The Feed the Future Knowledge-Driven Agricultural Development project, implemented by Insight Systems Corp., cultivates engaged learning communities that generate knowledge, information and innovations to support improved development outcomes at scale. It also builds capacity of USAID staff and implementing partners to achieve Feed the Future goals.
## ADVANCED TOPICS IN AGRICULTURE: AGRICULTURE POLICY COURSE

**MAY 11-15, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONDAY – May 11</th>
<th>TUESDAY – May 12</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY – May 13</th>
<th>THURSDAY – May 14</th>
<th>FRIDAY – May 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 9:15</td>
<td>8:30 – 9:00</td>
<td>8:30 – 9:30</td>
<td>8:30 – 8:45</td>
<td>8:30 – 9:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1.1 – Introductions and Course Opening</td>
<td>FTF Priorities and Focus for the next 18 months, and the importance of improved host country policy commitments</td>
<td>Session 3.1 – Trios: Applying the Policy System framework in country case situations</td>
<td>Opening and Overview of day</td>
<td>Session 5.1 – Plenary Discussion – Looking more closely at elements of Policy System in priority policy areas and on field trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15-10:00</td>
<td>9-12:00 (BREAK tbd)</td>
<td>9:30- 10:30</td>
<td>8:45-11:45 (BREAK tbd)</td>
<td>9:30 – 11:15 (BREAK tbd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1.2 - Framing of Course</td>
<td>Session 2.1 - MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY</td>
<td>Session 3.2 An Insider’s View of the Policy Process</td>
<td>Session 4.1a – Agricultural Inputs Policy and 4.1b Agricultural Trade Policy will be held concurrently.</td>
<td>Session 5.2 – Regional approaches that drive country policy reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:15 BREAK</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:30 – 10:45 BREAK</td>
<td></td>
<td>11:15 - 12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1.3 – Trios: Participant Challenges</td>
<td>12:00 -1:00 LUNCH</td>
<td>12:15  – 1:15 LUNCH</td>
<td>Session 5.4 – Discussion of Selected Country Challenges</td>
<td>Session 5.5 – Planning for Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15-12:00</td>
<td>12:00–1:00 LUNCH</td>
<td>1:00- 4:30 (BREAK tbd)</td>
<td>1:15-2:00</td>
<td>1:15 – 5:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1.4 – POLICY SYSTEMS OVERVIEW</td>
<td>1:00-4:30 (BREAK tbd)</td>
<td>Session 2.2 – INSTITUTIONAL ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>Session 3.4 – Overview of Priority Policy Areas</td>
<td>Session 4.2 – Capitol Hill field trip – In-depth look at Institutional Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 1:00 LUNCH</td>
<td>1:00-4:30 (BREAK tbd)</td>
<td>1:15-2:00</td>
<td>2:00-5:00 (BREAK tbd)</td>
<td>3:30 – 3:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 - 4:30 (BREAK tbd)</td>
<td>1:00-4:30 (BREAK tbd)</td>
<td>Session 2.2 – INSTITUTIONAL ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>Sessions 3.5a – Enabling Environment for the Private Sector and 35b – Land and Natural Resources: Tenure, Rights and Policy to be held concurrently</td>
<td>Session 5.6 – Closing Words Final Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 Wrap-up and Closing</td>
<td>4:30 Wrap-up and Closing</td>
<td>Daily evaluation</td>
<td>Daily evaluation</td>
<td>Daily evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily evaluation</td>
<td>Daily evaluation</td>
<td>Daily evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DAY 1 - May 11th

8:30 am  1.1 Introductions and Course Opening
      Ed Salt, Course Facilitator
      John Thomas, BFS/USAID

9:15 am  1.2 Framing of the Course
      Jeff Hill, Chief, Policy Division, ARP/BFS

10:00 am  Break

10:15 am  1.3 Trios: Participant Challenges

11:15 am  1.4 Policy Systems Overview
      Jim Oehmke, Policy Team, BFS/USAID

12:00 pm  Lunch

1:00 pm  1.5 Setting the Policy Agenda
      Dan Charette, Africa Lead Project, DAI
      David Atwood, Policy Team, BFS/USAID
      David Quinn, Fintrac Inc.

