

XD-AAX-318-A
54733

EXTERNAL PROJECT EVALUATION
THE AGRICULTURAL POLICY ANALYSIS PROJECT (APAP)
836-4084

Lane Holdcroft (Private Consultant)
David Sechler (Colorado State University)
Richard Edwards (AFR/TR)
William Goodwin (ANE/TR - LAC/DR)

Agency for International Development, Washington D.C.

December 1957

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

II. BACKGROUND

III. PLANNED OUTPUTS VIS-A-VIS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. Worldwide Activities

1. Comparative Evaluation of AID-Funded Agricultural Policy and Planning Projects
2. Preparation of AID Agricultural Officers' Guidelines
3. Preparation of LDC Policy Analysts' Guidelines
4. Development of a Roster of Agricultural Policy Consultants
5. Establishment of Agricultural Policy Makers' Networks

B. Country-Specific Assistance Activities

1. Conducting Country-Level policy Analyses and Studies
2. Designing and Evaluating Agricultural Policy Projects or the Policy Components of Agricultural Projects
3. Planning and Conducting Country Workshops and Seminars
4. Providing Technical Assistance to Ongoing Projects

IV. SPECIFIC ISSUES

- A. Consistency With AID's Current Agenda
- B. Contribution to "State-of-the-Art"
- C. Clarity and Relevance to AID of Policy Focus
- D. Strategies for Developing Host Country Policy Analysis Capacity

- E. Effectiveness of the Type of Contract Services Currently Used
- F. Quality of Services Provided to Field Missions
- G. Future Demand for APAP Services
- H. Relationship to Other S&T Projects with Agricultural Policy Components
- I. Progress To date in Achieving Project Purpose

V. CONCLUSIONS AND MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. Overall Conclusions
- B. Specific Concerns
- C. Other Recommendations

- APPENDIX 1 PROJECT EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK
- APPENDIX 2 A GENERAL OVERVIEW OF THE APAP
- APPENDIX 3 PERSONS INTERVIEWED BY EVALUATION TEAM
- APPENDIX 4 FIRST EVALUATION CABLE TO FIELD AND TABULATION OF REPLIES
- APPENDIX 5 SECOND EVALUATION CABLE TO FIELD AND TABULATION OF REPLIES
- APPENDIX 6 LIST OF COUNTRY AND REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

EXTERNAL PROJECT EVALUATION

THE AGRICULTURAL POLICY ANALYSIS PROJECT (APAP)

DECEMBER 1987

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to present the results of the external evaluation of the Agricultural Policy Analysis Project (APAP #936-4084). The rationale for this evaluation at the end of the fourth year of APAP's first five year phase is stated in the scope of work (Appendix 1). It is to provide guidance to S&T/AGR in its efforts to redesign and implement APAP's second five-year phase. Specifically, the evaluation team was asked to:

- 1) assess the need for any change in current project design, particularly regarding the mix of worldwide and country activities undertaken to date;
- 2) validate the appropriateness of a competitively procured contract with a mix of private firms and U.S. universities as an effective project implementation mode; and
- 3) determine any project modifications needed to make APAP wholly supportive of the Agency's new ARDN focus.

In addition to addressing the above and the "specific issues" listed in the scope of work, the evaluation team also assessed APAP's accomplishments vis-a-vis its planned outputs and progress in achieving its project purpose, as stated in the project paper. A general overview of the APAP by one of the outside evaluators is attached as Appendix 2 and should be read prior to reading beyond part II of this report.

Preparatory to drafting this report, the evaluation team interviewed some 30 persons who have observed APAP from a variety of perspectives, including officers from the S&T and regional bureaus in AID/W, field mission officers recently assigned to AID/W and contractor personnel, past and present, who implemented APAP. These persons are listed in Appendix 3.

Also two questionnaires were cabled to field missions and those answers incorporated into the body of this report. Those cables and the tabulation of responses received are attached in Appendices 4 and 5.

