

AGRICULTURAL POLICY ANALYSIS PROJECT
U. S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
CONTRACT NO. DAN-4084-C-00-3087-00

AGRICULTURAL POLICY WORKSHOP SUPPORT

Provided by

The Agricultural Policy Analysis Project

Abt Associates, Inc.
4250 Connecticut Ave., N. W.
Suite 500
Washington, D. C. 20008

Subcontractor

Department of Agricultural Economics
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078

Prepared by

Phillip Church, ST/AGR (AID)
and
Dean Schreiner, Ag Econ (OSU)

April 10, 1986
Stillwater, OK 74078

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
POLICY WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES OF APAP.....	1
POLICY WORKSHOP FORMATS	
Skills-development Workshops	2
Policy-maker Workshops	3
Policy-systems Workshops	4
POLICY WORKSHOP PREPARATION AND PRESENTATION	
SUPPORT SERVICE	6
SUMMARY	7
ANNEX A:	9
ANNEX B:	12

AGRICULTURE POLICY WORKSHOP SUPPORT

POLICY WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES OF APAP

One of the key objectives of the Agriculture Policy Analysis Project (APAP) is to develop and foster the use of a structured framework for training public and private sector decision makers and analysts of agricultural policy problems in their own institutional environment. Specific objectives include:

- To increase awareness of agricultural policy issues and to develop a capacity for problem identification, diagnosis and analysis.
- To construct case studies involving actual policy issues for use in instruction and analysis.
- To inform host country personnel on sources of policy analysis technical assistance -- agencies, analysts, data, and publications.

POLICY WORKSHOP FORMATS

The formats chosen by APAP to achieve these objectives is a series of workshops in specific areas of agricultural and food policy analysis. APAP has developed three workshop formats for use in support of AID field mission efforts to help host countries build and better utilize policy analysis capability. These three workshop formats are:

- Skills-development Workshops

- Policy-maker Workshops
- Policy-systems Workshops

Skills-development Workshops

A skills development workshop is appropriate for an audience of technicians seeking to gain fairly rapid acquaintance with analytical techniques, concepts, microcomputers and other tools used in policy analysis. The workshop has at least two variants. The first is a short course on policy analysis with emphasis on concepts plus a few illustrations. In a typical three-week session, topics such as supply and demand analysis, trade and exchange rates, food security, and econometric methods are reviewed in a classroom setting, drawing on theory and applications contained in a set of lesson plans.

This workshop is for policy analysts and technicians. Once lesson plans are prepared, the workshop can readily be taken from country to country because minimal equipment is required and minimal application is made to policy problems specific to each country. The approach, though lacking in sufficient depth to enable analysts to work on local problems without assistance, gives a broad overview of policy analysis tools at relatively low cost to sponsoring agencies.

The second variant of the skills-development workshop combines the above approach with hands-on application of analytical methods (such as mathematical programming) and tools (such as microcomputers). Ideally, this second variant also allows trainees to apply data from their own country to analyze real policy problems in their country. This approach is appropriate for an audience of analysts and technicians to help them gain fairly rapid

acquaintance with analytical techniques, concepts, microcomputers, and software useful for policy analysis.

The approach requires more time (training of Liberian government staff at Oklahoma State University was for two months), more equipment (microcomputers), and more personnel to work with trainees. Training can best be done in the U.S. where facilities are available, however, procedures can be arranged to provide some aspects of the skills-development workshops in the host country. The major advantage of this type workshop is in-depth training more likely to provide capabilities that will actually be used and transferred to others by trainees. This is one of the strongest workshops that can be conducted, given its compatibility with ongoing programs regularly offered at land grant universities.

Policy-maker Workshops

A second workshop format is a policy-maker workshop. In a four day session, policy makers can gain a concise overview of economic situations of their country and known alternatives to deal with their problems. This approach places little or no emphasis on developing local capabilities to analyze problems either in preparation for the workshop or as a follow-up. The success of the decision-maker workshop depends on availability of "off-the-shelf" research results for presentation.

A policy-maker workshop was conducted by APAP staff jointly with the Agriculture Services Unit (UEA) of the Ministry of Agriculture in the Dominican Republic in 1985 to inform analysts and policy makers about experience in how applied analysis has been carried out in other settings. About 70 persons

attended, including officials from the Ministry of Agriculture, other ministries, private sector representatives, university faculty and AID representatives.

The presentations were diverse in themes and addressed issues of relevance in designing agricultural policy. A paper on recent Mexican experience in pricing policy emphasized the need to link support prices with fiscal capabilities, agricultural extension, programs for storage and transport, and other policies and programs. Another paper focused on policies aimed at productivity improvements, reviewing those policies to develop the managerial capacity of farmers and the need to place agricultural research in the setting of actual resource constraints on farms, and to orient the research toward cost-reducing technologies.

