatives can build the technical skills needed to be able to identify and link new services to members in ways that benefit both the members and the cooperative.

Other Issues (not scored)

Gender and Youth Inclusion

One of the key research questions for the assessment was the status of women and youth in cooperatives. The assessment team set out to understand the types of services offered to women and youth and their standing in the cooperatives as members and leaders.

While 41% of cooperative members are women, there are fewer women represented in leadership positions than reflect cooperative membership (13% of cooperative managers, and 17% of cooperative board members). The majority of cooperatives had not considered how to target services to women producers. In general, gender inclusion will require increased representation of women in management and leadership positions and the development of services to women.

A comparative analysis between the age of management and age of leadership reveals that managers are much younger, with higher education levels compared to leadership. Indeed, the youngest manager is 23 years old while the youngest chairman is 36 years old. The average age of the managers is 40 (data is available on 23 managers) compared to 53 for the chairmen (data is available on all 29). The median age of the board chair is 53 and 20% are over age 60. The oldest manager is 69 compared to 81 for the oldest chairman. Additionally, of the 23 managers for whom data is available, 30% have attended college (7 out of 23) compared to 17% for the chairmen (5 out of 29). Only 13% of managers (3 out of 23) have only primary school education compared to 34% of chairmen (10 of 29) with only primary school education. Only two cooperatives have programs to engage young people from cooperative member’ family. As with women, it is also essential to capitalize on youth inclusion. Youth have the potential to bring new energy within the cooperatives but also to improve processes, procedures, and education level within the cooperative.
Cooperatives Recommendations

From this analysis, we can make several recommendations on the types of support needed by Haiti’s agricultural cooperative sector and specific cohorts within it. These findings are divided into two types of support needed: (1) those that improve economic returns to cooperatives and their members, and (2) those that improve the social benefits to participants (current and future) in the cooperative sector.

To improve economic returns, five types of capacity building can deliver significant returns:

**Skills to increase cooperatives’ institutional Independence in financial management, program planning, and marketing.**

The analysis showed that the cooperatives rely heavily on their relationships with the agricultural unions. The unions provide financial support, often managing the cooperatives financial books, lead most programmatic planning, and manage critical market relationships. This has resulted in under-developed skills on the part of cooperatives in these three areas, which keeps them from having the full range of skills to deliver value to their members – skills that are central to assessing threats and opportunities, adapting to changes in input and output markets and member needs, and adjusting to shocks. This lack of independence also keeps the cooperatives tied closely to a single union, whose interests may not be aligned with that of their cooperative members. Any program of support to cooperatives will impact the relationships with unions and should be sensitive to the power imbalances which may be upset by an intervention with cooperatives. We recommend that training and technical support be delivered to increase cooperative skills in these areas. (This ties to weaknesses discussed above in Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6.)

**Improved understanding of markets.**

New skills are needed by cooperatives for collecting, using, and sharing strategic market information to their members, utilizing appropriate technology to the extent possible to increase timeliness and transparency for all potential producers. We recommend that training and technical support be delivered to increase cooperative skills in this area. (This ties to weaknesses discussed above in Criteria 2, 4, and 7.)

**Improved links to agricultural input and service markets.**

Building cooperatives’ ability to link to agricultural input and service providers continues to be a major need for cooperatives – from seeds to credit to transportation services. Some solutions may be common across value chains, but most will need to be customized to the needs of each specific value chain. We recommend that training and technical support be delivered to increase cooperatives ability to establish input and service partnerships that are beneficial to their members. (This ties to weaknesses discussed above in Criteria 2, 4, and 7.)
Crop Diversification: A major finding was the need for cooperatives to support their members in expanding from mono-cropping (in coffee, for example), into a more diversified enterprise. This can not only improve incomes, but also reduces market, environmental and climate risks for farmers, and therefore for cooperatives. A simple example would be inter-cropping on coffee plantations which enhances coffee yields, increases incomes, and provides a hedge against catastrophic coffee losses. Three types of skills are needed for improved diversification: appropriate agronomic knowledge and skills, credit and other needed inputs, and relationships that link cooperatives to willing buyers for their new crops. (This ties to weaknesses discussed above in Criteria 4 and 7.)

Improved Resiliency and Climate-Smart Agricultural and Land Management Practices: Agricultural cooperatives in Haiti, as in many other island countries, are at risk of repeated shocks, whether droughts, storms, or economic shocks. Without advance resiliency planning, even strong agricultural cooperatives can be felled by unexpected events, as can their individual members. Capacity is needed in developing a long-term resiliency plan and preparedness for the cooperatives, and these skills need to flow down to the farm level along with the skill-building needed to put new practices into place. (This ties to weaknesses discussed above in Criteria 4 and 7.)

Increased capacity in just these five areas can significantly increase economic outcomes for cooperatives and their members alike. Additional benefits can accrue to both input providers and those marketing and distributing these crops.

To improve social benefits, two types of capacity building can deliver significant returns:

**Women, youth, and priority population engagement.**

For the IDB, a social goal is to ensure that women, youth, and other priority populations are not excluded from the cooperative sector. Women increasingly make up a significant proportion of agricultural cooperative members in Haiti, however they may face special challenges that call for targeted strategies to ensure they can take advantage of all services offered. So far, data are unavailable on youth and other special population participation in cooperatives. We recommend that cooperatives develop skills in attracting, designing for, and monitoring membership and service uptake for priority populations. Building capacity in this area will ramp up cooperatives ability to serve these populations well, which in turn will attract higher numbers into the cooperative movement. (This ties to weaknesses discussed above in Criteria 1 and 2.)

**Developing a Robust Member Education Program**

For all cooperatives, the principle of education for members is central to achieving their mission. However, education for members, as discussed above, is missing for most agricultural cooperatives in Haiti: current training comes from external sources such as USAID, while no one within the cooperatives is tasked with ensuring education initiatives reach all members or are successful in solving the problems facing members. Increasing the cooperatives’ capability to design and deliver a strong education program for members has the potential to meet the core mission of cooperatives, plus serves as the vehicle for delivering on all of the economic
improvements discussed above. We recommend this be accomplished through development of robust education sub-committees within the cooperatives, trained to design and deliver a quality educational program to their members. (This ties to weaknesses discussed above in Criteria 1, 2, and 7.)

**Recommendations for Specific Cohorts of Cooperatives**

**Coffee cooperatives** are by far the most dependent on their unions for support, and show significant need to build their independent capacity across most criteria in some form or another. Reasonably high scores in leadership and strategic management mask the reality that their governance structures may be stronger than their governance function: the cooperatives may be highly structured, but not high-functioning as market actors or in delivering member services. Their high technical knowledge skill focuses on coffee itself, but misses complementary services such as technical knowledge in crop diversification or climate-smart land management techniques. A broad plan to build capacity in this sector can have significant social and economic impact, and can “refresh” coffee’s cooperative hierarchy with proper care.

**Cocoa cooperatives** on average are the oldest, largest, and highest-functioning of all of the cooperative groups, and are likely to provide some of the “positive deviants” from which we can draw success stories for others. However, they too show weaknesses in two important areas: ability to manage projects, monitor, evaluate and learn, and external relations and communications – important skills to deliver the best solutions to their members. Targeted capacity building is recommended for this cohort.

The **“other” cooperatives**, which include fruits, vegetables, rice, and other grains, are by far the newest cohort of cooperatives. They show an appetite to learn quickly and fill gaps in newer product markets, but they still have significant skills to build before they can properly serve their members. In fact, they have the lowest score on Criterion 2, suggesting that their ability to plan, execute, and monitor services to members is unacceptably weak. This cohort is an important target for capacity building, with an emphasis on marketing, input selection, and financial management skills, given the complexity and lack of standardization that cooperatives are likely to face in this sector.

### 4.2 Intermediary Service Organizations (ISO) Findings

Agricultural cooperatives in Haiti operate within an agricultural system with many different actors - administrative, regulatory, unions, donors, technical assistance providers, other cooperatives, finance providers, agro dealers, individual farmers to name a few.

One group of actors that provides services and support to cooperatives are intermediary service organizations (ISOs), dedicated to making other organizations stronger through training, technical assistance, market assistance, and more. In Haiti, the team identified over 300 ISOs providing some level of organizational and technical support to different actors in the agriculture sector. From that group, the team identified a smaller group of 33 ISOs providing support specifically to cooperatives. The 7 top scoring ISOs from that group were selected for in-depth assessment, with
the expectation that among these 7 are those best suited to serve as the long-term coordinators and service providers for expanded capacity building of the agricultural cooperative sector in Haiti.

