

# APAP Staff Papers

## AGRICULTURAL POLICY ANALYSIS PROJECT

---

---

Sponsored by the

### **U.S. Agency for International Development**

Assisting AID Missions and Developing Country Governments  
to Improve Food and Agricultural Policies

Prime Contractor: Aht Associates Inc.

Subcontractors: Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc.  
Abel, Daft & Earley, Inc.  
Oklahoma State University

PN-AAV-312

**Abt Associates Inc.**  
55 Wheeler Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138-1168  
Telephone • 617-492-7100  
TWX: 710-3201382

AGRICULTURAL POLICY  
ANALYSIS AND PLANNING:  
A SUMMARY OF TWO RECENT ANALYSES

May 7, 1986

Authors: John S. Tilney, Jr.  
Dr. James T. Riordan

Submitted to:

Dr. Phillip Church  
Agency for International Development  
S&T/AGR, SA-18  
Room 403  
1601 N. Kent Street (Rosslyn Plaza)  
Rosslyn, VA 22209

## FOREWORD

This publication is one of a series of staff papers that are part of the continuing effort of the Agricultural Policy Analysis Project (APAP), sponsored by the Office of Agriculture in AID's Bureau of Science and Technology, to disseminate the experience it has been accumulating in the area of agricultural policy analysis. Through interactions with policy makers, country analysts and AID missions in Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, the Near East and Asia, APAP has identified and concentrated its technical resources on the following themes:

- Developing agendas for an informed mission-host country dialogue on economic policies constraining progress in agriculture.
- Defining food aid strategies and programs that foster and support economic policy reform measures.
- Identifying input and output price reform programs that stimulate agricultural production and productivity.
- Fostering private sector participation in input supply and product marketing and redefining the role of parastatal institutions.
- Developing the indigenous capacity of host-country institutions to provide the information needed to analyze, formulate, and implement policies conducive to agricultural development.

This paper reviews, in summary form, AID's worldwide experience in supporting agricultural policy and planning projects. It presents preliminary findings of two studies, a comprehensive comparative analysis of AID's agricultural policy projects that APAP has in progress, and a completed evaluation of similar policy projects in Latin America. The authors conclude that while AID has had considerable success in building capacity to analyze policy issues in host-country governments, it has had less success with these projects in fostering policy reform.

We hope this and other APAP Staff Papers in the series will provide useful information and analysis to all those involved in the continuing agricultural policy dialogue between AID and host-country governments. We welcome comments, criticism, questions, and suggestions from our readers.

## ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes the findings of two studies that reviewed 129 AID-sponsored agricultural policy and planning projects carried out since 1970--ranging from 3-week studies to multiyear sector assessments--in Africa, Asia, the Near East, and Latin America and the Caribbean. Impact analysis revealed that in a narrow sense the projects were successful in achieving their purposes, which were primarily capacity building and host-country personnel training. Less common were projects that yielded policy/program changes or that increased the awareness of decision makers about the importance of policy analysis and reform. A three-pronged diagnostic approach for future project design is recommended that includes (1) a consideration of the agricultural sector and the policies that constrain sector development, (2) a review of what key decision makers want and need, and (3) an examination of the capacity of host-country governments to engage in policy analysis and planning.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD .....	i
ABSTRACT .....	ii
I. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	1
II. PROCEDURES FOLLOWED IN THE ANALYSIS AND A DESCRIPTION OF PROJECTS.....	3
III PROJECT GOALS, PURPOSES AND IMPACTS.....	6
IV. LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PROJECT DESIGN.....	11
APPENDIX A: LISTING OF PROJECTS.....	A-1

## I. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Over the past 20 years, the Agency for International Development (AID) has funded a broad range of agricultural policy and planning projects worldwide. The agency has supported many types of activities, including development of agricultural sector data bases, creation of planning units within government, training of host country staff in policy analysis, and implementation of policy and programmatic changes.

This paper synthesizes the findings of two recent studies which reviewed AID-sponsored agricultural policy and planning projects worldwide over the past 15 years. The first was the final report of a study<sup>1</sup> which examined the impacts and effectiveness of AID-sponsored agricultural planning projects in Latin America and the Caribbean region. The second was an interim report<sup>2</sup> of a study which examined agricultural planning and policy analysis projects in Africa, Asia, and the Near East since 1970. The results of the interim report are included here because the final report is not yet complete, but the interim report did produce a number of valuable findings concerning projects undertaken in these three regions. The two studies used essentially the same methodology and therefore provide a consistent way of examining the effectiveness and impacts of AID-sponsored projects worldwide.

The intent of these studies has been to glean information from past projects that will help in the design of better agricultural policy and planning projects. This paper summarizes the results of these two studies so that the findings can be widely disseminated to professionals involved in the agricultural policy and planning arena.

The major conclusion of the analysis is that, in a narrow sense, the agricultural policy analysis and planning projects sponsored by AID during the 1970s and early 1980s successfully achieved their primary purpose, which was

---

<sup>1</sup> Abt Associates Inc. Evaluation of Agricultural Sector Planning Activities in Latin America and the Caribbean, June 1982.

