



## **Summary of the Proceedings of Tuesday 21<sup>st</sup> March**

Review Workshop

20-22 March 2006

Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton, UK

## Programme for Tuesday 21 March – Future Agricultures Workshop

9.30 Opening session – Welcome (Lawrence Haddad), followed by introductions and overview of the Future Agricultures consortium (Ian Scoones)

*Chair:*

10.00 Country perspectives: future scenarios for agriculture – challenges and dilemmas (20 mins each presentation)

- Ethiopia – Samuel Gebreselassie/Amdissa Teshome
- Kenya – Rosemary Atieno (John Omiti/Gem Argwings-Kodhek)
- Malawi – Ephraim Chirwa (Blessings Chinsinga)

11.00 Coffee break

11.30 Panel commentary from invited participants – Diana Hunt (Kenya focus), Kay Sharp (Ethiopia focus), Stephen Devereux (Malawi focus), each reflecting on particular countries and across them.

12.00 Open discussion – key issues and challenges for each country, region and more broadly, highlighting next steps/priorities for Future Agricultures consortium work.

12.30 Lunch

*Chair: Richard Moberly, DFID*

14.00 Theme 1: Agricultural policy processes – what role for a Ministry of Agriculture in the 21<sup>st</sup> century? (Lidia Cabral – 20 mins)

Discussant – Peter Bazeley (independent consultant) (10 mins), followed by open discussion

15.00 Theme 2: Agricultural growth and social protection – conflict or complementarity? (Rachel Sabates-Wheeler/Jonathon Kydd – 20 mins)

Discussant – Felicity Proctor (NRI) and Tim Waites (DFID) (5 mins each), followed by discussion

16.00 Tea break

16.30 Closing session chaired by Ian Scoones – panel overview: gaps, challenges, priorities – followed by open discussion.

Panel: Michael Lipton (Univ of Sussex), Richard Moberly (DFID), Jamie Morrison (FAO), Erik Skoglund (Sida)

17.30 Close – next stages for the consortium work (Stephen Devereux)

## 1. Opening Session

In welcoming the workshop participants, Lawrence Haddad raised a number of challenging issues for the Consortium, which must coordinate between at least six organisations, with budget constraints and a relatively short time period of three years. He mentioned five key challenges:

- i. who is or should be the audience (aside from agricultural economists)?
- ii. how strategic should the Consortium be? Which windows of opportunity are open, and how can the Consortium coordinate with the FAO evaluation, CAADP, and works such as Cernea's edited volume *Culture in Agriculture*
- iii. how deep should the Consortium enquire? He noted the Consortium's founding principle of examining interlocking constraints, and discussed the issue of underlying constraints beneath obvious problems.
- iv. how new will the Consortium's work be? Lawrence noted the danger of repetition, of saying the same things in a different way.

## Introduction and Overview of the Consortium

Ian Scoones discussed the Consortium's aims, context (e.g. why now), focus, geographic and thematic focus, and next steps.

## 2. Country Perspectives

### Ethiopia – Samuel Gebreselassie and Amdissa Teshome

Samuel discussed his paper on scenarios. He noted four scenarios, including intensification, commercialisation, diversification, and depopulation. The importance of the scenarios varied in different regions of Ethiopia. He also discussed three issues: intensification, land tenure, and food aid. Regarding intensification, he noted that, despite PADETES, much of the increased output during 1995-2002 came from an expanded area cropped. He noted four challenges: (i) land unavailable (average farm size is 63% of that needed to maintain a livelihood); (ii) subsistence orientation (64% of farmers are net buyers); (iii) low commercialization; and (iv) weak urban-rural links.

Amdissa discussed his paper on policy processes. He noted the PRSP had been top-down, and that policy continued to be influenced by ideology rather than an assessment of costs and benefits. There is little prioritisation and a weak use of evidence in policy, and limited research-policy links. He stated that mixing policy debates and party politics undermined participation. He then outlined some differences between the two PRSP phases (SDPRP and PASDEP).