This section of the report describes the assessment findings, summarizes the characteristics of each of the 7 ISOs, their scores against the criteria developed for the assessment, describes their technical capacities and offers recommendations for future program design based on the findings.

ISO Summaries

Standardized information was collected from each of the seven ISO assessed. These summaries present information on the type of organization (for-profit, non-profit, association, academic), when they were founded, their size and overall budget, the number of cooperatives and other clients they work with, their key donors and key competencies.

1. Accounting and Financing Corporation (ACFINCO)

ACFINCO is a for-profit financial auditing and management firm, which provides financial and management audits, technical support in management, the development of business plans, increase in supply chain, and assists in soliciting micro-financing for farmers. Incorporated in 2000, ACFINCO has worked with donor agencies such as the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), USAID, Fonds d’assistance Economique et Sociale (FAES), and FOSREF. ACFINCO is not funded by grants but has worked as a subcontractor on grant funded projects and has experience answering RFPs for consultancies. It is currently working with 17 farmers, cooperatives and farmer associations that are part of the USAID Feed the Future (FTF) program. It has two full time employees: a Director and Administrative Assistant and is led by a team of associates that make up the Advisory Board and who are compensated on a commission basis.

ACFINCO provides program beneficiaries technical assistance in management, supply chain improvement and business planning. The organization also assists agricultural cooperatives in technical agriculture training, such as storage management to reduce production loss/waste and therefore increase profits. It also provides milling machines for farmers to increase product diversity. ACFINCO has managed programs focused on fiscal education and implemented the project Education Pour Tous (EPT) for FAES. It also has experience in lending money to farmers for agricultural production. Post-harvest, the farmers are then expected to bring their production to ACFINCO, whom acts a speculator, purchasing and reselling at the best market price, hence increasing the market value of the crops. Following the requirements of USAID and FTF, ACFINCO incorporates modules on gender and climate change mitigation in its program management training for cooperatives.

2. Agribusiness & Development (AGRIDEV)

Founded in 2009, AGRIDEV is a privately held company with 7 employees, one of which is a consultant, along with a Board of Directors comprised of 3 members. AGRIDEV’s annual budget is between 500-600K USD annually and they have managed donor funded projects in excess of $1M USD. This ISO works along several agricultural value chains with donors and cooperatives. AGRIDEV is currently a subcontractor for the USAID Feed the Future program implemented by
international development company, DAI. It has the ability to provide capacity reinforcement training to cooperatives, to strengthen their governance practices and help them better integrate into relevant value chains, conditional upon the types of products they market. For instance, in the cocoa value chain where quality can be improved, AGRIDEV facilitates a connection between producers and exporters to effectively eliminate the middlemen -- speculators -- who inflate cooperatives’ production and operation costs. It provides cooperatives with training to improve quality of crops, and supports them with access to external markets to sell products.

AGRIDEV provides innovative solutions to chronic problems in the agriculture sector. It has been involved in donor and private-funded projects that have achieved results obtained in terms of increased levels of production and sales of high value crops, primarily three crops (coffee, cacao, and mango), as well as a number of high value field crops (yam, pumpkin and pepper) with significant domestic and export market potential. It uses a business approach to poverty reduction, with rural people as active participants engaging in productive activities, rather than passive recipients of assistance. Its staff have helped farmer groups access loans for marketing by encouraging lending by local financial institutions, particularly FONKOZE. Its staff has also been very active and successful in the rehabilitation of irrigation systems on the Plain de Gonaives, Trois Rivières and elsewhere.

3. Fédération des Chambres d’Agriculture Nord (FECHAN)

FECHAN, a federation, was founded by the Ministry of Agriculture (MARNDR) in 1997, to address distribution challenges regarding agricultural material amongst the various agricultural chambers, associations and cooperatives. They were legally registered in 2001 and are in the process of renewing their registration with the Ministry of Social Affairs and Labor (MAST) as an association, which expired in May 2016. FECHAN’s management structure fits the needs of the Federation. They have minimal full-time employees; the Coordinator, Assistant Coordinator, and Secretary are employed as volunteers. Their membership body is their clientele, and the organization’s mission is to serve the needs of its members. In some cases, a member chamber may have over 100 associations registered, hence the FECHAN field of work spans over thousands of people across 19 communes of the northern region of Haiti.

Currently, FECHAN works with 19 agricultural chambers, each having a voting power of 3 persons, which make up the grand assembly of 57 people with a minimum quota of 3 women. There are at least 19 women who are members of the grand assembly. The advisory council/board is comprised of 19 representatives (one from each chamber) who supervise administrative work. FECHAN assists the chambers with capacity building, management, farming, value chain, gaining access to water, commercialization of goods, and applying new and/or sustainable funding techniques. FECHAN’s budget is not fixed; it is project based. The federation’s main source of funding comes from the fees charged to the agricultural associations and from the French Embassy, who also solicits partnerships and other sources of funding for the Federation. FECHAN does not engage in seeking or soliciting funding sources on its own.

4. Haitian Foundation for Sustainable Agricultural Development (FONHDAD)
Founded in 2014 and registered as a Haitian foundation, FONHDAD works with 124 producer associations involving 38,000 producers, of which 7 are agricultural fertilizer shops, 4 of them own tractors and are involved in marketing cooperative agricultural products. It has 10 permanent employees and over 30 consultants. Its yearly operational budget has increased from year to year and is currently worth approximately USD 400,000. In addition, they manage project funds, including a current USAID project. It has experience managing donor programs that involve agricultural cooperatives mostly focused on research and development. Most of their project funding comes from USAID. They also work in partnership with the University of Florida, which manages the Center of Research for Rural Development (CRDR) in cooperation with many partners. The CRDR is funded by USAID and mainly targets cooperatives.

FONHDAD facilitates research and provides training, serving as an agricultural extension educator for cooperatives. If the donor project they are implementing requires financial training or access to micro finance for cooperatives, they typically hire a consultant to manage the activity. It conducts capacity assessments to evaluate whether the cooperatives are making use of the information and training that they have received from the center in their communities. FONHDAD’s donors require them to consider the impact of climate change on all projects that they implement and to comply with environmental regulations. FONHDAD is 30-40% women-led and its leadership ensures that cooperatives include women. Its aim is to contribute to the modernization of Haitian agriculture by introducing new techniques, fertilizers and improved equipment to enable the agricultural sector to achieve better yields and better ways to commercialize its products. It has signed a contract with the Ministry of Agriculture (MARNDR) to manage the Rural Center for Sustainable Development (CRDD).

5. Productive Cooperatives Haiti (PCH)

Founded in 1984, PCH is a non-governmental organization that works solely with agricultural cooperatives, reinforcing their capacities in a range of areas. A staff of 30 Haitian agronomists, technicians and educators provide resources to rural communities who are motivated to advance themselves economically by forming productive agricultural cooperatives. FIDA/PCH currently partners with 25 cooperatives, representing over 7,000 members throughout Haiti. PCH is currently operating several projects with a budget of $500K USD including food security, improved livestock and poultry raising, community engagement and cooperative development, urban gardening. It leverages donor support from funding agencies including Hope International Development Agency and World Accord.

PCH provides technical and agricultural support in all areas, as per cooperatives’ requests. It also extends credit for stock production and controls, helping agricultural cooperatives remain in business. Furthermore, PCH has experience with the implementation of programs on education and literacy for cooperatives, as well as on financial literacy; it has experience maintaining long-term relationships with cooperatives and prepares them to withstand food insecurity and shocks on their own. Conflict resolution is an integral part of its programming, and it has experience managing projects requiring the use of this skills set. Finally, PCH encourages gender parity, specifically in Grand-Anse, where the cooperatives are composed of 76% women on average.

6. Partenariat Pour le Développement Local (PDL)
PDL was registered as a non-governmental organization in Haiti in October 2009, with a purpose to leverage support from government donors to help agricultural cooperatives increase income and productivity. PDL has 15 permanent employees (decreased from 21 at the beginning) and 7 consultants. Its overall budget varies between USD $500,000 and USD $900,000; this year. Since 2009, Groundswell International has partnered with PDL and has articulated a 10-year vision of a prosperous and sustainable Haitian countryside as the foundation for national development. Together, Groundswell and PDL currently support numerous peasant organizations, representing over 150,000 people living in rural areas.