4:30 pm  Wrap up and Closing

5:00  No-Host Reception
      JALEO
      2250 A Crystal Drive
Setting the Policy Agenda

Prioritizing the Policy Agenda

- Institutional Architecture
- Mutual Accountability

ACTION PLANS
Session Objectives

By the end of the session, participants will be able to:

• Discuss the processes and approaches to setting the policy agenda
• Demonstrate familiarity with evidence sources for policy prioritization
• Explore existing and prospective tools useful in agenda-setting
• Apply lessons from other Missions’ experiences in policy programming
Session Structure

• Overview – David Atwood
• Using evidence in setting the policy agenda – Dan Charette of AfricaLEAD and David Quinn of EAT Program
• Tools for USAID and partners in defining and prioritizing a policy agenda – David Quinn and Dan Charette
• Panel discussion
• Group exercise
A question
This short overview:

– Overlapping or conflicting agendas
– Different levels of policy – very messy area
– Case study in agenda-setting – FTF
– FTF Policy Matrices: Experience/next steps
– Programming for support of agenda
Whose policy agenda?

- Host country?
- Farmers? Civil society? Private sector?
- World Bank?
- G8/African Union/Private Sector/Host country?
- USAID?
- International NGOs?
Whose policy agenda—Host country and partners?

Pre-METASIP
MTADP, FINSAP, AgSSIP, AADGDS

METAS

Post-METASIP
Ghana Irrigation Devt Policy, Ghana Tree Crop Policy, Fertilizer and Seed Policy, ICT4ADP, Fisheries Policy, New Alliance, GASIP
Whose policy agenda—Farmers?

Case study of National Farmers Union engagement in Ghana
### Whose policy agenda—World Bank?

**Policy Matrix, Ghana 3rd Agricultural Development Policy Operation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Objective</th>
<th>2011 (AgDPO3)*</th>
<th>2012 (AgDPO4)**</th>
<th>2013 (AgDPO5)</th>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Area 1: Agricultural Technology for Improved On-Farm Productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved research, extension services, skills training and education in agricultural sciences and farm management.</td>
<td>FY2011 funding for agricultural research reflected in budget, for disbursement based on research priorities identified by Research Extension Liaison Committees and MoFA.</td>
<td>Science, Technology and Innovation Policy and Development Program approved by Cabinet that promotes (i) the mainstreaming of agriculture STI, (ii) demand-driven nature of agricultural research and innovation, (iii) regional collaboration in agriculture research.</td>
<td>Agriculture sector STI projects and activities reflected in STI investment plan and reflected in national budget.</td>
<td>Enhanced ability of the research system to identify and program research priorities of producers and other stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Whose policy agenda—G-8/Private Sector/Host Government?**

**New Alliance: Government of Ghana Key Policy Commitments**

### Policy Indicators
- Improved score on Doing Business Index
- Increased $ value of new private-sector investment in the agricultural sector
- % increase in private investment in commercial production and sale of seeds

### Objective Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Framework Policy Actions</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish policy that enables the private sector to develop, commercialize, and use improved inputs to increase smallholder productivity and incomes</td>
<td>1. Regulations developed to implement the new seed law, specifically: Seed registry system established. Protocols for variety testing, release and registration, authorization to conduct field inspections, seed sampling, and seed testing developed. Standards for seed classification and certification established.</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a secure investment climate for investors by reducing transaction costs and risks</td>
<td>2. New agricultural input policy for fertilizer and certified seed use developed that includes: Clearly defined role of government in fertilizer and seed marketing; Clearly defined role of government’s CSIR and Grains &amp; Legumes Board; and Defined role of private sector in breeding.</td>
<td>December 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Support transparent, inclusive, evidence-based policy formulation process based on quality data and sound evidence that leads to increased investment in agriculture | 3. Database of suitable land for investors established*  

| 1,000 ha registered                                                | December 2013 |
| 4,500 ha registered                                               | December 2014 |
| 10,000 ha registered                                              | December 2015 |

4. Pilot model lease agreements** for 5,000 ha of land in database established.  
5. Clear procedures to channel investor interest (including that related to value-added agricultural processing) to appropriate agencies*** completed.  
6. New Ghana Agricultural Production Survey (GAPS) stood up:  

| Piloted data release                                                | July 2012      |
| 2nd phase completed                                                | September 2013 |

New national agriculture survey data released  
7. Private sector representatives of key grain value chains appointed to the MOFA Post Harvest Committee.****  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>December 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* Database of suitable land for investors established is a milestone with specific targets and timeline.
Whose policy agenda - International NGOs?