<sup>2</sup> Agricultural Policy Analysis and Planning Project, A Comparative Analysis of Agricultural Policy and Planning Projects in Africa, Asia and the Near-East, October 15, 1984.

to improve the analytical capacity of staff in host country governments. The projects were less successful, however, in triggering policy and programmatic change. Policy issues were often not given sufficient emphasis in project design and subsequently downplayed during project implementation.

If AID is to have its support contribute more directly to policy reform and programmatic change, it appears that its approach to, and design of, policy analysis and planning projects needs to be modified. First, there needs to be more diagnosis of what the major problems of the agricultural sector are and what policies constrain development. The diagnosis needs to be done prior to, or as part of, project design so that the projects can be more specific about what policy issues need to and can be addressed. Secondly, far greater attention should be given to the needs of host country decision makers. Without this support and active participation, experience suggests there is little reason to initiate a project. Finally, the strategy for targeting assistance to host country governments needs to be re-examined. Assistance should be targeted to those government units which decision makers rely on for policy analysis; these units may be located outside the Ministry of Agriculture.

More specific recommendations are enclosed in the body of this report for the design of future AID-sponsored agricultural policy and planning projects. It is encouraging to note that some of the recommendations which are made in this report concerning AID projects implemented in the 1970s and early 1980s have been incorporated into a new group of projects which AID designed in the mid-1980s and is currently implementing in countries such as Niger, Ecuador, and the Philippines. It will be interesting to observe what these new projects accomplish in the years to come.

## II. PROCEDURES FOLLOWED IN THE ANALYSIS AND A DESCRIPTION OF PROJECTS

### Procedures followed in the Analysis

Although AID has conducted numerous evaluations of individual projects, relatively little attention has been paid to assessing the overall impact of agricultural policy and planning assistance. The two studies summarized here are an exception because, in the aggregate, they compare and contrast the results of AID-sponsored agricultural planning and policy analysis projects across all four regions of the world. These studies also focus on the impacts of AID-sponsored projects, and the reasons why certain projects have achieved greater impacts than others.

The studies identify four different kinds of impacts that agricultural policy analysis and planning activities can have. The four kinds of impacts are capacity-building impacts (that is, impacts on the capacity of institutions to conduct policy analysis and planning and to provide input to policy making effectively), interinstitutional impacts (that is, impacts of policy analysis and planning institutions on other public or private sector institutions), decisionmaker impacts (that is, impacts on the awareness, of or demand by, decisionmakers for policy analysis and planning), policy and program impacts (that is, impacts on policy and programmatic decisions).<sup>1</sup> In these studies, the effectiveness of agricultural policy analysis and planning activities is assessed according to the impacts that have resulted from them.

The Agency for International Development's own project evaluations were used to identify these different types of impacts, and in the Latin American study a series of site visits and case studies were used to expand upon the information available in AID evaluations. The Africa, Asia, and Near East study has not yet had the benefit of such site visits and case studies, but these will take place in the future.

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Africa, Asia, and Near-East study, the socio-economic impacts of policy analysis and planning projects were also examined. This type of impact was not considered in the LAC study, however, and so it has not been included here for the sake of consistency.

These studies attempted to review all agricultural policy and planning projects funded by AID since 1970 or other types of AID-sponsored projects which had had a major policy or planning component. A list of all of the projects included in the two studies is shown in Appendix A. Even though most of the policy analysis and planning projects sponsored by AID were identified, only about half of these projects had been evaluated by them. Thus, the impact analysis considered only those projects which had been evaluated. It is entirely possible that the additional projects had different types of impacts, but the sample was sufficiently large that the major findings are applicable to the universe of policy and planning projects. The type of information available on each of the projects is also shown in Appendix A.

#### A Description of AID-Supported Agricultural Policy Analysis and Planning Projects in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Caribbean, and the Near East

The intent of these studies has been to review the experience of all AID funded agricultural policy analysis and planning projects in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Caribbean, and the Near East since 1970. In Latin America and the Caribbean Regions (LAC), 63 policy analysis and planning activities were identified, while in Africa, Asia, and the Near East, 66 projects<sup>1</sup> were identified from available documentation. The reason that the LAC region had such a relatively large number is that 23 small planning or policy activities which were not formal projects were included, while this type of activity was excluded from the Africa, Asia and Near East study because of the difficulty of obtaining good documentation.

The 129 projects and activities represent assistance to 47 countries worldwide. In Africa 18 countries received assistance compared with 9 in Asia, 16 in Latin America and the Caribbean, and 5 countries in the Near East. Ten of the projects are regional in scope -- 3 in Africa and 7 in Latin America and the Caribbean.

The amount of funds which has been allocated to agricultural policy and planning since 1970 amounts to \$464 million, as shown in Exhibit 1. This sum

---

<sup>1</sup> These were the projects included in the Interim Report. It is anticipated that the Final Report will have a somewhat modified list of projects.