PDL provides technical assistance to cooperatives on how to increase their production using natural fertilizer and soil protection methods. It also has experience managing a project for the development of a seed bank. While it does not provide formal education training, it puts a strong emphasis on civic engagement and incorporates this strategy in all of their projects. PDL teaches cooperatives (especially, agricultural ones) how to manage their finances on their own, mobilizes local resources and works with locals for the implementation of projects. It facilitates cooperatives’ access to micro-credit and finance. It is PDL’s philosophy to work with cooperatives in a full capacity in order to maximize value chains potential from the planting of the seedling until the sale of the produce. Concerned about the environment, the organization does not use any chemicals for the implementation of its projects and agro-ecological issues are taken into consideration in each project managed /implemented with cooperatives. PDL promotes women’s leadership and its representatives claim to have evidence that women are more productive than men within cooperatives. The organization aims to increase farmers’ incomes in order to benefit entire communities and be successful in this role.

7. Université Caraïbe (UC)

The Université Caraïbe is private university located in Port-au-Prince, Haiti. It was founded in 1988 and is organized in six faculties. There are 400-500 students enrolled in the agricultural department, with 200 enrolled year-round. It provides agricultural training, servicing the public sector as well as agricultural cooperatives. UC has relationship with several international institutions. The university works with cooperatives when it receives donor funding (in the past, they have received USAID funds) for a project but donor funding is inconsistent.

Its members have experience mapping cooperatives and assisting them with demand driven production through intensification of crops. They have evaluated agricultural produce needs of local hotels and assisted cooperatives in organizing themselves in order to meet that demand. In a project called “Learn While Doing,” UC offered adult literacy training to cooperative members. UC has also provided training to members of cooperatives on how to put together a production budget, teaching them to make projections of capital needs for upcoming production seasons. Finally, UC has provided capacity building services through its education program, has offered technical support to cooperatives and conducted market research on the hotel industry.
### Ranking of ISOs: Overall Assessment Score & Sub Category Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>PDL</th>
<th>FONDHAD</th>
<th>PCH</th>
<th>AGRIDEV</th>
<th>UNIV CARIBES</th>
<th>FECHAN</th>
<th>AFINCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Leadership &amp; Management</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Mgmt &amp; Donor Compliance</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting &amp; Financial Management</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human &amp; Material Resources</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Relations &amp; Communication</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3: ISO Overall Scores*
ISO Evaluation

The seven ISOs were evaluated based on the seven critical capabilities as defined by Counterpart International’s ISO development model:

1. Leadership & Strategic Management
2. Program Management, Quality Control and Measurement, Evaluation and Learning
3. Financial Management & Accounting
4. Financial Sustainability
5. Human & Material Resources
6. External Relationships & Partnerships
7. Technical Skills and Expertise

The total score possible across the categories was 232. Each sub-section had a different total possible score. While the ISOs were compared against each other for purposes of determining suitability for partnership with the IDB their scores are relative scores comparing them against a standard for ISOs and don’t denote strength or weakness against the others.

In our experience some of these capacities are trainable while others are must be present in an ISO for them to successfully manage funds and provide high quality assistance.

Criterion 1: Leadership & Strategic Management = 48 total points possible

The measure of an ISO’s leadership and strategic management capacities focus on how the mission, direction, and programming of the organization are planned, approved, and executed, with clearly defined roles for staff, leaders and the governing body.

FECHAN scored highest in the area of organizational leadership because they have internal systems and written operational procedures. They provide organizational leadership support to the chambers that they work with.
Leadership and Strategic Management is considered a trainable area for an ISO. Support to leadership could be provided to learn techniques and approaches to strategic planning, and distributed leadership.

**Criterion 2: Program Management, Quality Control and Measurement, Evaluation and Learning = 44 total points possible**

Measures of program management and quality focus on how well programs are managed. Quality control is singularly focused on tracking what the organization does, and how they measure client satisfaction after the project, program or service is provided.

![Program Management & Donor Compliance (44 max pts)](image)

The high relative scores of FECHAN, PCH, PDL and AGRIDEV in program management and donor compliance are an indicator of their cross functional abilities in terms of governance practices, transparency and their ability to manage large scale and complex projects. Higher scores indicate that they can provide effective over sights and analyses on how projects are implemented. This is especially important in Haiti with weak institutions and relatively weak compliance practices. Effective oversight suggests that financial resources are employed in compliance with donor requirements; or projects’ expenditures are in compliance with terms of donor agreements. ISOs with higher scores conduct regular desk audits and occasional field audits while lessening financial risks for both donors and project implementers. This results in quality financial and accounting reporting, with the likelihood of a greater impact for each dollar invested.

While these skills can be trained, this is an area where a high current score is considered essential for any ISO considered as the lead organization for agricultural cooperative capacity building in Haiti.

**Criterion 3: Financial Management & Accounting = 44 total points possible**

Measures of financial management and accounting focus on how the organization plans and manages its resources, documents and analyzes its resource usage, identifies potential for additional resources, and tracks the flow of finances in conformity with local laws and regulations as well as donor requirements.
PDL, AGRIDEV, FONDHAD and PCH all scored high in accounting and financial management due to their established accounting systems and procedures that are adhered to. Evaluators were able to verify their financial systems, viewing accounting manuals and financial tools that each of the institutions have. The ISOs do not currently provide financial services to cooperatives due to the low capacity of cooperatives to absorb those services. Nonetheless, the ISOs do have the skills to build cooperative capacity in this area.

While AFINCO showed high scores in areas of accounting and financial management they had lower scores on human resources management. Through their work with cooperatives, they have experience providing financial leadership and management training, however, they do not offer the human resource management training that cooperatives require, such as civil registration and national identification cards.

While considered a trainable area for an ISO, given the scale of resources that would be managed as a lead organization, it is considered a threshold area for selecting an ISO for further investment.

**Criterion 4: Financial Sustainability = 28 total possible score**

Overall this functional area measures how organizations (a) actively prepare for their financial future through strategic long-term financial planning; (b) have access to tools, methodologies, and technical support to raise sound financial resources; (c) diversify funding from a single donor to other sources, new donors and earned income; (d) develop a solid funding base to leverage grant money for highest returns.
Nearly all of the shortlisted ISOs depend on donor funding at some level. They are vulnerable to industry shocks or risks arising from factors such as political instability, economic crises, or drastic changes within their own organization. Financial sustainability plans were either incomplete or missing for the seven ISOs evaluated.

While FECHAN and University Caraibes have the most stable funding sources, they struggle to implement the same services as the other entities because their funding is low. PCH’s funding is relatively stable – from its Canadian branch, FIDA. However, it retains its low score because of its dependency on FIDA.

This is considered a trainable area for ISOs. Each organization is different when it comes to the types of sustainability approach they could pursue that allows them to stay true to their mission while at the same time providing products and services to clients. A capacity building program for the ISOs could offer both individual and cohort-wide support to the ISOs to improve their financial sustainability.

**Criterion 5: Human & Material Resources = 48 possible score**

This section measures the ability of an organization to hire appropriate staff with the right competencies through formalized human resources policies and procedures, staff development and training plans, and the use of volunteers and consultants to supplement staff skills and outreach. It also measures whether an organization also has the physical resources base to adequately provide products and services (i.e. fulfilling its mission) and these resources are maintained to ensure greatest cost efficiency as possible.

Strong performance in this area implies that recruiting practices, selection and retention of talents underlie the ISO’s organizational culture or corporate practices. Weak performance points to organizational processes which carry substantial costs for ISOs as employee turnover may be high and material resources either are lacking or misused.
FONDHAD and PDL’s relatively high scores in the area of human and material resources implies that they have not only the human resources to pursue their goals and objectives, but also a managerial discipline in the use of their material resources. Also, a high score in this area suggests that they are endowed with the necessary infrastructure to implement their activities.

This is considered a trainable area for ISOs and while important for the successful implementation of a program, scores can be improved through individual and cohort support to the ISOs.

**Criterion 6: External Relationships & Partnerships = 20 possible score**

External relations and partnerships refer to how an organization manages its relationships with external audiences, including media, the community, government agencies, donors, partners, and other target groups to ensure one voice and one message is consistently conveyed to its constituency. This level of clarity and focus goes a long way to supporting organizations’ marketing efforts and outreach (both for donors, members and overall financial sustainability) as well as its goals for program and service delivery.
In addition to measuring their relationships with donors, government and the media the team assessed the depth of relationship to the agricultural cooperative clients or organizations they serve. This is an important measure as it points to the ISO’s ability to establish a level of client service that will be necessary given the social, cultural, and political landscape in Haiti – and may prove pivotal in working closely with agricultural cooperatives in the context of long-standing power and economic dynamics that have defined sectoral performance to date. Based on our analysis, two of the ISOs have the deepest relationship with cooperatives: PCH and PDL. They also have the strongest grasp of cooperative principles.