### Kenya – Rosemary Otieno

Rosemary noted that the Kenya team had been able to work with the Agricultural Sector Coordinating Unit, as well as with KIPPRA, Tegemeo Institute, and IDS (Nairobi). She described some well-known policy concerns, and then noted the priorities of the Strategy for the Revitalisation of Agriculture (SRA). On policy processes, she noted the legacy of state impetus, a fragmented parliament, and the ethnic and/or regional association of some agricultural commodities. She mentioned that there was scope for progress in policy, through conventional channels, private members' bills, lobby groups, and donor influence. She pointed to ways forward by improving the demand for better policy, information to stakeholders, work with Parliamentary Committees, farmer association capacity, and information on international experiences.

### **Malawi – Ephraim Chirwa**

Ephraim mentioned many of the well-known conditions and constraints facing Malawi, together with recommendations and priorities. He noted that Malawi's Economic Growth Strategy had begun to emphasize tobacco, cotton, tea, and sugarcane.

### **Panel Commentary**

#### **Ethiopia - Kay Sharp**

Kay made four main points. She firstly noted that different organisations and people distinguished different numbers of regions in Ethiopia, and suggested that this regional diversity might conflict with nationally-set policy processes. Secondly, she raised the issues of labour mobility, noting it was often rural-rural, and suggested that migration was greater than is often realized. Her third point was about commercialization and diversification, noting that they do not necessarily require state action, suggesting that the boundaries between agriculture and non-agricultural activities are not always clear, and asking how much non-agricultural activities depend on agriculture. She also mentioned that pastoralism was beginning to be considered in policy documents (and not simply in relation sedentarisation), and asked what role pastoralism has in the Consortium work.

#### **Kenya - Diana Hunt**

Diana raised mentioned four constraints on agricultural policy design: (i) vision; (ii) funding; (iii) corruption; and (iv) marketing. She noted the difficulty of the concept of minimum viable farm sizes, due to the fact that households often have multiple livelihoods. She also raised the issue of difficult external conditions (e.g. competition by Brazil). She noted that that the Kenya paper did not mention the current land policy debates. She discussed the issue of land tax, noting that it could be collected at a local level, but expenditure would have to be tied to local rural development programs. On credit, Diana mentioned that credit was constrained by more factors than the lack of land title to use for collateral. She also mentioned that nothing had been said about Low External Input Sustainable Agriculture (LEISA). Finally, she raised the issue that changing laws and regulations could help overcome corruption in marketing cooperatives (e.g. having external, non-coop members monitor the coops as in Italy).

#### **Malawi – Stephen Devereux**

Stephen stated that he believed Malawi is in a crisis, but this was not conveyed in the presentations and papers. He raised the question of what agriculture was for (including (i) growth and poverty reduction; (ii) national food sufficiency, stable prices, and reduced food aid; (iii) sustainable livelihoods). He noted the difficulty of integrating political and technical

analyses, and cautioned against long lists of familiar technical constraints. He noted the Malawi paper did not mention the food crisis in Malawi, which he suggested exacerbated and exposed the underlying structural deficiencies of Malawian agriculture (e.g. demand for *ganyu* work exceeding supply). He noted the need to learn from history, go beyond technical analyses of ‘market coordination failure’, and understand path dependency and the breakdown of the social contract in Malawi.

## **Plenary Discussion**

Discussions initially focused on the policy context for debates about agriculture in Africa. Ephraim Chirwa noted that in all three countries there is a shift from poverty to growth issues, from smallholders to commercialisation, and they receive similar advice from the World Bank and IMF, rather than policy makers actually being convinced. But, as encountered in the Malawi stakeholder workshops, there is actually a lot of debate about which way to go and whether the official position is proper.

Some participants observed that the framing of policy debate is problematic. For example, the smallholder v. commercial agriculture dichotomy is often a diversion. For policy debate to be useful, there has to be an understanding of changes in the context for agriculture. For example, Stephanie Barrientos noted that there has been a shift in some areas from smallholders to wage workers, yet this shift remains largely invisible to policy. There is a need to understand which mechanisms exist (if any) between commercialization, growth and poverty.