2011 Via Campesina Ghana Conference

• “defend the family farming based on agro-ecology”
• “opposition to the false solutions: the agro-fuels, the GMO and any mutant plants”
• “perseverance of fighting against the seizure of the multinationals over the living, their speculative willingness to develop only cash crops”
• “stop any land grabbing and to engage in land reform”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area / Component of CIP</th>
<th>Issues / Obstacles / Constraints</th>
<th>Policy Objective</th>
<th>Actions / Measures</th>
<th>Targets / Timelines and Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>USG/Ghana Feed the Future Policy Matrix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Policy Area 1: Agricultural Inputs | Lack of sustainable, market-oriented seed system capable of disseminating modern varieties of staple and cash crops. Lack of capacity of formal seed sector to effectively perform the necessary procedures. Irregular variety release process, slowing commercialization of new varieties. Certification procedures are not transparent, and the responsible division requires capacity | Enable the private sector to develop, commercialize and broadly disseminate improved inputs to smallholders, to increase smallholder productivity and incomes. | Policy Action 1: Seed regulations developed and passed by Parliament to implement the Plant and Fertilizer Act, specifically:  
- Seed registry system.  
- Protocols for variety testing, release and registration, authorization to conduct field inspections, seed sampling, and seed testing.  
- Standards for seed classification and certification.  
USG support action:  
- TA and training to Ghana Grains and Legumes Board (GGLB) and the Seed Inspection Division (GSID) to improve to set up variety registration, release, and certification processes  
- TA, training and limited equipment to enable the institutions such as the GSID to maintain quality of seeds as they move through the system.  
Policy Action 2: New agricultural input policy for fertilizer and certified seed use developed that includes:  
- Clearly defined role of government in fertilizer and seed marketing;  
- Clearly defined role of Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) and GGLB; and  
- Defined role of private sector in breeding.  
USG support action:  
- TA through Program for Biosafety Systems  
- TA through Program for Biosafety Systems  
USG support action: | Policy Action 1: June 2013  
Policy Action 2: December 2013  
Policy Action 3: TBC  
Policy Action 4: TBC  
Indicators:  
- $X / x%$ increase in private investment in commercial production and sale of improved seed  
- # of days for variety release of new seed varieties  
- # of days for release of new seed varieties  
- # of seed companies accredited by government to produce foundation seed  
- # of private entities accredited to certify seed  
- Volume of breeder seed |
Whose policy agenda - Host country and partners?

Pre-METASIP
MTADP, FINSAP, AgSSIP, AADGDS

METAS

Post-METASIP
Ghana Irrigation Devt Policy, Ghana Tree Crop Policy, Fertilizer and Seed Policy, ICT4ADP, Fisheries Policy, New Alliance, GASIP
Definitions and different levels of policy

Nutrition Sector, FAO re: seed and African Union re: land policy
• Policy is the overarching general approach, framework and commitment within which legislation, regulations and administrative decisions get made and implemented.