In the area of external relations, FONHDAD has developed relationships with universities and USAID and together this has led FONHDAD to score well on external relations and partnerships.

It should be highlighted that AGRIDEV’s low score in external relation is due to its operating only as a subcontractor. As a result, it does not feel the need to invest in public relations campaigns or in community outreach.

ACFINCO is an accounting firm, and not very active in the realm of external relations. They do not put a lot of effort in marketing themselves to donors; instead they focus on providing technical services, such as financial auditing, to clients.

This is considered a trainable area for ISOs however the organizations with existing strong relationships with cooperatives have the greatest potential to provide high quality organizational support to cooperatives.

**Criterion 7: Technical Capacities and Range of Services to Cooperatives**

Each sector has unique technical requirements, so this seventh area is customized in each analysis to match the needs of the sector to be strengthened. While no ISO will have the full breadth of technical capabilities needed in a sector as complex as Haiti’s agricultural cooperative sector, they must at least have sufficient expertise in this area to be able to identify and select other service providers and create new products for the sector that are precisely matched to agricultural cooperatives’ needs. For that reason, strength in this area is an essential element for selecting the appropriate ISO.
The table below shows the core services and experience of each of the seven ISOs in the agriculture and cooperative sector. The analysis was unable to directly assess customer satisfaction with these services, but looked at trends in funding as a proxy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Core services</th>
<th>Capacity Building for Cooperatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ACFINCO    | Consulting services, Financial and management audit: Provides technical assistance for management, financing, financial literacy, helping agricultural cooperatives obtain micro-credit | **Access to Markets:** Conduct studies on market demand, create markets/establish networks to facilitate client purchases, find markets for corn, rice, vegetable crops  
**Production diversity and value chain enhancement:** Distribute milling machines, strategize on demand driven production, buy and sell agricultural production  
**Sustainability:** Business plan development, stock control  
**Equipment:** Oversee small construction projects to upgrade physical structures  
**Access to credit:** Facilitate credit opportunities  
**Financial planning:** Business plan development, financial management training, manage large donor funds  
**Environmental impacts:** Stock control, seed banks, silo  
**Organizational capacity and management:** Business plan development  
**Quality control:** Have a standard for crops they buy |
| AGRIDEV    | Accounting; auditing; taxation and financial management; business development support; coaching; mentoring; sales and commerce. Provides marketing services, develops new markets, facilitates access to credit, and increasing competitiveness. | **Technical training:** Provides training to cooperatives to help them build up capacity, increase production, strengthen their governance practices, soil management and irrigation systems, fertility improvement, post-harvest, agro-ecological farming techniques  
**Access to markets:** Links producers to exporters by removing intermediaries and reducing exploitation costs, links exporters to foreign buyers; helps exporters partake into agro fairs abroad  
**Production diversity and value chain enhancement:** Improves quality and integrates cooperatives along several value chains such as cocoa, yam, corn; promotes ecofriendly production process  
**Maintain stability:** Helps with business plan and strategic management  
**Access to credit:** Improve projects’ bankability  
**Financial planning:** Financial planning, reporting, auditing, tax filing  
**Environmental impacts:** Ecofriendly farming techniques and preservation of high yield ground, water conservation, rain water catchment, health centered production  
**Human Resources:** Organizes cooperative into organizations, provides seminars to cooperatives to build capacity  
**Organizational capacity and management:** Improves compliance, gender equity, partnerships between cooperatives and private sector operators  
**Quality control:** - Improves quality in subsectors with lower standards  
**Literacy and basic education:** -Provides seminars, preparing banking projects, preparing grants |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FECHAN</th>
<th>Federation of agricultural chambers in the north, institutional and government- provides capacity development, organizational development; financial literacy and helps with marketing of crops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Technical training: Crop intensification, fertilizer use  
Access to markets: Find markets for coffee, cacao, plantain, beans, sugar cane  
Production diversity and value chain enhancement: -Distribute milling machines, make molasses from sugar cane  
Equipment: Fertilizer, milling machines  
Environmental impacts: Stock control, siloing  
Organizational capacity and management: Facilitate elections, ensure coordination between chamber members, facilitate regular coordination of activities |
| FONHDAD | Provides technical services to modernize Haiti’s agricultural domain with new techniques, fertilizers and improved equipment for better yields and ways to commercialize products. Contract with the Ministry of Agriculture (MARNDR) to manage the CRDD (Research/Demonstration Center) |
| Technical training: Facilitate training center that specializes in soil structure and diagnostic, disease identification and care, integrated pest management, other trainings requested by farmers  
Production diversity and value chain enhancement: Education on crop diversity  
Maintain Stability: Assist in evaluation of cooperatives so they can learn about production costs, losses and profits  
Equipment: Provide small tools (i.e. machetes, rakes, etc.)  
Access to credit: Provides micro-credit lending  
Financial planning: Training on budgeting  
Environmental impacts: Teach/train adaptation methods (i.e. effects of slash and burn)  
Human Resources: Form committee for registration and membership tracking within cooperatives, administration trainings  
Organizational capacity and management: Help to evaluate whole production process, committee is trained on organizational management and governance  
Quality control: Disease control to avoid crop loss and maintain quality, integrated pest management |
| PCH | Focuses specifically on cooperative development with a mission based on the 7 Principles of cooperatives. Provides Consulting; organizational development and management; consulting services access to finance; communication support; financial literacy; organizational development. |
| Technical training: Vegetable gardening, composting/soil preservation, ecosystems and environmental protection, grafting techniques, irrigation techniques, tree nurseries  
Access to market: Facilitate marketing network  
Production diversity and value chain management: Educate on crop diversity (grafting)  
Maintain stability: Provide long-term support, set up cooperatives to operate  
Equipment: distribution of seeds and tools  
Access to credit: Provide credit to cooperatives (has criteria for borrowers)  
Financial planning: Training on accounting and recordkeeping, training on administrative function  
Environmental impacts: Training on disaster mitigation  
Human resources: Register cooperatives  
Organizational capacity and management: Training on principles and values of a cooperative, training on administration and management, instilling democratic practices (7 pillars)  
Literacy and basic education: Offer education and literacy training, promote members' skills development |
| **PDL** | Founded to work with peasant associations. Consulting; access to finance; communication support; financial literacy; organizational development | **Technical training:** Provide consultant for training (if not available in-house), strong in soil management, fertility improvement, post-harvest, agro-ecological farming techniques  
**Access to markets:** Finding international channels for marketing network, assists in identifying viable local markets  
**Production diversity and value chain enhancement:** Post harvest (i.e. milling), promote organic/agro-ecological produce  
**Maintain stability:** Organize saving groups, seed bank, continuously update on training, monitor and evaluate (send extension agents to gather data on the successes of farms)  
**Equipment:** Distribution of small agricultural tools (i.e. machete, rake)  
**Access to credit:** Help to find partners that offer micro-credit  
**Financial planning:** Financial management training, assist in creating budgets for agricultural cooperative activities  
**Environmental impacts:** Agro-ecological farming techniques and attitudes, seed bank, health production committees, rain water catchment, fertility improvement with no chemicals  
**Human Resources:** Facilitate membership tracking, field agronomists collect data from cooperatives  
**Organizational capacity and management:** Strengthen community networks, constructing center to hold meetings, store equipment, civic commitment and engagement, good governance  
**Quality control:** Training on post-harvest treatment  
**Literacy and basic education:** Support primary education and literacy for adults |
| **UNIVERSITE CARAIBES** | Agricultural services, community development, feasibility studies, market research & intelligence, education, vocational training, environmental Access to technical services; organizational development. Involved in diversification of crops, marketing of small farmers’ production | **Technical training:** Provide technical training on many levels by professors that are agronomists  
**Access to markets:** Conduct studies on market demand (hotels) for cooperatives’ produce, facilitate relationship with hotels  
**Production diversity and value chain enhancement:** educate on crop diversity, connect cooperatives to hotel value chain (only)  
**Literacy and basic education:** Support primary education and literacy for adults |
ISO Analysis

Based on our assessment, we believe Haiti has the necessary foundation of ISOs to meet the needs of agricultural cooperatives. All seven ISOs would be responsible grantees or contractors, with the necessary financial management experience and systems coupled with appropriate project management skills.