A list of APAP country and regional activities for the four year period is attached as Appendix 6, and a list of APAP publications for the four year period is attached as Appendix 7.

II. BACKGROUND

In response to the concern that the policy environment (e.g., inappropriate pricing, marketing, trade and exchange rate policies) in many LDC's discouraged food production and agricultural development, the Agricultural Policy Analysis Project (APAP) was authorized in 1983.

According to the project paper, APAP was designed to support mission and LDC decision-makers' efforts at coping with policy issues and constraints affecting agricultural and rural development. This was to be accomplished by assisting USAID field missions in doing better analyses of host country policies and in institutionalizing the policy analysis process in host countries by increasing capacity and fostering demand for policy analysis by host country decision-makers. The major emphasis in both cases was to be on making policy analysis useful to decision-makers.

APAP was to support field missions' policy analysis efforts and institutionalizing efforts by providing technical assistance to analyze host country policies and to design and evaluate policy analysis projects. The cross-country and cross-regional nature of the project was to provide a means to apply the lessons learned from one country or region to another.

According to the recent scope of work for this evaluation (Appendix 1), APAP was intended to: 1) synthesize AID lessons and experiences about how to assess the impact of economic policy on agricultural sector performance; and 2) assist USAID missions in building LDC institutional capacity to conduct their own analysis in support of formulation and monitoring economic policies affecting the sector.

With funding from S&T/AGR and USAID missions, APAP was launched when a contract with Abt Associates, Inc. was signed on September 30, 1983. The prime contractor was to be assisted by subcontractors Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc., Abel, Daft and Early, Inc. and Oklahoma State University in undertaking the activities listed in Part III. below.

An S&T/AGR core budget of \$7.37 million over the five year Phase I period was authorized in FY1983, but reduced to \$5.8 million in FY1986. It was planned that missions would contribute \$1.23 million to Phase I, however by the end of year four, missions had already contributed \$3.3 million* to the project.

*Amount quoted by Project Officer. Mission buy-in list provided to evaluation team totals \$2.2 million.

A few of the numerous tangible examples of AFAP's impact at the country level, as reported in evaluation cable replies and interviews, include:

-- In Peru AFAP provided the basis for the policy dialog and then policy reform that was a major factor in three successive years of over 4 per cent growth in agricultural production.

-- In Liberia rice policies were changed after AFAP analysis revealed that the government's efforts to foster self-sufficiency by buying rice at artificially high prices was costing the government nearly \$3.00 in lost national income for every \$1.00 it invested because of waste and excessive marketing costs, as well as net export revenues lost from not growing more profitable export tree crops of rubber and cacao.

-- In Niger AFAP research on fertilizer subsidies revealed that farmers would be able to profit from using competitively priced fertilizer if only they could get it and that public resources tied up in the subsidies would do more for farmers and the national economy if invested in research and extension to get better fertilizer-use technologies into practice.

-- In Tunisia AFAP is credited with playing a major role in establishing the Ministry of Agriculture's Planning Unit as a very professional and significant government entity.

-- In Sri Lanka AFAP efforts resulted in a much clearer focus on truly critical policy issues by government officials.

-- In Zaire AFAP developed guidelines that were used by the government as the basis for developing key policy analysis work.

III. PLANNED OUTPUTS VIS-A-VIS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This part of the evaluation report compares planned outputs (activities), as listed in the project paper, with actual performance during the first four years of the project and provides recommendations deemed significant by the evaluation team. The logical framework from the project paper is attached as Appendix 6, and an activity implementation matrix comparing planned and actual accomplishments is attached as Appendix 9.

A. Worldwide Activities

The worldwide activities have been accomplished about as planned, but with delays in the preparation and dissemination of both sets of guidelines and in establishing policy maker networks, as indicated below.

Although it was not discussed in the project paper, AFAP's implementors believe that country-level activities are to be undertaken as much to develop, test and disseminate worldwide guidelines as they are to provide direct assistance in support of mission programs. This has not happened to the extent desired because of S&T core budget reductions and increased mission funding, with increased mission influence, of country-level activities.