Many FTF host governments:
• Policy = overall approaches within a problem area or subsector that a Ministry or executing branch of government can promulgate without requiring legislation or within existing legislation.
• Example: Ghana policies for fisheries, tree crops, irrigation
• Example: Kenya irrigation policy currently under development
FTF Policy Definition

Policy = Laws, regulations, treaties, statements, administrative actions and funding decisions.
Case study: setting the overall FTF Policy Agenda

• **The Problem**: State and USAID senior managers review fear policy blockage to FTF goals

• **Stakeholders and consultation**:
  – Embassies tasked to develop FTF country policy priorities
  – Embassy/Mission partners consultations
  – Formal, official interagency Steering Group review

• **Evidence**:
  – IFPRI in-depth evidence review of priorities emerging from posts/Missions
1. Institutional Architecture for Improved Policy Formulation
2. Enabling Environment for Private Sector Investment
3. Agricultural Trade Policy
4. Agricultural Inputs Policy
5. Land and Natural Resources Tenure, Rights, and Policy
6. Resilience and Agricultural Risk Management Policy
7. Nutrition Policy
Summary of FTF Policy Matrices

In all, responses from 20 out of 22 Missions:

303 total policy actions:
- 84 Agricultural inputs highest policy area (27%)
- 15 (~5%) around resilience policy, 19 (~6%) nutrition.
- Nearly 50/50 split between on track completed versus behind target on hold.
Results by Policy Area

Policy Area Progress Across Africa, by Policy Area

- Nutrition Policy
- Land and Natural Resources Tenure, Rights and Policy
- Agricultural Inputs
- Agricultural Trade
- Institutional Architecture for Improved Policy Formulation
- Enabling Environment for Private Sector Investment
- Resilience and Risk Management Policy

Legend:
- Completed
- In progress - on target
- In progress - behind
- On hold

0.0 10.0 20.0 30.0 40.0 50.0 60.0
Policy Action Success Factors

- Inclusivity: 27
- “Other”: 22
- Strong Evidence Base: 22

Policy Action Barriers

- “Other”: 38
- Unpredictable or Unreliable Policy Framework: 29
- Lack of Inclusivity: 18
LAC Mission Reporting

• 41 Policy Actions

• Most Frequent Area:
  • Agricultural Trade

• 98% in progress/2% on hold

• Laggard pol. area: enabling env
Asia Mission Reporting

- 45 Policy Actions

- Most Frequent Area:
  - Agricultural Inputs
  - Agricultural Trade

- 82% progress/18% on hold

- Laggard pol. area: Enabling environ.
Southern AFR Reporting

- 62 Policy Actions

- Most Frequent Areas:
  - Agricultural Trade
  - Agricultural Inputs

- 92% progress/8% on hold

- Laggard pol area: trade

![Policy Area Progress Across SA Missions](image-url)
West AFR Reporting

- 47 Policy Actions

- Most Frequent Areas:
  - Agricultural Inputs
  - Institutional Architecture

- 98% in progress/2% on hold

- Laggard area: ag inputs
East AFR Mission Reporting

• 127 Policy Actions
• Most Frequent Areas:
  • Agricultural Inputs
  • Agricultural Trade
  • Enabling Environment
• 87% in progress/13% on hold
• Laggard pol area: Enabling env
Next Steps in FTF Policy Matrices

• Window for updating if appropriate

• Looking into FTFMS and Pol Matrix reporting

• Help your country develop common policy matrix (eg, Africa through Malabo new country investment and policy plans)
Programming to Support the Agenda

Key concepts in setting policy agenda:

• Country-led
• Transparent
• Inclusive
• Evidence-based
• Iterative process
• Increased effectiveness of national investments
Policy Dialogue in support of the agenda

• Then and now
• Question
Programming to the Policy Agenda

- A different era – programming essential
- Dialogue and programming
- Program to advance the agenda.....with
  - Programming for evidence and capacity
  - Programming for stakeholder consultation
  - Programming for instutional architecture
  - Programming for mutual accountability
The Policy System

James F Oehmke
Agricultural Policy Course
May 11, 2015
What is Policy

• Laws, statutes, regulations etc. and their implementation
  – Systems for the formulation and implementation of laws, statutes, regulations etc.
  – Evidence based dialog around funding allocation
  – NOT funding allocation (although see David)

• But really, what is it?
Session Objectives

• To understand the FTF perspective on what constitutes a policy system
• To appreciate the importance of policy change and region-wide policy system change
What are Opportunities for Policy Change?