We first looked for their ability to build skills in three areas where cooperatives were found to be weak:

- Criterion 2: Program Management, Quality Control and Measurement, Evaluation and Learning
- Criterion 3: Financial Management & Accounting
- Criterion 6: External Relationships & Partnerships

We then looked at their specific technical skills given the urgent needs of the sector:

- Financial sustainability, member services development, and commercial partnerships
- In-depth understanding of agricultural input and output markets
- Skills related to increasing production and production quality with an understanding of climate smart agriculture

Based on our analysis, four ISOs came out in the lead:

- PDL (91)
- PCH (80)
- FONDHAD (78)
- AGRIDEV (77)

Yet while these are the four scored the highest, none of them has all the required technical skills to meet all the needs of the cooperatives. Each organization fills a specific niche. PCH and PDL are the most similar with a focus on rural development through support to cooperatives and peasant’s associations. Their greatest strengths lie in the organizational development of cooperatives. FONDHAD, the youngest of the four ISOs, has the greatest skills related to increasing production, productivity and climate smart agriculture. Agridiev has the strongest skills related to markets.

PCH and PDL are the strongest of the four with regards to depth of knowledge, connection and understanding of cooperatives in Haiti. They have extensive experience helping communities of farmer’s form and register cooperatives, establish their organizational structures and begin their work. FONDHAD and AGRIDIEV have the strongest technical expertise with both an in-depth understanding of markets as well as farming and production techniques.

5. Program Recommendations

We recommend that the IDB invest in the cooperative sector, working through lead cooperatives to deliver essential services to members, supported by Haitian ISOs.
We recommend the IDB select up to ten lead cooperatives to deliver rapid impact at the member level and to demonstrate the potential of cooperatives to better serve their members. The primary result would be creation of new opportunities for cooperative members that increase incomes through agriculture. The secondary result would be proof that cooperatives can, with targeted technical support, meet the evolving needs of members and improve their own financial sustainability by doing so.

The cooperatives recommended for investment are in sectors that have both domestic and export markets, and that provide an opportunity to reach significant numbers of members quickly. [Cocoa cooperatives have been excluded from this proposal for first-round investment, based on the level of other programs targeting this sector.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th># of Coops</th>
<th># current members</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2062</td>
<td>Rationale for working with coffee cooperatives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Opportunity to reach large number of vulnerable farmers facing declining income, currently members of legacy coffee cooperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Help coffee farmers to diversify beyond coffee to increase incomes and reduce risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- For members continuing to grow coffee, need to scale adoption of improved varieties and technologies including land management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Need to demonstrate improved cooperative-level financial sustainability through diversification (creating cooperative incentives to shift business model)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Need to test ability of coffee cooperatives to create new market linkages and deliver service that help members successfully enter new markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mango/cereals/vegetable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3054</td>
<td>Rationale for working with these crops:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Growing market opportunities in local as well as export markets (especially mangos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Member risk reduction through diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Significant membership growth possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The recommended cooperatives are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th># Members</th>
<th>Crops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative 19: COSAHEC</td>
<td>Nord-Est</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation Saint Helene de Carice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative 9: CAPB</td>
<td>Nord</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopérative Avenir des Paysans de Borgne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative 11: CAMDEC</td>
<td>Sud-Est</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopérative Agricole Manes des Commissaires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative 14: SOCAPCOL</td>
<td>Sud-Est</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Société Coopérative Agricoles des Petite Planteurs de Collin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative 17: COPACMI</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Mango/cereals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopérative des paysans &quot;Chanpyon&quot; de Mirbalais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative 28: KOPKOMFG</td>
<td>Artibonite</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>Mango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopérative Production et de Commercialisation Mango Francique de Gros –Morne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative 13: COPAS</td>
<td>Sud-Est</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Vegetables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopérative des Producteurs Agricoles de Seguin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative 25: COLUC</td>
<td>Ouest</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>Beans, corn, millet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopérative Lumiere Chinchiron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative 6: CAB</td>
<td>Artibonite</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Beans, millet, corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopérative Agricole Barbe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative 12: CODEL</td>
<td>Artibonite</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>Rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopérative Délivrance de L'Estère</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5,116</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These ten cooperatives provide a platform to reach over 5,000 members quickly with improved services. The key to rapid results is to focus resources only on those areas where the cooperative must focus to effectively link members to market – demonstrating to members the commercial value of the cooperative. This is the starting point for rebuilding trust and engagement with current members and to expanding membership in the future. Other important but less urgent types of capacity building (such as cooperative governance) are recommended to be put on hold until immediate results are achieved in terms of increased member production and sales.

Yet this design still relies on the cooperatives as the institutional home for improved services to members, such as market information, or access to inputs or equipment at bulk or shared-economy rates.

The table below shows the priority areas recommended for services to be delivered to cooperative members, plus the areas in which the cooperatives need to be strengthened in order to deliver these services on a permanent basis. It also provides an illustrative set of
performance metrics that will show the IDB and other investors whether or not cooperative performance and delivery to members is improving over time: an essential foundation for judging the impact of the program. The recommendations are similar but not identical between coffee cooperatives and the other cooperatives; specific recommendations are provided for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Members will be strengthened to...</th>
<th>Coops will be strengthened to...</th>
<th>Performance Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>- Improve coffee varieties, techniques, and land management</td>
<td>- Strengthen market information system for members</td>
<td>- Total value of crops marketed through coop (and on per member basis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Diversify into new crops per farmer field schools</td>
<td>- Develop commercial agreements with buyers of diversified crops</td>
<td>- Total cooperative revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Access input and output markets through cooperatives</td>
<td>- Create Ag Input Member Stores</td>
<td>- # (and %) members growing non-coffee crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Link to financial (savings) services</td>
<td>- Host farmer field school for members to disseminate improved production techniques</td>
<td>- Total (and %) coop revenue from non-coffee crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Establish new variety coffee nurseries, with youth component</td>
<td>- Develop coop’s financial model including diversified crop revenues</td>
<td>- # new members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Improve coop’s member engagement and feedback system</td>
<td>- # commercial buyer relationships brokered by coop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mango/ Cereals/ Vegetables/ Rice</td>
<td>- Increase scale, quality, and diversity of production</td>
<td>- Strengthen market information system for members</td>
<td>- Total value of crops marketed through coop (and on per member basis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Access input and output markets through cooperatives</td>
<td>- Develop commercial agreements with buyers of diversified crops</td>
<td>- Total cooperative revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Link to financial (savings) services</td>
<td>- Create Ag Input Member Stores</td>
<td>- # new members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Access land preparation services</td>
<td>- Host farmer field school for members to disseminate improved production techniques</td>
<td>- # commercial buyer relationships brokered by coop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Expand into value-added services (packaging, grading, etc.) with gender and youth component</td>
<td>- Improve coop’s member engagement and feedback system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final recommendation is the source of technical services to the cooperative members and the cooperatives themselves: the ISOs.

As the analysis in Section 4.2 showed, the ISOs reviewed in detail each bring complementary skills and content needed by the 10 cooperatives and their members discussed above. We recommend that five be considered as a consortium of service providers with the right basket of skills to achieve the results described above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISO</th>
<th>Key skill sets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACFINCO</td>
<td>Market analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business plan development for diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to markets and buyer relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgriDev</td>
<td>Access to export markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversification into certain crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FONHDAD</td>
<td>Farmer training in production and productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Input stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCH</td>
<td>Seed and tool distribution services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member engagement and feedback systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDL</td>
<td>Deepening member reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farmer engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, we recommend that PDL be selected to serve as a coordinator/match-maker to develop cooperative plans and monitoring systems, and to procure ISO services as needed with the proper tracking and reporting back to the donor. PDL may also deliver direct services to cooperatives and their members in the specific areas in which they have expertise.