Discussion focused too on how to generate demand for better policy? What was the role of the Consortium in this? Is more information needed? While there are often lots of policy documents, implementation is more difficult. Drawing on Kenya’s experience, Gem Argwings-Kodhek argued that implementation is a key challenge – the bottleneck on the policy process. It is difficult to shepherd through the policies and strategies that do exist. How do we improve the system, and not just the content?

Participants commented on the need for neutral fora for discussion. There is a need to link to other than ministries besides Agriculture which often play important roles in the agricultural sector (e.g. Transport, Finance, etc.), as well as other coordinating public agencies that work outside the Ministry of Agriculture. A role was seen for research-policy links being fostered by networks like the Future Agriculture Consortium, but not to constrain the debate. Terri Sarch argued it would be useful to have more political economy analysis of different policy options – this would help stimulate dialogue, which is a key aim of the Consortium. Raising the question of visions for agriculture is critical, it was argued. Is it possible that in some cases agriculture will not be the main driver of growth and poverty reduction.

Andrew Dorward observed, that there is a need to think more about diversity in agriculture, including sub-sectors, social classes, geographical areas, etc. Lawrence Haddad observed that if the Consortium is going to focus on agricultures, then its important to map agricultures in the countries, perhaps by different stakeholders, which would highlight the politics, and highlight institutional issues, help us prioritize (water, infrastructure, extension, etc), sequencing, and most importantly, how agriculture is analyzed.

Felicity Proctor argued for an interrogation of assumptions underlying different scenarios: we need a much longer term view, looking inter-generationally, she observed. Lawrence

Haddad pointed out that there is perhaps a need to think more about ‘second best’ solutions. Is it possible that if we always try for ‘first best’ solutions and fail, then other options may then be precluded.

Overall, the session concluded that, given the budget and time constraints of the Consortium, focus is needed on policy process bottlenecks and implementation issues. This requires a focus on smallholders and poverty, perhaps to counter-balance the current policy emphasis exclusively on growth. Focusing on key issues, highlighted through the country-based scoping work, a focus on political economy themes was seen as essential.

### **3. Theme I: Policy Processes – Lidia Cabral**

Lidia discussed her and Ian Scoones’ paper. She suggested that the lack of clarity about the roles of states, combined with vested interests, resulted in failed markets and poverty. She noted that differences in donor policies are not always clear, as the policies are sometimes themselves contradictory or ambiguous because they are the result of compromises and differing visions. On realities, she noted that MoAs are often not key players, they operate under contradictory processes, aid investments potentially undermine effectiveness and interests are protected. The result has been a failure to pursue the potential of SWAP and PRSPs. She noted that the agricultural sector is often fragmented and MoAs need to balance and provide consistent voice. She suggested looking at (1) civil society’s role in state-market relations; (2) whether the private sector is a meaningful concept; and (3) local government and its different structures.

#### **Discussant – Peter Bazeley**

Peter raised the issue of the role of the third sector, and questioned whether it was limited. He asked whether it was possible to quantify some assumptions – such as market failures, or lack of capacity. He also noted the importance of studying donor behaviour, such as incentives and cycles. He asked whether MoAs are the best place to start for policy change. Is the MoA really the best form for coordination, or can other new organizational forms be thought of? He suggested consulting the literature on human and organizational behaviour. He also asked what is the role of international organizations (e.g. FAO).

#### **Plenary discussion**

In discussion, Michael Lipton observed that market failure is a precise concept, while state failure is not. The state-market debate is old. There has been a move away from detailed sector planning and towards more macro-economic management. The state sector is ultimately accountable to Parliament, but NGOs – though many do good – are mainly accountable to their funders.