• • • •
The Policy System

Policy Agenda

Policies, Systems, Plans and Processes that accelerate the end of hunger and poverty

Institutional Architecture

Mutual Accountability
Institutional Architecture

• An *institutional architecture* to identify barriers, design policy options, and coordinate actions to implement policies. The term “institutional architecture” applies to public and private sector institutions in partner countries; and activities, including collecting and analyzing data, proposing, implementing, and enforcing policy. It also includes the process of consultation between partner Governments and stakeholders from the private sector, civil society organizations, think tanks, and development partners.
Policy Agenda

• A *prioritized agenda* of critical policy actions, articulated in the FTF Policy Matrices. This agenda was built through consultation with country and interagency representatives to ensure that priority policy areas align with and add value to the investment plans of partner countries, as well as Feed the Future’s strategy.
Mutual Accountability

• **Mutual accountability** to ensure that policy changes are effective and have significant impact, and to ensure that partner governments, development partners, the private sector, and civil society follow through on commitments to implement the FTF program.
Question
Why Systemic Change?

• Importance of Policy
• Need for Change at Scale—not usually a single policy holding things back
• Importance of Changing Policy Systems to catalyze change in agricultural and rural systems accelerating agricultural transformation
Importance of Policy

African growth data suggest that Africa may finally be reaping the rewards of institutional and policy change in the 1980s and 1990s (source: IFPRI)
Why Systemic: SSA Poverty
Varietal Introduction Policy

Source: Data for 2003–10 are from DAE (2003 through 2011); data for 2001/02 and 2002/03 are estimated; all other data are from DAE, BARI, and CIMMYT 2003.
African Agricultural Policy and Varietal Adoption

Improved variety adoption rates

\[ y = 0.0003x^{1.5879} \]

\[ R^2 = 0.2422 \]
Ag. Systems Change &

Over the last decade, where countries have increased investments in agriculture as per CAADP targets (or have exceeded), they have seen reductions in hunger and poverty, and increases in productivity. This includes countries such as Ghana, Togo, Zambia, Burundi, Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger, Congo, Senegal, Ethiopia and Malawi. -- Dr. Nkosazana Dlamini Zuma, Chairperson of the African Union Commission
What are Opportunities for Policy Change?

• -
• -
• -
• -
Action Plans

Prioritizing the Policy Agenda

ACTION PLANS

Institutional Architecture

Mutual Accountability
A prioritized agenda of key policy actions is needed to maximize the food security impact of agricultural programs and stimulate greater private investment in the sector. Using country policy priorities and evidence-based analysis, FTF has identified **seven priority areas** likely to have the greatest impact on reducing hunger and poverty.
7 Priority Areas

1. Institutional Architecture for Improved Policy Formulation
2. Enabling Environment for Private Sector Investment
3. Agricultural Trade Policy
4. Agricultural Inputs Policy
5. Land and Natural Resources Tenure, Rights, and Policy
6. Resilience and Agricultural Risk Management Policy
7. Nutrition Policy
Key concepts

- Country-led
- Transparent
- Inclusive
- Evidence-based
- Iterative process
- Increased effectiveness of national investments
Mission-level Policy Matrices embody prioritized agendas

- 2012 development of policy matrices by all FTF countries
- Review of current, sample policy matrices
Steps and actions needed at 2 levels:

– Level 1: Develop prioritized policy agenda (already done)

– Level 2: Develop a plan to implement each priority policy agenda item to achieve purpose / goal / intent of the overall policy
Assessing capacity for setting for inclusive policy prioritization

Policy Development Training teaches participants how to formulate a policy position by analyzing:

- The perceived policy problem including evidence to substantiate problem
- Policy solution options
- Impacts of different solution options
- Distribution of impacts for each option, including compliance requirements
- Consultation with stakeholders on options
- Formulation of policy position
- Advocacy on policy position
Feed the Future Policy Matrices: Where Bilateral, Regional and Washington Policy Priorities Align
1. Review of FTF Policy Matrix Priorities
2. Overview of recent reporting
3. Barriers/success factors
4. Alignment of regional and bilateral agendas
5. Next steps: Policy results 18-24 months
FTF and New Alliance Policy Matrices

• New Alliance – Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote D’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, Tanzania
  o Actual negotiated government commitments