Exhibit 1

FUNDING OF AGRICULTURAL  
POLICY AND PLANNING ACTIVITIES

Region	Number of Projects and Activities	Funding in \$000s				
		AID GRANT	AID LOAN	HOST COUNTRY	OTHER	TOTAL
Africa <sup>1</sup>	40	\$121,193	\$ 5,400	\$ 41,493	\$15,275	\$183,361
Asia <sup>1</sup>	16	32,850	16,000	65,189	5,684	119,723
Latin Ameri- ca and Caribbean <sup>2</sup>	63	29,986	19,528	38,106	6,011	93,631
Near East <sup>1</sup>	5	52,837	0	11,429	3,606	67,872
TOTAL	124	\$236,866	\$40,928	\$156,217	\$30,576	\$464,587

<sup>1</sup> In Africa, Asia, and the Near East, funding information was available for only 61 of the 66 projects.

<sup>2</sup> The LAC Region contains 23 small policy analysis and planning activities which were not formal AID Projects. The funding for the LAC Region is from 1970-82, while the funding in the other regions is from 1970-84. Thus, the LAC would be higher if the additional two years were included.

does not include amounts spent on activities other than agricultural planning and policy analysis, such as inputs of commodities or sector loans which were incorporated in some of the projects. It should be noted that we used a broad definition of policy and planning projects and included activities such as data collection, survey implementation and training, which are part of the policy analysis and planning process. This is the reason for the large amount of total funds spent on these activities. AID's contribution has amounted to \$277.8 million, or approximately 60 percent of the total, most of which has been grants. The total amount allocated to policy analysis and planning has been greatest in Africa (\$183 million), followed by Asia (\$119 million), LAC (\$93 million), and the Near East (\$67 million). As this information indicates, AID, host countries, and other donors have made a sizeable investment in agricultural policy and planning since 1970.

### III. PROJECT GOALS, PURPOSES AND IMPACTS

#### Project Goals and Purposes

It is useful to review the goals and purposes in the logical framework of AID-sponsored policy and planning projects. Project goals tended to be general and called for overall improvement in agricultural sector performance and improvement in the life of rural people. Goals were highly consistent across projects.

Project purposes were more concrete and defined the substance of projects in more detail. Analysis of project purposes revealed several generalizations applicable to the entire set of policy analysis and planning projects. In the first place, most projects had capacity building as an objective. Second, most projects included training of host country personnel as a major purpose. Third, few projects were designed specifically to analyze and bring about changes in defined areas of agricultural policy. Policy analysis and policy reforms were rarely identified as key project purposes.

## Impacts of AID-Sponsored Policy Analysis and Planning Projects

AID-sponsored agricultural policy analysis and planning projects have had a substantial impact on the capacity of host country governments to engage in policy analysis and planning. In fact, capacity-building impacts were, by far, the most prevalent. Fully 58 of the 61 projects<sup>1</sup> (see Exhibit 2) have had capacity-building impacts. Capacity impacts usually resulted from the formation of a new policy analysis or planning unit, the addition of new qualified staff to existing units, or the upgrading of staff in existing units through long-term training. In Liberia, for instance, the Agricultural Program Development Project resulted in the formation of a Statistical Division and a Planning Bureau in the Ministry of Agriculture, while in Thailand the Agricultural Sector Analysis Project succeeded in establishing a unit which was able for the first time to apply economic analysis to policy problems in the agricultural sector. The presence of capacity impacts did not tend to vary by region. Given the purposes of most projects, it is not surprising that their major impact has been capacity building.

Interinstitutional impacts were observed in 64 percent of the projects reviewed (39 of 61 projects). These impacts have resulted from improved coordination between agricultural policy analysts and planners and their counterparts in other public sector agencies or private sector organizations. The major type of interinstitutional impact has been the establishment of inter-agency boards or commissions, which by their nature improve institutional coordination. In Indonesia, for example, the Assistance to Agriculture Project was responsible for the formation of an interdepartmental fertilizer management board, while in Honduras an Agricultural Policy Commission was established through an AID project and was able to promote common methodologies for policy analysis across institutions involved in the agricultural sector. Improved communications between units in government was also a frequently noted interinstitutional impact. In Tunisia, staff working on the Agricultural Economic Research and Planning Project were responsible for the first effective collaboration between the Ministry of Planning and the Ministry of Agriculture

---

<sup>1</sup> As mentioned on page 3, a total of 129 projects were identified, but only 61 of these had been evaluated, so this is the number of projects considered in the impact analysis.

Exhibit 2

DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECT IMPACTS BY REGION

IMPACTS	REGION								Total	
	Africa		Asia		Latin America and Caribbean		Near East			
	Number n=24	Percent	Number n=12	Percent	Number n=22	Percent	Number n=3	Percent	Number n=61	Percent
Policy-Program	6	25%	5	42%	9	41%	0	0%	20	33%
Decision maker	9	38%	6	50%	9	41%	0	0%	24	39%
Interinstitutional	10	42%	7	58%	20	91%	2	66%	39	64%
Capacity-Building	21	88%	12	100%	22	100%	3	100%	58	95%

on medium-term investment planning. Interinstitutional impacts were most frequent in LAC projects (91 percent) followed by the Near East (66 percent), Asia (58 percent), and Africa (42 percent).