6. Conclusion

This report has provided answers to the key research questions as outlined in the research plan. We encourage the IDB to move forward with its plan to invest strategically in the agricultural cooperative sector, advancing an agenda of improved member service, with particular focus on creating accessible market opportunities, expanded and inclusive membership (including for women and youth), and risk management through diversification and climate-smart agricultural techniques. The impacts will be felt in poor and vulnerable communities, on rural women, girls and youth, on consumers better served by a robust agriculture sector, and on society as rural livelihoods and incomes rise.
Annexes:

I. Final list of Cooperatives Assessed

Cooperative 1: COTRAS - Coopérative Travailleur Agricole Savanette
Location: Centre
Crop: coffee

Cooperative 2: COCAC - Coopérative Comercialisation Agricole Coordonee
Location: Grand-Anse
Crop: coffee, cocoa

Cooperative 3: CAUD - Coopérative Agricole Union Développement
Location: Grand-Anse
Crop: cocoa

Cooperative 4: COPCOD - Coopérative de Production de Commerce et de Dernrée
Location: Grand-Anse
Crop: cocoa

Cooperative 5: CUPEC - Coopérative l'union des paysans de Ca-Louis
Location: Ouest
Crop: cocoa

Cooperative 6: CAB - Coopérative Agricole Barbe
Location: Artibonite
Crop: beans, millet, corn

Cooperative 7: CAJBC - Coopérative Agricole Jn-Baptiste Chavannes
Location: Nord
Crop: cocoa

Cooperative 8: CAFUPBO - Coopérative Agricole Frere Unis de Petit-Bourg Borgne
Location: Nord
Crop: cocoa

Cooperative 9: CAPB - Coopérative Avenir des Paysans de Borgne
Location: Nord
Crop: coffee

Cooperative 10: COPVIAPS - Coopérative des Plantes Vètiver de Arrondissement Port-Salut
Location: Sud
Crop: vetiver (essential oils)

Cooperative 11: CAMDEC - Coopérative Agricole Manes des Commissaires
Location: Sud-Est
Crop: coffee

Cooperative 12: CODEL - Coopérative Délivrance de L'Estère
Location: Artibonite
Crop: rice, livestock
Cooperative 13: COPAS - Coopérative des Producteurs Agricoles de Seguin
Location: Sud-Est
Crop: vegetables

Cooperative 14: SOCAPCOL - Société Coopérative Agricoles des Petite Planteurs de Collin
Location: Sud-Est
Crop: coffee

Cooperative 15: CAB - Coopérative Agrocommerciale Baptiste
Location: Centre
Crop: coffee

Cooperative 16: COPACSE - Coopérative des Paysans Champions de Saut d'Eau
Location: Centre
Crop: vegetables, peas, millet, corn, pigeon peas

Cooperative 17: COPACMI - Coopérative des paysans "Chanpyon" de Mirbalais
Location: Centre
Crop: rice, corn, peas, millet

Cooperative 18: COPVED - Coopérative Planteur Vetiver de Debouchette
Location: Sud
Crop: vetiver

Cooperative 19: COSAHEC - Coopérative Saint Helene de Carice
Location: Nord-Est
Crop: coffee

Cooperative 20: NCOCABA - Nouvelle Coopérative Caferiere de Baptiste
Location: Centre
Crop: coffee

Cooperative 21: CACGAVA - Coopérative Agricole Caferiere Gadgart le Vaillant
Location: Nord
Crop: coffee

Cooperative 22: KOPAKGM - Coopérative Production et de Commercialisations Gros Morne
Location: Artibonite
Crop: mango

Cooperative 23: SOCAM - Société de Coopérative pr l'avancement de Maugé
Location: Artibonite
Crop: rice

Cooperative 24: CAFUMO - Coopérative Agricole Frere Unis de Mont Organise
Location: Nord-Est
Crop: coffee
**Cooperative 25:** COLUC - Coopérative Lumiere Chinchiron  
Location: Ouest  
Crop: beans, corn, millet, pigeon peas  

**Cooperative 26:** SOCAD - Société Coopérative Agricole de Dupui  
Location: Sud-Est  
Crop: coffee  

**Cooperative 27:** CAPUP - Coopérative Agricole des Planteurs Unis de P. Margot  
Location: Nord  
Crop: cocoa, peanuts  

**Cooperative 28:** KOPKOMFG - Coopérative Production et de Commercialisation Mango Francique de Gros –Morne  
Location: Artibonite  
Crop: mango  

**Cooperative 29:** SOKOBELAM - Société Coopérative Société Bellevue Lamontagne  
Location: Ouest  
Crop: vegetables
II. Cooperatives Capacity Assessment Tool

Date: _____________________  Surveyor’s name: __________________ / __________________ / __________________

Country: __________________

Name of Cooperative: ___________________________________________________________________________  Acronym: _______________

Address: 
Department: __________________; Town: __________________; Section: __________________; Locality: __________________

Contact Person Information:
Name: _____________________; Email: _______________________; Telephone: ___________________; Role: _______________

Address: __________________________________________________________________________________

Data on the target cooperative:  Year of establishment: _________________  Official registration date: _________________ (check documents and official records of the cooperative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Effectif /Catégorie</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Level of education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oversight Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manager:  Name _____________________; Gender: ____ ; Age _______ ; Level of education________
Chairman of the Board:  Name _____________________; Gender : ____ ; Age _______ ; Level of education________

Assets: ; Liabilities: ;

Share capital: 

Number of active partners providing financial support: 

Number of active partners providing technical support: 

Crops (Select all that apply):

- Coffee
- Cocoa
- Rice
- Mango
- Vegetable crops
- Others, Cite

Types of services/ activities the cooperative engage in (Select all that apply):

- Seed loans
- Sale of seeds
- Sale of intrants (insecticides, pesticides, tools, etc...)
- Agricultural credit
- Warrantage / credit storage
- Commercialization/marketing of member’s products
- Others, Cite
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments / Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Leadership and Strategic Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1 Registration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative is a <strong>legally registered</strong> structure with the government</td>
<td>____/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative has <strong>bylaws and a charter</strong> that clearly outlines roles the structure of the cooperative</td>
<td>____/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2 Board of Directors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The <strong>roles and responsibilities</strong> of the Board is clearly defined and is distinct from the role of the manager</td>
<td>____/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Board members</strong> have received training** on their duties</td>
<td>____/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The <strong>frequency of board meetings</strong> complies with internal regulations</td>
<td>____/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Meeting minutes</strong> are written after each board meeting</td>
<td>____/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Decisions</strong> taken by the Board are respected and implemented</td>
<td>____/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3 Oversight Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An <strong>oversight committee</strong> exists within the cooperative</td>
<td>____/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Its <strong>members</strong> have received training** on their duties</td>
<td>____/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative has <strong>reports and control documents</strong> to prove the oversight committee exists and operates</td>
<td>____/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4 Education Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An <strong>education committee</strong> exists within the cooperative</td>
<td>____/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Its <strong>members</strong> have received training** on their duties</td>
<td>____/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative has <strong>reports and control documents</strong> to prove the education committee exists and operates</td>
<td>____/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 (4) 0 = No Capacity. *No aspect of the ideal is present; 1= Poor. There is minimal understanding of the ideal and substantial revisions and work needed; 2= Fair. There is partial understanding/implementation of the ideal with a significant number of revisions necessary; 3 = Good. Understanding/implementation of the ideal with minimal revisions necessary; 4 = Very good. Perfect understanding/implementation of the ideal with no revision necessary.*
### 1.5 Strategic Membership Management Plan
- The cooperative has **membership criteria** and maintains rosters of members
- The cooperative collects **membership fees** to function
- The cooperative collects "**social shares**" (**contribution**) to support its activities
- "Social shares" (contribution) reflect the **ability** of members **to pay**
- The membership plan reflects **identified needs**
- Membership in the cooperative is governed by the **principle of free membership**

### 1.6 Member Management Systems
- Organizational **values** are clearly articulated and reflected in the decision making
- The cooperative has an **organizational chart** adapted to its structure
- The cooperative has a **youth integration program**
- The cooperative **train** its members on their **rights and responsibilities** within the cooperative

### 2. Program Management

#### 2.1 Planning and Design
- The cooperative has an **annual workplan**
- The cooperative **involves** its members in the **design and planning** of its activities
- The cooperative conducts **market analysis studies** prior to launching new activities
  - Activities reflect the ‘**Do No Harm**’ principle
- The cooperative has **clear indicators for assessing the performance** of its activities

#### 2.2 Activity Implementation & Impact
- Cooperative activities are **in line with its mission**
- The managers follow a **shared workplan** for the implementation of activities
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The staff in charge of implementation of activities are <strong>technically competent</strong> and receive periodic refresher training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3 Data Collection and Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative collects data on the <strong>changes in livelihoods</strong> of its members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.4 Management of the Value Chain</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative maintains a contact list of stakeholders in value chain(s) in which she is involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative is able to <strong>negotiate contracts</strong> all along the value chain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5. Access to Credit</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative is able to <strong>complete an application</strong> for credit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative has <strong>access to loans/credits</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative develops and commits to <strong>loan repayment schedules.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.6. Community Mobilization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative uses <strong>communication tools to mobilize communities</strong> and facilitate community meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative has <strong>staff trained in facilitation skills and conflict resolution</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.7. Education and Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative's <strong>members</strong> have received <strong>literacy training</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative provides <strong>training to its members</strong> in areas related to its core mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative maintains a <strong>register of trainers and trainees.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Financial Management &amp; Accounting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1 Financial Management Procedures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative has <strong>procedures and tools</strong> to record <strong>financial transactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Internal controls</strong> are in place to support transparent financial handling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative has a <strong>bank account</strong> in its name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- If yes, the **president**, treasurer and secretary are all three signatories  