• FTF Policy Matrices - 2012:
  o All FTF countries/regions
  o USG interagency aspirational targets/actions
  o Reporting on Progress for Interagency
  o Modifying 2012 Matrices where needed
**FTF Policy Matrix Reporting**

- 11/19 FTF Missions reported in full
- 212 Policy Actions.
- Most Frequent Action Areas:
  - Agricultural Trade (58)
  - Agricultural Inputs (55)
  - Enabling Environment (42)
- 53% completed or on target; 47% on hold or behind target
- At least 13 Missions cited need to revise their policy matrix
Policy Area Program Across 11/19 FTF Countries, By Policy Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Complete/On Target/Behind</th>
<th>On Hold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience and Risk</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Architecture</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and NRM</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition Policy</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Environment</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explanations of Fast vs. Slow Progress

• Explanations of Fast Progress
  • Inclusivity: 35
  • Strong Evidence Base: 26
  • International or regional pressures: 20
  • “Other”: 12 (see handout with specific comments by area and country)

• Explanations of Slow Progress
  • Unpredictable or Unreliable Policy Framework: 27
  • Lack of Inclusivity: 18
  • Fiscal resource constraints: 15
  • “Other:” 24, see handout
Urgency of Policy Change/Results 18-24 Months

- FTF timeframe – audit, evaluation, reporting
- Not just beneficiaries, scaling, value chains but also *Systems Change and Policy Change*
- USAID Missions – bilateral and regional -- are in the best position to facilitate significant policy changes
- Focus your bilateral action planning on
  a) what can you really accomplish on major policy change in this timeframe and
  b) Where can you and bilats push together to get country implementation of priority regional policies in that time
- Use time during this session for developing priority action plans / updated matrices
Conclusion

- Robust Policy Agenda across FTF Countries, regionally and bilaterally
- Major challenges but tools exist to address them
- Strong alignment around trade, inputs and enabling environment
- Many opportunities for regional and bilateral agenda to:
  - Mutually reinforce and strengthen each other
  - Advance a range of consistent goals:
    - FTF inclusive growth, nutrition, productivity, trade
    - Trade Africa regional and international trade
    - African Heads of State tripling agricultural trade
    - USG WTO trade agenda
Introduction to Institutional Architecture:

- Provides a framework for analyzing a country’s capacity to undertake agriculture and food security policy change.

- Examines six components: Guiding Policy Framework, Policy Development and Coordination, Inclusivity and Stakeholder Consultation, Evidence-based Analysis, Policy Implementation, and Mutual Accountability.

- Full presentation on findings of Institutional Architecture Cross-Country Study of 16 countries tomorrow.
Policy Component 4: Evidence-Based Analysis

• Examines seven key indicators:
  1. Economic and financial analysis completed as a component of planning.
  2. Performance monitoring measures and targets developed.
  3. Quality data exists for policy monitoring.
  4. Quality data is available for policy making.
  5. Inclusion of analysis in the policy development process.
  6. Annual performance measurement produced and reviewed.
  7. Independent analysis capacity exists.

• This presentation will discuss some of the key findings based on these indicators from the cross-country study.
1. Despite growing political commitment, evidence-based policy making remains limited.

- Limited use of evidence-based analysis to develop policy priorities.
- 31 percent of countries scored weak and 69 percent scored average for evidence-based policy making. No country scored strong.
2. The availability of timely and reliable data is a problem across practically every country.

- 38 percent of countries scored weak, 50 percent scored average, and 6 percent scored strong.
- Funding cited as the primary deterrent to data collection and availability.
- Zambia scored strong due to a robust and reliable crop forecast survey conducted by the Central Statistics Office each year.
3. In addition to the availability of data, the systems that allow access to this data are also a constraint.

- 38 percent of countries scored weak, 44 percent scored average, and 18 percent scored strong.
- A common constraint across countries was a lack of a centralized, easy accessible hub for all agriculture and food security data from across government agencies, donors, and stakeholders.
4. Limited staff and resources diminish the impact of monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

- 12 percent of countries scored strong, 38 percent of countries scored average, and 50 percent of countries scored weak.
- Bangladesh and Guatemala scored strong.
- While many countries had M&E framework in place, limited resources and a scarcity of qualified staff obstructed the process.
5. Progress in producing annual performance reports is mixed.