Decisionmaker impacts were observed in 24 of the 61 projects (39 percent). Decisionmaker impacts have been quite varied, but the most prevalent has been increased demand for information and analysis by decisionmakers. The other relatively common impact has been the development of greater understanding by decisionmakers of the agricultural sector and its relationships with other sectors of the economy. In Kenya, the Rural Planning Project provided a great deal of information to key officials about the needs of small farmers, which eventually translated into the targeting of more assistance to this group in the country's Development Plan. Similarly, in Bangladesh the staff working on the Rural Finance Experimental Program provided key officials with information and insight about the agricultural credit system and possibilities for revising their programs. Asian projects have been slightly more successful than LAC and African projects in this regard; no decisionmaker impacts were observed in Near East projects.

Policy and program impacts were observed in 20 of the 61 projects (33 percent). Such impacts result when AID-sponsored projects contributed to actual changes in policies or programs. Some examples included changes in commodity pricing policies, credit policies, marketing policies, legislation on land redistribution, commodity distribution policies, and investment policies. In Indonesia, for instance, a flexible fertilizer pricing system and an expanded rice storage program were established because of work on the Assistance to Agriculture Project. In Ghana, the staff working on the National Agricultural Planning Project developed proposals for a National Fertilizer and Seed Program which were accepted and funded by the government. The regional distribution of policy and program impacts follows a pattern similar to those of of interinstitutional and decisionmaker impacts. In Asia and Latin America, policy and program impacts were observed in approximately 42 percent of the projects in question. In Africa and the Near East, the corresponding percentages are 22 and zero. It should be stressed, however, that this simple calculation does not account for the differences among the policy/programs impacts identified. As might be expected, some impacts were more dramatic than others.

The major conclusion of the impact analysis is that in a narrow sense the projects were successful in achieving their purposes, which dealt primarily with capacity building and training. Policy reform and programmatic change were not major purposes of the projects in question, so it is not surprising that these types of impacts were not as common as capacity-building impacts. The projects also had some impact on increasing the awareness of decision-makers about the importance of analysis and changes in policy, but these were also considerably less frequent than capacity-building and interinstitutional impacts.

Another major conclusion has to do with regional differences in impacts. Projects in Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean have had substantially more policy/program and decisionmaker impacts than African and Near Eastern projects. The reason that the Near Eastern projects have had such little impact is quite straightforward. There were only three Near Eastern projects in our sample, and the projects in question focused on data gathering and analysis. They were not designed to result in decisionmaker or policy impacts. The relatively low level of policy impacts in Africa as compared with Asia and Latin America has three major explanations:

- Asian and LAC countries have placed greater emphasis on agriculture than African countries and have tended to provide more support to AID-sponsored projects.
- AID-sponsored projects in Africa have been more involved in basic institution building and less involved in actual policy analysis and implementation issues than projects in Asia and Latin America.
- The logistics of carrying out projects have been more difficult in Africa than in other regions.

These three reasons appear to account for most of the differences in performance between African, Asian, and LAC projects. This was to be expected given the limited manpower and institutional resources in Africa as compared with the other regions.

#### IV. LESSONS LEARNED AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE DESIGN

While it is important to understand the types of impacts AID-sponsored policy analysis and planning projects have had, it is also critical to understand what factors have contributed to the relative effectiveness of these projects. As mentioned earlier, AID has funded a number of different types of activities under these projects, and these activities have somewhat different objectives and different reasons to explain their relative effectiveness. In this section, the three major activities undertaken as part of these projects -- policy analysis and planning, institution-building, and data collection and analysis -- are examined separately.

##### Policy Analysis and Planning Activities

Policy analysis and planning activities have been major components of these projects. These activities have ranged from multiyear sector assessments and modeling efforts to three-week studies undertaken by short-term advisors. While it is difficult to compare activities which are so different in scale, there are a number of conclusions which can be drawn overall:

- Real contact between analysts and decisionmakers needs to be established. In prior projects, there has been a general and pervasive lack of such contact. Institutionally, there appears to be little real demand for policy analysis and planning, that is, a demand that grows out of policy concerns and is formulated in specific terms. Analytical units often have no clear mandate as to what they are supposed to do and, as a consequence, operate in a vacuum. In the design and implementation of projects, major issues of concern to decisionmakers need to be identified and addressed. The approach to this is discussed in more detail below.
- Agricultural policy analysis and planning should generally concentrate on fast turn-around, highly focused, problem-oriented studies. Long-term data-intensive activities are wont to run into technical difficulties, become disengaged from pressing policy issues, and often cost far more than initially estimated. In general, policy analysis activities should be relatively short-term, that is, they should not take longer than a year. There is also a role for long-term developmental ef-

forts, but these projects need to produce findings on a periodic basis and engage in short-term analytical efforts as well.