Aaron DeGrassi noted that the paper neglected to mention that state intervention can be justified on democratic grounds, not just to solve market failures or distributional goals. Consequently there needs to be a greater dialogue between political analysts and agricultural economists. The suggestion that mobilisation is not a route to policy change is outdated. There is evidence of significant pressure in Cote d’Ivoire, Burkina Faso, Senegal, Zimbabwe, South Africa, etc. There is therefore a need to be cautious of the tendency to prematurely

dismiss the potential of rural political pressure. You can't make sweeping statements, and need to conduct specific political analysis.

Much discussion focused on the debate about the role of a Ministry of Agriculture. Felicity Proctor pointed out that current debates offer no effective, costed proposals for replacing old public MoAs. What would the 10% of budget advocated by CAADP be spent on? Do policy units really have all the resources they need to develop effective proposals? A key focus – as with the country papers – was what to do with PRSPs. Ministries of Finance have often inhibited MoAs. Martin Greeley pointed to the example of the Ugandan PRSP which was seen by the MoF as a roads and micro-credit plan. Maybe we should start by looking at Ministries of Finance and how they relate to MoAs, he suggested.

Diana Hunt asked: where do agricultural strategies get designed (MoA, cabinet?). Pointing to the Ethiopian experience, Amidssa Teshome observed that the Ethiopian MoA was strong 20 years ago, but not now. This is due in part to the declining influence and support of the FAO, the rise of NGOs, and regionalization/ethnicisation.

With donors playing such a key role in framing and influencing agricultural policy the relationship between donors, ministries and PRSP type processes was seen as key. The focus on the role of the state in coordination roles was also seen as an important issue for the Consortium's work. In addition to the donor perspectives outlined in the paper, Andrew Dorward suggested that there is possibly a four donor narrative in the Jeffrey Sachs promoted and Millennium Village approach.

#### **4. Theme II: Social Protection – Rachael Sabates-Wheeler and Andrew Dorward**

Rachel and Andrew summarized their paper. Social protection (SP) was considered as welfare, risk mitigation, and building of resilience. They tried to match ideas of social protection to the three phases of agricultural growth identified by Dorward et al. They also reviewed SP from agriculture, SP independent of agricultural growth, SP for agriculture, and SP through agriculture. They raised questions about design, implementation, and political economy issues.

#### **Discussants – Felicity Proctor and Tim Waites**

Felicity noted the need to place the social protection debate in the context of international changes, such as climate change, HIV/AIDS, etc. She also noted the huge numbers of people involved. She pointed to the need to consider different household types, improving relations between ministries of agriculture and welfare (for instance), coordinating with other groups (e.g. BASIS).

Tim mentioned that social protection ought to seek to do no harm. He noted that some measures are just quick fixes, and can be donor driven. Social protection is often cheaper than responding to emergencies. What happens when programmes are scaled up, and which roles does the private sector have?

#### **Plenary Discussion**

Michael Lipton cautioned that we ought to beware of trying to hit two aims with one instrument. Social protection measures can sometimes undermine markets and states. Can irrigation provide social protection? Many non-ag risks such as health and social expenses (e.g. marriage) are often significant, and could they then also be considered by social protection programmes? Are there anticipatable stresses? There are many unanswered questions about social protection in low income countries, observed Andrew Shepherd. Diana Hunt was surprised that there was little mention of migration and remittances, and education in the paper.

Stephanie Barrientos agreed that current challenges include issues that are not as clear as the model in the paper. How to combine multiple dimensions of households? What are the policy processes around social protection and agriculture? In South Africa and Kenya, social protection and agriculture work are in separate ‘bunkers’. What are the possible contributions of private sector actors?

## **5. Closing Session**

Erik Skogland (Sida) noted that Sida is smaller than DfID and tends to focus more on a few aspects rather than whole sectors. Too much emphasis has been focused on environment and social sectors relative to agriculture in the past 10-15 years. A recent workshop and paper noted that agricultural growth is key to poverty reduction, but will come more from staples than high value commodities. Green Revolutions are not just technical, but also involve policy. There is scope to involve Swedish institutions. He also discussed the importance of market orientation, farmer diversity, and the role of state provision of public goods and services. He raised the issue of how the Consortium’s work will be ‘packaged’.