- 31 percent of countries scored strong, 44 percent of countries scored average, and 25 percent of countries scored weak.

- Countries scoring weak had no formal review system in place, whereas countries scoring average produced annual work plans but did not include annual targets or indicators.
6. Independent research institutions have strong capacity to conduct policy analysis.

- Strongest indicator in evidence-based analysis component.
- 44 percent of countries scored strong, 44 percent of countries scored average.
- Research institutes generally found to have the capacity to undertake independent analysis.
- IFPRI, CGIARs, and donors engaged in supporting independent research facilities.
Despite growing political commitment, evidence-based policy making remains limited.

The availability of timely and reliable data is a problem across practically every country.

In addition to the availability of data, the systems that allow access to data are also a constraint.

Limited staff and resources diminish the impact of monitoring and evaluation.

Progress in producing annual performance reports is mixed.

Independent research institutions have strong capacity to conduct policy analysis.
Analytical Tools for Policy Reform
May 2015
David Quinn, Industry Analyst
Developing a reform model for policy change:

- **Quantitative Country Benchmarks (e.g. AGRI)**
  - Identify and quantify key AgBEE indicators
  - Compare between countries and over time
  - Facilitate public-private dialogue
  - Capture attention of policymakers and increase urgency to address AgBEE issues

- **Root Cause Analyses**
  - Build on benchmarks to describe why strengths and weaknesses exist
  - Aid civil servants and donors in targeting funds to address underlying issues
  - Existing tools include AgCLIR, World Bank Agribusiness Indicators (ABI)

- **Results-Driven Technical Assistance**
  - High-level attention and root cause analyses create foundation for successful interventions
  - Targeted technical assistance by government, private sector or donors
  - Improved AgBEE leads to more efficient and profitable operations

- **Increased Agricultural Growth**
  - More efficient and certain legal and regulatory environment
  - Lower cost business operations
  - More investment
  - Greater growth
Quantitative Country Benchmarks: Agribusiness Regulation and Institutions (AGRI) Index

• No cross country comparable data on the efficiency or effectiveness of government administration.

• To meet this need, USAID commissioned the development of the Agribusiness Regulation and Institutions (AGRI) Index, a tool to provide clear and easy-to-understand metrics on the ease of doing business in the agricultural sector across countries and over time.

• AGRI assessments were conducted in eight FTF countries (Bangladesh, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Nepal, Senegal, Uganda, and Zambia), and two benchmark countries (Thailand and the Netherlands).
AGRI Index focus areas and indicators:

AGRI Topics
1. Obtaining Seed
2. Obtaining Fertilizer
3. Starting & Operating a Farm
4. Accessing Rural Land
5. Accessing Finance
6. Trading Agricultural Goods
7. Enabling Contract Farming

For each topic, EAT developed short written surveys with standardized case scenarios to yield comparable results.

Indicators were designed to be:
1. Highly relevant to the agricultural sector;
2. Simple, discrete, and actionable;
3. Comparable across countries.
AGRI results highlight the power of comparison.

Cross country comparison of the AGRI Index found:

1. Substantial variation across countries in the time and cost of key agribusiness processes.
2. Inefficient or unclear regulatory requirements that raise the cost of doing business in agriculture.
3. Evidence to where processes can be combined or streamlined.
1. AGRI found substantial variation across countries in the time and cost of key agribusiness processes.

Registering a new seed variety takes nearly three times as long in Mali than in Thailand, and costs 50 times more as a percentage of GDP per capita.
2. AGRI captures the regulatory requirements that raise the cost of doing business in agriculture.
3. AGRI data points to where processes can be combined or streamlined.

AGRI data breaks down a process into its component steps in order to **identify common issues across countries** and pinpoint “low-hanging fruit” where improving government administration can have the greatest effect.