3.2 Accounting Procedures  
- The cooperative uses an **accounting procedures manual**  
- The **accounting records** are available and the oversight committee has access to them

3.3 Management Systems and Finances  
- The cooperative has a **budget/spending plan**

3.4 Budget Control System  
- The cooperative has a system in place to **record all expenditures** against budget lines

3.5 Common Forms and Instructions  
- The cooperative maintains **standard forms** to support the financial management system  
- Forms are updated for compliance  
- **Staff are trained** in how to use all forms

3.6 Financial Report  
- The cooperative produces **financial reports on a regular basis**

3.7 Procurement/Purchasing Policies, Plan and Procedures  
- Purchasing policies are in place that ensure **value for money** and elimination of corruption  
- **Managers are trained** in purchasing policies

3.8 Inventory Tracking  
- A list of all physical assets is maintained

3.9 Sub-Grants  
- Organization has procedures to **track, monitor and legally protect** themselves when re-granting or sub-contracting

4. **Financial Sustainability**

4.1 Financial Sustainability Planning
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative has the capacity to analyze its <strong>financial situation</strong> and make decisions to support financial sustainability</td>
<td>/_____/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative has the <strong>capacity to mobilize funds</strong> to achieve its mission</td>
<td>/_____/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The cooperative defines <strong>strategic fundraising goals</strong> to ensure its financial sustainability</td>
<td>/_____/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2 Fees for Service
- The cooperative provides **services** in line with its mission for which it can charge a fee
- Services and pricing structure are based on clear **market analysis** of need

### 4.3 Business Planning
- A **business plan** exists to guide the management of the organization’s revenue generating activities

### 4.4 Donor Relations – Grant Writing
- The cooperative has a **partnership strategy** to ensure that partners add value to the cooperative
- The cooperative ensures that its **partnership agreements** improve and complete its work and expertise
- The cooperative understands the priorities of partners and intermediaries to finance (credit unions, associations, NGOs ...)
- Partnership agreements are signed in order to ensure the **independence and autonomy** of the cooperative

### 4.5 Funding Diversification
- The cooperative has and applies a **revenue diversification strategy** (crop diversification, diversification of services, ...)

### 5. Human and Material Resources (Administration)

#### 5.1 Standard Operating Procedures
- When **personnel** are paid by the cooperative (part time or full time) there are administrative **policies and procedures** related to their employment.

#### 5.2 Volunteer Management
- /_____/

---
- The cooperative relies on **volunteers**
- The cooperative has non-discriminatory policies for **recruiting** volunteers
- The cooperative has clear policies for **managing** volunteers
- The cooperative maintains a **list** of potential volunteers and regularly maintains contact with them for potential collaboration

### 5.3 Facilities / Equipment
- The cooperative has the **appropriate facilities and equipment** to carry out its programming and mission

### 5.4 Safety & Security Plan
- The cooperative has a **comprehensive safety plan** that identifies the potential risks and mitigation strategies for staff, office, information, and asset safety
- Staff are **trained in proper security protocols** and know who to contact and what to do in case of emergency

### 6. External Relations & Communications

#### 6.1 Outreach Strategy
- The cooperative has and implements a clear **outreach strategy**

#### 6.2 Outreach Materials
- The cooperative produces compelling **outreach materials** that deliver key messages to target audiences in line with the outreach strategy
- **Branding and marking guidelines** are followed

#### 6.3 Communication / PR Products/ Equipment
- The cooperative has the **equipment needed** to implement its outreach strategy
- The staff are trained in the use and maintenance of the equipment.

#### 6.4 Media Relations
- Organization has and implements a clear **media strategy**
- Organization has the **tools to support the media strategy** – i.e. press releases, press kits, press conferences

#### 6.5 Cooperation among Cooperatives
- The cooperative is a member of a **cooperative union**
- The cooperative develops partnerships with **cooperatives in other sectors of activities**
- The cooperative develops partnerships with **cooperatives of the same sector in other geographic areas**
- The cooperative is **connected to other organizations** and stakeholders via formal and informal networks that increase the influence and impact of the organization

### 7. Technical Capacity

#### 7.1. Technical capacity - Leaders/managers and staff
- Leaders/managers have **technical expertise** in the selected crop/value chain
- **Staff involved** in the activities and services provided has **technical knowledge** in this field of activity

#### 7.2. Enhanced Production Techniques
- The cooperative **provides training and technical support to its members** on improved production techniques

#### 7.3. Market Information
- The cooperative has **access to market information** (prices, customers, suppliers ...)
- The cooperative uses **market information to improve its services** for the benefit of its members

### Open-ended Questions

### 8. Identification of Needs and Priorities

#### 8.1. Vision and Mission of the Cooperative
- What is the **vision** of the cooperative??
- What are the **objectives** the cooperative wants to attain in the upcoming years?
- What is **missing** for the cooperative to attain their vision and mission??
- What **services** does the cooperative offer to its **female members**?

#### 8.2. Identification of Needs
- List of the most **important needs** of the cooperative
- List the most **important needs of the cooperative members**
- What are the services the cooperative **needs and is willing to pay for**?
- What are the services the **cooperative members need and are willing to pay** for?
- What services do **women need but that are not currently available**?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.3 Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- What are the <strong>main priorities</strong> of the <strong>cooperative</strong>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are the <strong>main priorities</strong> of the <strong>community</strong>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. ISO Assessment tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Completed (0-4)</th>
<th>Understanding (0-4)</th>
<th>Comments/Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizational Leadership/Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Registration (Legally Registered in Country)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Date published in Le Moniteur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Charter / Bylaws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Founders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mission Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Owned by citizens or lawfully recognized permanent residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not controlled by anyone not meeting the above statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Primary location of business is Haiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 BOD Policies and Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mission and Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- BOD Roles and Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Code of Conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Evaluation (self or otherwise)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Board Development Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Board Member Selection / Dismissal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- BOD length of terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Board Member Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Meeting Protocol / Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grievance Policy / Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- BOD Voting Rights / Protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Payment / Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 BOD Member Orientation (training materials or handbook)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 BOD Contact List / Profiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Advisory Board Policies and Procedures (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mission and Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Advisory Board Scope of Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Code of Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Advisory Board Member Selection / Dismissal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Advisory Board Member Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Meeting Protocol / Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Payment / Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Advisory Board Member Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.7 Advisory Board Contact List / Profiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.8 Strategic Management Plan (annual or otherwise)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Mission/Vision Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analysis of External Environment / Stakeholders / Opportunities and / or Obstacles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analysis of Internal Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strategic Goals of Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Risk Assessment(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.9 Management System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Management Philosophy and Operating Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organizational System / Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Staffing Balance (gender/youth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Methods of Assigning Authority and Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Internal Communications Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Segregation of Duties / Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Knowledge Management System / Structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.10 Leadership Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Leadership Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leadership Balance (gender/youth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Succession Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.11 Legal Counsel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Access to Quality Legal Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Programming Assured to be Operating Legally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Funding for Legal Counsel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.12 Partnership Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Partnership Policy / Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Types of Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contracting Policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Program Management and Donor Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **2.1 Program Management System** | - Program Management Philosophy (documented)  
- Segregation of Duties / Responsibilities  
- Staff Communications (internal)  
- Product Protection / Intellectual Property |
| **2.2 Monitoring and Evaluation Handbook** | - M&E Philosophy, Policies and Procedures  
- Training is available to appropriate staff on data collection and methods for using data  
- Results Framework / Log Frame  
- Performance and Monitoring and Evaluation Plan  
- Workplan  
- Reporting / Data Collection Templates  
- Peer Engagement |
| **2.3 MIS System** | - Reporting Templates  
- Data Collection Standards  
- Solution for Accessing Data  
- Filing Checklist |
| **2.4 Training Program Policies and Procedures** | - Policy for Creating and Updating Modules  
- Training Modules  
- Training Evaluation Forms  
- Trainers Database  
- Trainees Database |
| **2.5 Resource Center Management** | - Visitor Usage Log  
- List of Services  
- Catalogue of Library Materials  
- Maintain database of consultants |
| **2.6 Community Dialogue Facilitation** | - Moderator / Facilitator Guidelines  
- Conflict Resolution Techniques  
- Event Logistics Checklist  
- Participant Evaluation Form  
- Results Sharing Templates (follow-up) |
### 2.7 Grant Management Policies and Procedures
- Grant Management Manual / Handbook
- Goals of Grant Management System
- Grant Management Staff
- Financial Instructions
- Solicitation and Grant Award System
- Contract and Work Plans
- Reporting Systems / MIS
- Grant Management Training Materials
- Monitoring and Evaluation System
- Audit Policy / Procedures