Jamie Morrison (FAO), noted that the FAO’s Economic and Social Affairs division is interested in similar issues, but work mainly at an analytic rather than practical level. The commodities division does more practical work, but there is also a need for more attention to policy processes around trade, in addition to content.

Richard Moberly (DfID) argued that the big picture needs to be kept in mind. DfID expects the quality of policy dialogue to be raised. How to be sure that that dialogue is happening? Attention needs to be paid to implementation, real conditions, and politics. CAADP potentially offers an opportunity for dialogue and lesson-learning.

Michael Lipton (University of Sussex) urged the Consortium to make early contact with CAADP. He noted, that no country has reduced mass poverty without agricultural growth – the poor depend on labour, and agriculture provides more work per unit of capital than other sectors. Growth-led diversification is desirable, distress-push diversification is not. Farmers will not take risks on fertiliser without water, yet only %4 of SSA land has water control (40% in India, more in China). The Consortium ought to look at an issue as a ‘slice’ through political and administrative systems (perhaps fertilizer?).

### **Wrap Up: Stephen Devereux**

Where to next? What would be enticing to learn? Three challenges:

- Methods — scenarios. Do we make the themes and approaches uniform across countries?



- How do we extract lessons from one area for another?
- Scope of work: do we deepen the work within countries, or try to broaden it?

How to achieve maximum policy impact? Two proposals: look at long-term visions, and how they are formed. Or is it all about implementation, and the bottlenecks?

In discussion, Felicity Proctor asked the Consortium members to answer the questions: Who wants this work? Who is the ‘champion’ for it? High-level champions are usually necessary for impact, she noted. Perhaps the Consortium could also link to or follow up on the OPPG initiative. Martin Greeley wondered whether perhaps the Consortium ought to find examples of more successful endeavours on which to build a constituency based in success. Jonathan Kydd concurred: results come when people have a problem to solve and are looking for expertise. Diana Hunt observed that much of the discussion had focused on influencing policy, but perhaps the aim should be to promote policy debate and listen to what comes out. Gem Argwings-Kodhek agreed that issues certainly are not new, but there is a need to engage with policy debates in local contexts.

## Participant List

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Gem Argwings-Kodhek	Ministry of Agriculture/Tegemeo Institute, Kenya
Rosemary Atieno	IDS, University of Nairobi, Kenya
Stephanie Barrientos	IDS
Peter Bazeley	Peter Bazeley Development Consulting, UK
Åsa Bjällås	Rural Development Division, Sida, Sweden
Daniel Bradley	DFID
Lidia Cabral	ODI
Blessings Chinsinga	Chancellor College, University of Malawi
Ephraim Chirwa	Chancellor College, University of Malawi
Aaron deGrassi	Independent Researcher
Stephen Devereux	IDS
Andrew Dorward	Imperial College, London
Samuel Gebreselassie	Ethiopian Economic Association
Clare Gorman	IDS
Martin Greeley	IDS
Lawrence Haddad	IDS
Diana Hunt	University of Sussex
Jonathan Kydd	Imperial College, London
Melissa Leach	IDS
Jen Leavy	IDS
Michael Lipton	University of Sussex
Richard Moberly	DFID
Jamie Morrison	FAO/Imperial College, London
John Omiti	Kenya Institute of Public Policy Research and Analysis
Colin Poulton	Imperial College, London
Felicity Proctor	Natural Resources Institute (NRI), UK
Rachel Sabates-Wheeler	IDS
Terri Sarch	DFID
Ian Scoones	IDS
Kay Sharp	ODI
Andrew Shepherd	ODI
Erik Skoglund	Rural Development Division, Sida, Sweden
Amdissa Teshome	A-Z Consult, Ethiopia
Rob Tripp	ODI
Boudy van Schagen	IDS
Steve Wiggins	Imperial College, London
Tim Waites	DFID
Will Wolmer	IDS