Another paper advanced the view that sector-wide policies generally have more impact on rural nutrition than nutrition-specific programs do, and do not necessarily require continuing fiscal outlays, unlike nutrition programs. Another paper reviewed the role and nature of pricing policy, with emphasis on the fact that price supports themselves usually are one of the less important instruments of pricing policy; the exchange rate usually is the most important, and other instruments of trade and fiscal policy are important as well.

The UEA planned to put out a soft-cover publication (jointly with APAP) of the proceedings of the conference. The workshop helped raise the visibility of the UEA within the economic circles of the Dominican Republic.

Policy-systems Workshops

A third format is the economic policy-systems workshop. Under this approach, agricultural policy analysis advisors spend sufficient time in the host country to learn issues in some depth, work with local technicians, analysts, and

advisors, and confer with policy makers to define and analyze real policy issues. This not only ensures that felt needs are addressed but also provides a collaborative atmosphere for advisors to interact with local analysts. Such collaboration in preparing position papers on major issues provides local personnel with training and gives continuity to efforts. Local counterparts can analyze emerging issues with the tools and analytical experience long after the policy advisors have left the scene.

A policy-systems workshop was prepared and presented in Liberia in 1985. APAP personnel spent several two-week consultations in Liberia to work with local policy analysts and decision-makers in (a) determining relevant policy issues, (b) discussing appropriate analytical procedures, (c) assisting in assembling data, and (d) initiating analysis of the data. Several key personnel from the Ministry of Agriculture in Liberia were brought to Oklahoma State University where they received two months of intense training in microcomputer and policy analysis methods. During that time they worked with APAP personnel at Oklahoma State to develop position papers for presentation at the workshop.

A subsequent four-day workshop was held in Liberia, attended by 51 persons and including the Minister of Agriculture and other key personnel in policy positions. The Liberian policy analysts and APAP personnel jointly made presentations dealing with key policy issues. The workshop format was designed to allow for discussion of issues in formulating a Liberian agricultural policy statement. Later, persons in the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) prepared an agricultural policy statement using input from the workshop and other sources.

This particular policy-systems workshop succeeded in: (1) developing in-country analytical capabilities to perform agricultural policy analysis, (2)

fostering collaborative working relationships between APAP personnel and in-country analysts and policy makers so as to respond to felt needs and to address short- and long-term problems in depth; (3) communicating the in-depth analysis of policy issues to decision makers through intense dialogue over the four-day period of the workshop; and (4) enhancing the credibility and standing of the MOA and its planning unit.

The policy systems workshop format requires more resources than the other workshop models because it entails more APAP personnel time than do other approaches, but it has a long-term payoff that compensates for the added cost. It provides an unprecedented opportunity to concerned and influential government officials to discuss freely the potentials and problems of agriculture and likely effects of related government policies.

POLICY WORKSHOP PREPARATION AND PRESENTATION SUPPORT SERVICES

USAID missions may wish to draw on APAP resources for the preparation of one or more of these workshops as part of their policy analysis programs or in carrying out their policy dialogue agendas. Oklahoma State University (OSU), the U.S. academic institution on APAP, leads the workshopping activity under the project. USAID can secure the services of OSU -- and others -- through an APAP buy-in either for "turn-key" workshopping from preparation through final presentation or for developing workshop agendas and scopes of work for workshops to be contracted later. OSU and other APAP staff and consultants are also available to participate as speakers

and trainers in workshops conducted by other entities as was done in Peru in 1984.

For missions wishing policy workshop support, APAP staff will prepare a workshop proposal that can be used as a guideline for workshop activity development, for negotiation by the field mission and host government institutions and for implementation. The workshop proposal briefly identifies and describes the policy issues of major concern to a country and to be included in optional training and analysis phases.

An implementation plan and schedule are then worked out by APAP and mission staff identifying resource people, subactivities to be completed, expected products or outputs and due dates of subactivity completion. A preliminary assessment of workshop costs is made and the role of all parties and institutions involved in the activity is specified. The proposal then becomes the basis for discussion, negotiation, contracting and implementation.

SUMMARY

No one workshop fits all AID field mission needs and circumstances. However, APAP has expanded the traditional view of workshops as a training mechanism for skills transfer and development when applied to policy analysis activities. Training is an important function, but on-the-job guidance and information transfer, and dialogue between analysts and decision makers have become important workshop objectives as well.