### 2.8 Grant Documents / Templates (Project Specific)
- Grant Guidelines
- Sample Grant Solicitation / Application Forms
- Sample Grant Award Documents / Grant Agreements
- Sample Financial Instructions
- Sample Control Sheet
- Sample Grant Check List
- Sample Audit Template / Form

### 2.9 Past Project Management Experience
- Agriculture
- Education/Literacy
- Finance
- Capacity assessment/building
- Human resources
- Micro-credit
- Environmental issues
- Value chain development
- Gender
- Community development

### 2.10 Donor Compliance
- Agreements/Contracts are available
- Organization is aware of all requirements and responsibilities have been assigned
- Requirements are fully met and on time
- Modifications are kept on record and tracked to assure compliance
2.11 Technical Reporting
- Reports properly reflect progress on the workplan
- Reports identify barriers to progress
- Reports are used to revise strategies to successfully meet goals and objectives of the donor and target groups
- Supervisory staff conducts field visits in order to assure reports truly reflect work being done on the ground

3. Accounting and Financial Management

3.1 Accounting Procedures Manual
- Financial Reporting – Identified Users (National / Donor)
- Financial Reporting – Requirements / Documentation
- Financial Reports – Standard Reports (National / Donor)
- Local laws pertaining to organizational audits are followed
- Date of most recent audit (financial review if not required by law)

3.2 General Ledger and Chart of Accounts
- General Ledger
- Chart Of Accounts
- Control of Chart of Accounts
- Account Structure (National / Donor)
- Separation of accounts according to source
- HTG and USD accounts are held

3.3 Cash Management Systems
- Cash on Hand Register / Report / Templates
- Periodic Cash Count
- Receipt of Cash Payment

3.4 Expense Allocation System
- Vouchers
- Allowable / Unallowable Expenses
- Project Codes
- Authorization / Approval System
- Documented Basis for Allocation
### 3.5 Common Forms and Instructions
- Receipt for Cash Payment
- Receipt for Cash Deposit
- Cash Advance Liquidation / Reimbursement Requests
- Cash on Hand Report
- Cash Advance Request
- Expense Voucher
- Travel Expense Report
- Timesheets

### 3.6 National / Donor Reporting
- Reporting Schedule
- Monthly Financial Reports
- Sub-Grants Listing Report
- Cash Count Report
- In-Kind Local Inputs
- Inventory Year-End
- Accrued and Pre-Paid Expense
- Accrued Leave (Vacation)
- Banking Information
- Bank Annual Reports
- External Audit of Books
- Timesheets
- Taxation

### 3.7 Procurement Policy, Procedures and Plan
- General Information and Regulations
- Procurement Procedures
- Checklist(s)
- Competition Policy
- Vendor List

### 3.8 Inventory of Physical Assets
- Office
- Equipment (Non-Computer)
- Computer (various)
- Audio / Visual
- Printing / Copies
- Telephone / Fax
- Furniture
- Vehicles

### 3.9 Sub-Contracting Policies
- Sub-Contracting Rules and Regulations
- System of Administering and Monitoring Awards
- CFR 226 Standards Met
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.10 Financial Management Policies and Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Budget Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Internal Controls System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expense Distribution / Tracking System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Spending Plan Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.11 Financial Management Documents / Templates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Spending Plan Template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expense Distribution Report / Tracking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Spending Analysis (Evaluation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Financial Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1 Financial Sustainability Plan (annual or otherwise)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Financial Diagnostic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Asset Leverage Brainstorm Tool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2 Financial Sustainability Handbook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.3 Fee for Service Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.4 Business Plan Writing Templates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.5 Proposal Writing Handbook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.6 Membership Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Membership Policies and Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Members Code of Conduct / Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Membership Criteria / Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Membership Types / Benefits / Rights / Obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Menu of Membership Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Membership Service Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Membership fee Cost Benefit Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.7 Donor Relationship Tracking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Human and Material Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.1 Personnel Manual / Handbook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Handbook for Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employees are given a copy and a signed receipt is kept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Signed statement affirming the employee is not engaged in trafficking or terrorism

5.2 Office Policies and Procedures
- Plan for Updating and Amending Policies
- Work Conditions and Office Operations
- Use of Company Property
- Electronic Communications
- Injury on / off Job
- Emergency Contact Numbers
- Personal Use of Office Equipment
- Use of Funds / Equipment for Political/Religious Purposes
- Travel Policies and Procedures

5.3 Security Plan
- Office Security
- Cash Security
- Bank Security
- Personal Security
- Political / Terrorism Security
- Natural Disaster Security

5.4 Policies for Employee Recruitment, Hiring and Termination
- Hiring of Family Members
- Hiring of Friends and Former Work Colleagues
- Country Staff Hiring Procedures
- Orientation and Training
- Probation Period of New Employees
- Grievance Procedures / Dispute Resolution
- Progressive Discipline Policies
- Appeals Process
- Termination of Employment
- Personnel / Staff Files (including storage / access / safety)
- Staff Suggestion Program
- Discrimination / Harassment
- Temporary Workers
- Volunteers/Interns

5.5 Employee Contracts
- Contracts On File (Current / Historic)
- Job Description and Responsibilities
- Staff Listing / Inventory of Skills
5.6 Performance Appraisals / Evaluation System
- Performance Appraisal Policy & Schedule
- Employee Evaluation Forms (Manager / Self / 360°)
- Professional Development Plan

5.7 Wages, Hours and Payroll Practices / Policies in accordance with local laws
- Hours of Work
- Timekeeping
- Compensation for Travel Time (Per diem policy)
- Compensation for Extra Work Time
- Timesheets
- Pay Days
- Holiday Policy
- Income, Social, Payroll Taxes and Pension Funds
- Salary Advances
- Raises
- Payroll Allocation
- Bonus Policy
- Salary Standards

5.8 Benefits, Attendance, and Leave of Absence Policy
- Benefit Policies (When, Why and Who)
- Attendance / Punctuality
- Holiday Benefits
- Annual Leave
- Sick Leave
- Maternity / Paternity Leave
- Bereavement Leave
- Personal Leaves of Absence

5.9 Consultant Policy
- Policies and Procedures for Contracting Consultants
- Consultant Contract (template)
- Contact Lists / Rate

5.10 Volunteer Management
- Volunteer Rights
- Code of Ethics
- Volunteer Agreement Template
- Volunteer Database
### 5.11 Personal Ethics and Work Conduct Policy

- Documented Ethics Policy
- Employee Confidentiality
- Workplace Harassment Policy
- Drug Free Workplace
- Lunch Hours / Break
- Personal Ethics in Workplace
- Work Products
- Open Office Etiquette
- Cell Phone Usage
- Dress / Personal Appearance
- Losses Due to Damage, Theft, etc.

### 5.12 Facilities / Equipment

- Office Space
- Training Space
- Meeting Space
- Resource Center with Library
- Archive / Storage Space
- Kitchen / Bathroom
- Computers
- Printing / Copying
- Audio / Visual
- MIS / Internet System
- Furniture
- Vehicles

### 6. External Relations / Communication

#### 6.1 Communication Protocol (External)

- Policy and Procedures
- Donor Protocol
- Partners / Other CSO Protocol
- BOD / Advisory Board Protocol
- Government Protocol
- Shura Protocol
- Private Sector Protocol
- Crisis Protocol

#### 6.2 PR Strategy

- Public Relations or Marketing Philosophy
- Main Outlets for PR
- Target Audiences
- Branding Guidelines
- PR or Marketing Products / Materials
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.3 Communication / PR Products / Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Fact Sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brochures / Leave Behinds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CDs / DVDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Banners / Posters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Success Story Profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Press Clippings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.4 Communication Tools / Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Telephone / Fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Internet / Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Digital Camera / Recorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Projector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Microphones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.5 Media Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Media Communication Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Media (Print / TV) Contact List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Press Kit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Press Release</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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