- Flexibility is a critical ingredient. There have been a number of relatively open-ended projects designed to address key problems as they arise. Such projects have more often resulted in policy and programmatic change than tightly defined, highly structured projects. Flexibility can be built into a project by setting money aside for special activities and by providing mechanisms for project staff to identify and work on open-ended activities.
- The quality of the technical advisory team is critical to the success of a project. An advisory team heavily laden with dogma or preconceived ideas will quickly isolate themselves. The most effective teams have taken a low-keyed, hard working posture and have appeared to be working for key people in government -- not vice-versa. Identifying this type of technical advisory staff may be the single most important element of the project design and implementation process.
- It is necessary to free up technical advisory personnel from administrative demands on their time. In the case of expatriate advisors, it is generally unrealistic to expect a Chief of Party both to exert technical leadership and to serve as project manager without a capable on-site administrative assistant.
- Analytical methods need to be kept simple. In technology transfer activities, the absorptive capacity of host-country technicians must be kept clearly in mind. There is a real danger that esoteric techniques may never be used after AID support ceases. As a rule, therefore, keep it simple.

### Institution-Building

Institution-building or capacity building have been prevalent activities in all of the projects examined. These activities have included support for the creation of new analytical units; training of host-country staff; and the provision of technical advisors for long and short term assistance to support host country institutions. A number of lessons have become apparent from the evaluation:

- Targeting of assistance is a critical ingredient for institution-building and will often explain whether a project results in impact on decisionmakers or policy and programs. Too often, project assistance has been targeted to isolated units which serve primarily a data collection and statistical function. Effective projects have targeted assistance to people in Ministries who can bring about change. The actual location tends to be less important than the organizational influence of the manager of the unit, the analytical capability of staff in the unit, and the level of interaction with decisionmakers.
- The policy agenda should be set jointly by decisionmakers and analysts. As mentioned above, there has been a pervasive lack of contact between decisionmakers and analysts. Workshops, seminars, or working meetings involving the Minister or Secretary are necessary to bridge the gap between analysts and decisionmakers. The most effective way to involve the decisionmakers, however, appears to be to produce a study whose findings they can use in the restructuring of policies and programs.
- Effective planning and policy analysis requires leadership and continuity of technically capable personnel. Most countries have problems in attracting and retaining qualified people. The payscale and opportunities for advancement are usually poor. Long-term overseas training has been demonstrated as an effective incentive to attract qualified candidates. Incentives to retain qualified staff also need to be built into projects, such as improvements to office space and equipment, the provision of housing and vehicles, and short-term training courses and seminars. If AID-sponsored projects can result in a small number of well-trained and dynamic host country staff, this is usually sufficient to make an effective policy analysis unit.
- The level of host country support will often determine the outcome of a project. When the host country government provided the type of support originally envisioned in terms of finances, staff, and facilities, the project was far more likely to be completed successfully and to have had impacts. This has several implications for the design and implementation of projects. Project designers need to be more realistic and careful about what support the country will actually provide on a project. If a country is unwilling or unable to provide the agreed upon support during the project, AID should consider either a major restructuring or termination of the project because it is unlikely that the project will achieve its purposes.

### Data-Related Activities

The third major component of many projects was data-intensive activities. These included agricultural censuses, household and consumer surveys, production surveys, and the construction and use of other data bases on the sector. The main lessons learned concerning these activities are listed below:

- Data-related activities can support, but not trigger, analytical work. In many instances, the collection and maintenance of data has grown into a far larger and more expensive undertaking than anticipated and has often become a large isolated undertaking. Data activities should grow from, and be directly tied to, the requirements of a specific analysis or series of analyses.
- Inadequacy of existing data is not, in and of itself, a sufficient rationale for launching major new data collection initiatives. Analysts are wont to complain that data at their disposal are flawed and therefore unusable. In many instances, this can be a pretext for policy analysts and planners to sidestep their responsibility to perform analytical work. No data are ever perfect and, as a rule, much more can be done with what is at one's disposal than is generally the case.
- Agricultural policy and planning units should generally not have direct responsibility for data-related activities. It is important for agricultural sector analysts to have a say in what data are collected, but, on balance, it is probably preferable that the statistical and analytical functions of planning and policy analysis be assigned to distinct institutional units.
- Consistency checks should be built into all data collection and processing efforts. With the magnitude of some of the data sets developed, errors are highly likely to occur. If errors are not found and corrected before data are presented in statistical reports, the whole credibility of a statistical activity can be brought into question. As a consequence, explicit attention needs to be paid to data review and evaluation. Whenever possible, data should be carefully assessed through consistency tests, error analysis, sensitivity analysis, tracking tests, or, at a minimum, review by knowledgeable professionals. For survey data, secondary sources of data should be checked as a rough gauge of accuracy and reliability.

- Improved planning for computers is required. In many cases it appears that insufficient forethought and planning has gone into the use of computers. In computer-intensive activities, substantial up-front planning is generally required to guarantee an appropriate mix of hardware, software, and in-country support services at a reasonable cost.