![Graph showing time for each step to transfer land across all AGRI countries.](Image)

**Time for each step to transfer land across all AGRI countries.**
Root Cause Analysis: Commercial Legal and Institutional Reform

• Commercial Legal and Institutional Reform (CLIR) methodology focuses on the systemic limitations that inhibit productivity improvement and limit profitability in the agricultural sector.

• Four part method of inquiry:
  1. Legal Framework
  2. Implementing Institutions
  3. Supporting Institutions
  4. Social Dynamics

• The CLIR framework simplifies the complex array of laws, regulations, and institutions that impact agribusinesses to identify key constraints and practical recommendations for reform.
### Different types of CLIR analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AgCLIR</td>
<td>Presents an in-depth analysis of AgBEE constraints, focusing on systemic issues that raise the costs of doing business throughout the agricultural sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VcCLIR</td>
<td>Identifies the AgBEE constraints that affect a specific value chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeedCLIR</td>
<td>Enables countries to assess critical seed sector weaknesses, undertake targeted seed sector reforms, and effectively gauge performance of reform activities over time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AgCLIR provides a systematic method and framework for diagnosing the root causes and inefficiencies of an underperforming agriculture sector.

The methodology entails a deep-dive analysis of all aspects of the AgBEE from starting a business to winding down in the event of insolvency.

AgCLIR looks at the enabling environment as a dynamic system of laws, institutions, and social forces.
The AgCLIR methodology entails a deep-dive analysis of all aspects of the AgBEE.

The AgCLIR Framework

- Starting a Business
- Dealing with Licenses
- Employing Workers
- Registering Property
- Getting Credit
- Protecting Investors
- Paying Taxes
- Competing Fairly*
- Accessing Marketing Infrastructure*
- Trading Across Borders
- Enforcing Contracts
- Closing a Business

Legal Framework → Implementing Institutions → Supporting Institutions → Social Dynamics

* New AgCLIR chapter added in 2011
The AgCLIR diagnostic is designed to be cross-disciplinary, practical, and reform minded.

1. Cross-disciplinary team of experts interview between 150-350 representatives including:
   - Farmers, cooperatives, lenders, traders, transporters, processors, and sectoral associations;
   - Ministries, border agencies and municipal governments;
   - Trade associations, NGOs and donors.
2. Identify key themes and discuss in a public roundtable.
3. Practical, reform minded analysis with prioritized recommendations.
The AgCLIR report is presented within 6 weeks of the start of the country assessment.

- **Scope diagnostic;**
- **Identify assessment team;**
- **Plan interviews;**
- **Review relevant reports.**

- **Conduct stakeholder interviews;**
- **Team discussions;**
- **Stakeholder roundtable.**

- **Draft report;**
- **Prioritize reform activities;**
- **Present report for discussion.**

5 to 6 weeks | 2 weeks | 3 to 4 weeks
Impact of AgCLIR diagnostic: Supporting Benin’s second country compact.

- Requested by MCC as part of the due diligence process in support of the development of the second country Compact.

- AgCLIR team conducted over 150 interviews and presented finding at a roundtable event which included the U.S. ambassador to Benin.

- Team’s findings validated many of the priority constraints identified by the government, but also challenged the proposed program design and instead offered alternative recommendations for reform activities.
Quantitative benchmarks and root cause analyses create the foundation for successful evidence-based interventions.

- **Quantitative Country Benchmarks (e.g. AGRI)**
  - Identify and quantify key AgBEE indicators
  - Compare between countries and over time
  - Facilitate public-private dialogue
  - Capture attention of policymakers and increase urgency to address AgBEE issues

- **Root Cause Analyses**
  - Build on benchmarks to describe why strengths and weaknesses exist
  - Aid civil servants and donors in targeting funds to address underlying issues
  - Existing tools include AgCLIR, World Bank Agribusiness Indicators (ABI)

- **Results-Driven Technical Assistance**
  - High-level attention and root cause analyses create foundation for successful interventions
  - Targeted technical assistance by government, private sector or donors
  - Improved AgBEE leads to more efficient and profitable operations

- **Increased Agricultural Growth**
  - More efficient and certain legal and regulatory environment
  - Lower cost business operations
  - More investment
  - Greater growth