APAP experience has shown that workshops can be extremely effective instruments to analyze and communicate policy alternatives in developing countries. They are proving under APAP to be valuable vehicles for networking among decision makers from different national agencies all of which may have

a say in policies affecting agriculture. Workshops are also useful techniques for getting information to policy makers and feedback to analysts. Their contribution to information flow, to recognition and morale building among analysts, and to cost-effective agenda setting for policy analysis work can be high.

For information on how to obtain APAP policy workshop support services contact Phillip Church or Dean Schreiner.

Phillip Church
USAID - ST/AGR
Room 403, SA-18
Washington, D.C. 20523
(703) 235-8946

Dean F. Schreiner
Department of Agricultural Economics
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078
(405) 624-6157

ANNEX A: GUIDANCE FOR ESTIMATING POLICY WORKSHOP COSTS

The funding of a full-scale workshop program consists of:

- (a) Initiating activities;
- (b) Analyzing selected policy issues;
- (c) Conducting the workshop; and
- (d) Overall management.

A policy workshop thus should be considered a joint undertaking between APAP, the sponsoring Mission, and the host country. As a general rule, this would involve:

- (a) Joint APAP-Mission funding for salaries and other costs of APAP Personnel; and
- (b) Counterpart Mission and host country funding for costs related to participating Mission and host country personnel and logistical support.

In general, all costs associated with APAP staff (or consultants) working in the U.S. preparing work plans, study materials, backstopping, and overall management would be paid directly by APAP. In-country costs for salaries, travel, per diem, and other expenses for APAP staff would be paid by the Mission. The Mission's contribution for salaries can be contributed by issuing a PIO/T or Purchase Order. Travel and per diem can be included or paid separately through an invitational travel order.

Counterpart-funding for costs associated with Mission and host country personnel and logistics are usually arranged directly between the two parties. Commonly, each pays its own costs. A major exception are the costs associated with optional training of host country personnel at Oklahoma State

University (OSU); for them travel and per diem are commonly paid by the Mission and their salaries by the host country.

Details of these general guidelines are provided in the attached table. The activities and the estimated time involved by APAP staff must be regarded as approximate only, and will need to be tailored to each country situation. Cost will depend to some degree on the type and number of policy issues selected for intensive analysis. Also, the workshop on methods and approaches could be omitted if the host country analysts are highly trained.

Guidance for Costing Out a Full-Scale Workshop Program

Activities (days for APAP staff) ^a	Month from start	APAP or Mission Contributions for APAP Personnel Costs		Counterpart funding for:				
		Site	Salaries	Other ^b	Mission Personnel		Host Country Personnel	
					Salaries	Other ^b	Salaries	Other ^b
		- No. -	-----Payers ^c -----					
<u>Initiating Activities</u>								
Preparation (10 days)	1	U.S.	A	--	M	--	H	--
Planning meetings (9-10 days)	1	In-country	M	M	M	--	H	H
Workshop on methods, approaches, and data needs (2-3 days)	1	In-country	M	M	M	--	H	H
<u>Analysis of Selected Issues^d</u>								
Develop procedures and outlines (5 days)	1	U.S.	A	--	--	--	H	--
Data collection and literature review	3-5	--	--	--	--	--	H	H
Training and preliminary analysis (40 days)	6-7	OSU	A	--	--	--	M	M
Complete analysis (10 days)	8-12	In-country	M	M	--	--	H	H
Develop final reports (10 days)	13-15	In-country	M	M	--	--	H	H
<u>Conduct Workshop</u>								
Prepare agenda (5 days)	13	U.S.	A	--	M	--	H	--
Make preliminary arrangements	13	--	--	--	M	--	H	--
5-day workshops -- Leaders (5 days)	14	In-country	M	M	--	--	--	--
-- Participant costs	15	--	--	--	--	--	M	M
-- Facilities and logistics	16	--	--	--	M	M	M	M
<u>Overall Management</u>								
Project direction (3 days)	1-16	U.S.	A	--	M	--	H	--
Backstopping (8 days)	1-16	U.S.	A	--	--	--	--	--

^a Approximate days involvement for each APAP staff person assigned to the project.

^b Includes travel, per diem, and other costs as appropriate.

^c Legend for payers: A = APAP/S&T M = Mission H = Host Country

^d These activities and APAP staff days may vary widely depending on workshop format (see text).

ANNEX B: TRAINING MATERIALS FOR POLICY WORKSHOP USE

OSU, through APAP, has also developed a range of materials for use in policy workshops and for distribution to USAID Missions and host country institutions as part of the networking of APAP. Policy workshops themselves serve as a major source of materials. Publications that have been prepared in conjunction with APAP-sponsored workshops so far are listed below.