### An Approach to Future Project Design

The set of projects reviewed in these two studies have not, as a rule, had policy or program change as stated objectives. Consequently, it should not come as a surprise that the projects in question have had relatively little impact on policies and programs. They have, however, definitely contributed to the building of host country capacity for policy analysis and planning. Unfortunately, it is not at all clear that the creation of such capacity translates itself into constructive policy and program changes. This may be true in the long run, but experience indicates that the translation is far from automatic in the short run.

If AID is to have its support contribute more directly to policy reform and programmatic change, it appears that its approach to, and design of, policy analysis and planning projects needs to be modified. First, there needs to be more diagnosis of what the major problems of the agricultural sector are and what policies constrain sector development. The diagnosis needs to be done prior to, or as part of, project design so that projects can be more specific about what policy issues need to and can be addressed.

The second area of diagnosis which also needs far greater attention is the review of what key decisionmakers want and need. Decisionmakers will likely have their own ideas about what constrains the growth and productivity of the agricultural sector, and they will usually have more insight than expatriate advisors or USAID Mission staff about what policy areas are politically possible to address. This second area of diagnosis was referred to in the Latin America and Caribbean study as a demand baseline study.

The third area of diagnosis is to examine the capacity of host country governments to engage in policy analysis and planning. This review of capacity should seek to identify which analysts the decisionmakers rely on for in-

formation as well as to examine the training and number of staff in planning or analytical units. This review should be used to reveal those units or analysts that can effect change.

In more specific terms, the elements of this three-pronged diagnostic approach would include:

#### Elements Concerning the Agriculture Sector

- What has been the performance of the agricultural sector over the past one and five years?
- How has this compared to other countries of similar size and physical conditions?
- Have there been major differences in performances among segments of the agricultural sector? What explains these differences?

#### Elements Concerning Agricultural Policies and Policymakers

- What are the major policies which affect the growth and productivity of the agricultural sector?
- Why were these policies instituted?
- Which policies have the potential for change over the next five years?
- Who are the major actors in the policy arena?
- In what kinds of activities do Ministry of Agriculture and other decisionmakers spend the bulk of their time?
- What other public sector institutions have influence?
- What are the key interest groups in the agricultural sector?
- What is the nature of the relationships that exist among the Ministry of Agriculture, the National Planning Office, and the Ministry of Finance?
- What institutional mechanisms come into play in decisions on what to fund and what not to fund?

### Elements Concerning the Agricultural Sector Planning or Analytical Unit

- Which analytical units do decisionmakers rely upon for policy analysis?
- In what specific activities is the agricultural sector planning or policy analysis unit involved?
- What are the relative priorities of these different activities?
- Who defines what the agricultural sector planning or analysis unit does?
- How many people work in the unit?
- What are their qualifications?
- What role does the analytical unit play in the preparation of plans and the development of projects?
- How extensive are the contacts of the analytical unit with other institutions, in both the public and private sectors?

The objective of these questions is to provide a basis for making informed judgments as to the kinds of activities that can be expected to have the most impact in upcoming projects. This three-pronged diagnosis may be incorporated into the Country Development Strategy Statement (CDSS) as well as the background work for a project paper. The underlying premise is simply that the point of departure for designing future agricultural sector planning and policy analysis activities must be things as they are, not things as one might like them to be.

It should be stressed that this diagnosis is usually an involved and complicated process and may require adjustments to the project design process. In many cases, project designers come with definite preconceptions as to what the major elements of the project should be. The design process, therefore, is often marked by a search for evidence that will buttress the validity of preconceptions rather than by a search to identify the key elements that currently drive the planning and decision making enterprise. This is really a matter of degree, of course, but the tendency is still there. Meetings between a Minister of Agriculture and a project design team, for example, are

often a forum in which the Minister reacts to the team's ideas, rather than vice-versa. And when a team does make a conscious attempt to use these meetings to learn what makes the Minister "tick," it often feels frustrated by an inability to elicit more than generalities, at one extreme ("Our objectives are to increase production, increase incomes, and improve the distribution of income"), or, at the other extreme, to get much beyond what it considers to be picayune details ("We're having trouble in getting everyone to sign off on the release of the rice project equipment from customs").

The moral of the story, therefore, is that a diagnosis of concerns and problems generally can not be put together from a series of brief meetings between the design team and the Minister. The diagnosis takes time and often requires piecing together a variety of details to see the whole picture. Frequent contacts with agricultural sector planning and analytical units can be key to this process, but the guiding philosophy of the contacts should be different from what has often been the case in the past. Rather than viewing these contacts as a mechanism for identifying things that planners and analysts would like to do, project designers should rely on them more as a means of finding out what decisionmakers would like them to do.

This three-pronged approach to the design of policy analysis and planning projects is considered essential to the project design process and therefore has been highlighted separately. Not all of this work can be incorporated into the project design process all the time. It will also have to be undertaken as part of project implementation and background work for the Country Development Strategy Statements. In any case, this information needs to be considered in order for projects to be effectively designed and implemented in the future.