In addition APAP has prepared a synthesis of AID experience in building host country policy analysis capacity and is preparing several case studies to illustrate lessons learned. Guidelines for policy analysts and for Agency agricultural officers are also being drafted as resource materials for use where appropriate. The synthesis of lessons-learned, case studies and guidelines will be distributed to field missions in late 1986.

Partial List of Workshop Publications as of 3/20/86

2. Schreiner, D. F. "Dominican Republic: Effects of Section 213 of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act," Activity Report, December 12, 1983.
3. Tweeten, L. G. and D. F. Schreiner. "Increasing Capacity for Agricultural Policy Analysis in Liberia," Activity Report, February 22, 1984.
4. Riordan, J. and D. F. Schreiner. "A Strategy for Strengthening CORECA Country Policies in Priority Areas of Agricultural Development," Activity Report, April 16, 1984.
5. Norton, R. D. "Análisis de la Política Agraria Dentro del Contexto de Objetivos Nacionales y Sectoriales: El Caso del GAPA en Perú," Activity Report, May 22, 1984.
12. Tweeten, L. G. "Components of an Overall Development Policy for Liberian Agriculture," Paper presented at the National Agricultural Policy Seminar, Yekepa, Liberia, March 25-29, 1985.
13. Tweeten, L. G. and B. Rogers. "Costs, Benefits and Income Redistribution from Liberian Rice Policies." Paper presented at the National Agricultural Policy Seminar, Yekepa, Liberia, March 25-29, 1985.

14. Trapp, J. N., B. Rogers and R. Wilkens. "Liberian Rice Policy: Rice Self-Sufficiency Versus Rice Security." Paper presented at the National Agricultural Policy Seminar, Yekepa, Liberia, March 25-29, 1985.
15. Epplin, F. M. and J. G. Musah. "A Representative Farm Planning Model for Liberia." Paper presented at the National Agricultural Policy Seminar, Yekepa, Liberia, March 25-29, 1985.
17. Li, E. C. "Tutorial Introduction to MUSAH86: A Microcomputer Program for LP." Mimeo, Department of Agricultural Economics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, n.d.
19. Schreiner, D. F., L. G. Tweeten and D. E. Ray. "Workshop Proposal for Purposes of Increasing the Capacity for Agricultural Policy Analysis in Jamaica." May 31, 1985.
20. Tweeten, L. G. "Introduction to Agricultural Policy Analysis: The Distribution of Economic Costs and Benefits from Market Intervention." Mimeo, Department of Agricultural Economics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, June, 1985 (Revised).
24. Norton, R. D. "Proceedings, Dominican Republic Workshop, Program of Policy Analysis, August 10-16, 1985." September 9, 1985.
25. Norton, R. D. "Structural Trends in Colombian Agriculture and the Role of Credit." Agricultural Policy Analysis, Methods and Case Studies, September 13, 1985
28. Norton, R. D. and P. B. R. Hazell. "A Model for Evaluating the Economic Impact of Food Aid." Agricultural Policy Analysis, Methods and Case Studies. October 29, 1985.
29. Norton, R. D. and Associates. "Economic Evaluation of an Agricultural Sector Investment Program: A Case Study for Peru," Agricultural Policy Analysis, Methods and Case Studies. October 30, 1985.
30. Norton, R. D. "Employment Criteria in Project Evaluation Procedures," Agricultural Policy Analysis, Methods and Case Studies. October 31, 1985.
31. Norton, R. D. and V. Santaniello. "A Model of Structural Adjustment in Agriculture," Agricultural Policy Analysis, Methods and Case Studies. November 5, 1985.
32. Li, E. C. and R. D. Norton. "The Role of Microcomputers in Agricultural Policy Analysis in Developing Countries." Agricultural Policy Analysis, Methods and Case Studies. November 8, 1985.

33. Norton, R. D. and Hasan Gencage. "Fertilizer Distribution and Inventory Management: A Case Study in Turkey." *Agricultural Policy Analysis, Methods and Case Studies*. December 17, 1985.
34. Norton, R. D. and Associates. "The Distributional Effects of Agricultural Trade in Central America." *Agricultural Policy Analysis, Methods and Case Studies*. December 18, 1985.
37. Norton, R. D. "Haitian Agriculture: Production Costs and Pricing and Fiscal Structures." *Agricultural Policy Analysis, Methods and Case Studies*. January 27, 1986.
39. Norton, R. D. and N. S. Ballenger. "Optimization of Policy Goals in the Context of A Sector Model." *Agricultural Policy Analysis Methods and Case Studies*, March 20, 1986.