## APPENDIX A

## AGRICULTURAL POLICY AND PLANNING PROJECTS INCLUDED IN THE TWO STUDIES

Project <sup>1,2</sup>	Project Paper	Mid-term, Interim, or Special Evaluation	Final Evaluation
<b>AFRICA</b>			
<u>Botswana</u>			
1. Agricultural Planning (633-0067)	X	X	
<u>Cameroon</u>			
2. Agricultural Management and Planning (631-0008)	X	X	
<u>Ethiopia</u>			
3. Agricultural Advisory Services (663-0111)	X	X	
4. Agricultural Sector Planning (663-0172)	X	X	
5. Drought Recovery and Rehabilitation (663-0187)	X	X	
<u>Gambia</u>			
6. Mixed Farming and Resource Management (635-0203)	X	X	
<u>Ghana</u>			
7. National Agricultural Planning (641-0048)	X	X	
8. District Planning and Rural Development (641-0073)	X		X
<u>Kenya</u>			
9. Agricultural Planning (615-0133)	X	X	
10. Rural Planning (615-0162)	X	X	X
11. Rural Planning II (615-0189)	X	X	
12. Arid and Semi-Arid Land Development (615-0172)	X	X	
<u>Lesotho</u>			
13. Agricultural Sector Analysis (632-0064)	X	X	
14. Agricultural Planning (632-0218)	X	X	
<u>Liberia</u>			
15. Agricultural Program Development (669-0123)	X	X	X
16. Agricultural Cooperative Development (669-0127)	X	X	
17. Agricultural Sector Analysis and Planning (669-0137)	X	X	
18. YMCA Agricultural Training and Development (669-0141)	X		
<u>Mali</u>			
19. Livestock Sector I (668-0203)	X	X	
<u>Mauritania</u>			
20. Renewable Resources Management (682-0205)	X	X	
21. Rural Assessment and Manpower Survey (682-0211)	X		X
<u>Niger</u>			
22. Evaluation Assistance to Ministry of Planning (683-0229)	X		
23. Forestry and Land Use Planning (683-0230)	X		
24. Integrated Livestock Production (683-0242)	X		
25. Agricultural Production Support (683-0234)	X		
26. Cereals Research (683-0225)	X		
<u>Rwanda</u>			
27. Agricultural Survey and Analysis (696-0115)	X		

<sup>1</sup>In a number of instances, sector assessments or other activities (usually funded by the PDS mechanisms) were included. These did not have project papers or evaluations, but all available documentation on these activities was obtained.

<sup>2</sup>Numbers in parentheses following each project title are the numbers AID has assigned to each project.

## APPENDIX A (continued)

Project	Project Paper	Mid-term, Interim, or Special Evaluation	Final Evaluation
<u>Senegal</u>			
28. Casamance Regional Development (685-0205)	X	X	
29. Agricultural Research and Planning (685-0223)	X		
<u>Sudan</u>			
30. Agricultural Planning and Statistics (650-0047)	X		
31. Rural Development Planning (650-0012)	X		
32. Southern Region Agricultural Development I (650-0046)	X		
<u>Tanzania</u>			
33. Livestock Marketing Development (621-0122)	X	X	X
<u>Upper Volta</u>			
34. Grain Marketing Development (686-0243)	X		
35. Eastern REgion Food Production (686-0244)	X		
<u>Zaire</u>			
36. Agricultural Economic Development (660-0050)	X	X	X
37. Agricultural Sector Studies (660-0070)	X	X	
<u>Zambia</u>			
38. Agricultural Training, Planning, and Institutional Development (611-0075)	X	X	
<u>AFRICAN REGIONAL PROJECT</u>			
39. Gambia River Basin Development (625-0012)	X		
40. Niger River Development Planning (625-0915)	X		
41. Entente Food Production (626-0203)	X	X	
<u>ASIA</u>			
<u>Bangladesh</u>			
42. Agricultural Sector Assessment			
43. Rural Finance Experimental Project (388-0025)	X		X
<u>Indonesia</u>			
44. Assistance to Agricultural Planning (497-0189)	X	X	
45. Agricultural Development Planning and Administration (497-0625)	X		
<u>Korea</u>			
46. Rural Policy Plan and Development (489-0594)	X	X	
<u>Laos</u>			
47. Agricultural Development - Administration & Planning (439-0065)	X	X	
<u>Nepal</u>			
48. Strengthening Institutional Capacity (367-0144)	X		
49. Administration and Management (367-0101)	X		
50. Resource Conservation and Utilization (367-0132)	X	X	
<u>Pakistan</u>			
51. Agricultural Research (391-0296)	X	X	
52. Agricultural Inputs (391-0419)	X	X	

Project	Project Paper	Mid-term, Interim, or Special Evaluation	Final Evaluation
<u>Philippines</u>			
53. Small Farmers Income and Production (492-0259)	X		
54. Integrated Agricultural Production and Marketing (492-0302)	X	X	X
55. Agricultural Research (492-0280)	X	X	
56. Agricultural Research II (492-0286)	X	X	
<u>Sri Lanka</u>			
57. Agricultural Sector Assessment			
58. Development Services and Training (383-0044)	X	X	
<u>Thailand</u>			
59. Agricultural Planning (493-0317)	X		
60. Rural Off-Farm Employment Assessment (493-0306)	X		
61. Agricultural Sector Analysis (493-1084)	X	X	X
<u>LATIN AMERICA</u>			
<u>Bolivia</u>			
62. Basic Foods Production and Marketing (511-0451)	X	X	
63. Agriculture Sector Loan (511-0455)	X	X	X
64. Agriculture Sector II (511-0465)	X		
65. Rural Development Planning (511-0471)	X	X	
66. Farm Policy Study (511-0485)	X	X	
67. Departmental Development Corporations (511-0511)	X		
68. Agricultural Sector Assessment			
69. Southern Valleys Assessment			
<u>Chile</u>			
70. Agricultural Production Credit (513-0294)	X	X	
71. Agricultural Sector Assessment			
<u>Colombia</u>			
72. Colombian Agricultural Sector Analysis		X	
<u>Costa Rica</u>			
73. National Development Information System (515-0139)	X		
74. Agricultural Sector Assessment			
<u>Dominican Republic</u>			
75. Agricultural Sector Loan II (517-0116)	X		
76. Agricultural Sector Analysis Phase II (517-0117)	X	X	
77. National Employment Policy (517-0121)	X	X	
78. Agricultural Sector Analysis (598-0554)	X	X	X
79. Comprehensive Resource Inventory & Evaluation System (931-0236)	X	X	X
80. Agricultural Sector Assessment			
<u>Ecuador</u>			
81. REE Baseline Study			
<u>El Salvador</u>			
82. Development Planning (519-0166)	X		
83. Multi-Purpose Household Survey (519-0176)	X		
84. Reform and Policy Planning (519-0260)	X		
85. Rural Poor Survey (931-0236)			
86. Progress Indicators for the Rural Poor (931-0236)	X	X	
87. Agricultural Sector Assessment			

## Exhibit A (continued)

Project	Project Paper	Mid-term, Interim, or Special Evaluation	Final Evaluation
<u>Guatemala</u>			
88. Small Farmer Development (520-0233)	X	X	
89. Integrated Area Development Studies (520-0249)	X	X	
90. Farm Policy Analysis			
<u>Guyana</u>			
91. Agriculture Sector Planning (504-0077)	X		
92. Agriculture Sector Assessment			
93. REE Baseline Study			
<u>Haiti</u>			
94. Agricultural Development Support II (521-0092)	X		
95. Agricultural Sector Assessment			
<u>Honduras</u>			
96. Agriculture Sector Program (522-0100)	X		X
97. Agriculture Sector II (522-0150)	X	X	
98. Agricultural Sector Assessment			
<u>Jamaica</u>			
99. National Planning (532-0039)	X	X	X
100. Agricultural Planning (532-0061)	X		
101. Agricultural Sector			
102. REE Baseline Study			
<u>Nicaragua</u>			
103. Agricultural Planning and Statistical Services (524-0105)	X		
104. Rural Development Sector Loan (524-0118)	X		
105. Agricultural Sector Assessment			
<u>Panama</u>			
106. Agricultural Sector Assessment			
<u>Paraguay</u>			
107. Agricultural Planning and Statistics (526-0104)	X	X	X
108. Agricultural Sector Assessment			
109. Small Farmer Survey			
<u>Peru</u>			
110. Integrated Regional Development (527-0178)	X		
111. Agricultural Research, Extension and Education (527-0192)	X		
112. ONERN -- Land Use Inventory Environmental Planning (527-0202)	X		
113. Iowa - Peru Program		X	X
114. REE Baseline Study			
<u>Caribbean Regional</u>			
115. Caribbean Institutional Development (538-0016)	X	X	
116. Caribbean Agricultural Planning (538-0033)	X		
117. Project Development Assistance (538-0042)	X		
118. Agricultural Development Survey			
<u>ROCAP</u>			
119. SIECA Institutional Assistance (596-0040)	X	X	X
120. Agricultural Research and Information Systems (596-0048)	X	X	
121. Agricultural Secretariat (596-0094)	X		
<u>LAC Regional</u>			
122. Agricultural Sector Analysis Support (598-0554)	X		

## Appendix A (continued)

Project	Project Paper	Mid-term, Interim, or Special Evaluation	Final Evaluation
<u>S&amp;T/AGR/EPP</u>			
123. Latin American Planning Network (931-0236)	X	X	
124. A Framework for Appropriate Agricultural Planning in LDCs			
<u>NEAR EAST</u>			
<u>Egypt</u>			
125. Agricultural Development System (263-0041)	X	X	
126. Data Collection and Analysis (263-0142)	X		
<u>Jordan</u>			
127. Agricultural Economics and Planning (278-0137)	X		
<u>Tunisia</u>			
128. Agricultural Economic Research and Planning (664-0237)	X	X	
<u>Yemen</u>			
129. Agricultural Development Support (279-0052)	X	X	