General Recommendations for III A:

In designing phase II of AFAP: a) provision should be made for updating each of the documents prepared under the below listed activities midway through phase II, and b) adequate S&T core budget should be available in phase II to allow additional country-level activities to update, test and disseminate both sets of guidelines.

A.1. Comparative Evaluation of AID-funded Agricultural Policy and Planning Projects

Findings

This component of AFAP surveyed 124 AID-funded planning and policy projects since 1970. The total funds expended for these projects amounted to nearly \$485 million, of which AID contributed \$278 million, or about 60%. The regional distribution of funds has been: Africa, \$183 million; Asia, \$119 million; LAC, \$93 million; and the Near East, \$67 million.

The study is presented in three volumes: a brief summary; Volume I of the main report, which presents the analysis; and Volume II, which contains the basic data.

The overall quality of the report is excellent. This was a very ambitious and arduous task, and the authors are to be commended for doing as good a job as it is possible to do. The lessons learned are particularly appropriate as a guide to future AID activities in policy.

One of the major findings of the analysis is that most of the successes occurred in Asia, while most of the failures were in Africa. It is natural to assume that this result was due to the more difficult conditions in Africa. However, further analysis is required to see if the content and processes of the projects

in the two regions were substantially different--and, if so, if this also contributed to differences in success ratios. Also, it would be interesting to see if the success ratio changed over time in each case.

Recommendations

The country-specific studies and conclusions should be reviewed by the Missions and AID officers in charge of the projects at the time, and their comments, perhaps in the form of short reflective essays, published in a third volume. Also, a more formal statistical analysis of these findings, using analysis of variance or other techniques, should be considered to see what, if any, systematic relationships can be discovered.

A.2. Preparation of a Set of AID Agricultural Officers' Guidelines

Findings

The final draft of the Guidelines was submitted by the prime contractor to AID in September 1986, a year later than proposed in the project paper. It has not yet been finalized and disseminated. The draft's major contribution is to the process of policy dialogue. It should be a valuable, appropriate primer to introduce AID officers to the agricultural policy process, with some limited presentation of analytical approaches. Its publication could lead to increased demand for other process- and analytical-related documents being produced under AFAP.

Recommendation

This document should be finalized and widely disseminated throughout AID and to others concerned with LDC agricultural policy analysis as soon as possible. However, the substantive components of this document should be reviewed, integrated with the more analytical documents and the rationale for conclusions better explained (partly by cross-references). All of the AFAP contract entities should be involved in this effort.

A.3. Preparation of a Set of LDC Policy Analysts' Guidelines

Findings

This is a valuable and instructive document. It has an acceptable blend of substance and procedure. It could have easily, but did not, turned into a "boy scout's guide to brain surgery". However, certain issues such as use of border prices as a standard for domestic price policy need expanded treatment. There should be more cross-references to other AFAP documents.

Recommendation

While this document is in sufficiently good shape to send to

Missions as a preliminary document for immediate use, it could be substantially improved through expanded treatment of certain issues, pro and con, and by cross-references to other AFAP documents before final publication (as explained in IV.B. below).

A.4. Development of a Roster of Agricultural Policy Consultants

Findings

The current edition of this computerized roster was transmitted to AID by the prime contractor in September 1986, and an expanded version is expected to be completed soon. It has been useful to field missions, and could be useful to private firms, universities and other institutions providing agricultural policy consultants to AID. The agricultural policy expertise of those 88 persons listed is generally high, with a few exceptions.

According to the S&T/AGR AFAP project officer, 24 field missions have drawn from the roster for consultants whose services were provided through AFAP or another contracting mechanism.

Recommendations

The roster would benefit from the addition of more of those development specialists who have had long-term experience in policy analysis units in LDC governments. These persons can be identified through a review of past agricultural policy analysis projects funded by AID and other donor agencies, and by asking recognized policy experts to name others they respect. Also the roster should be made available to those institutions, both private and public, currently providing agricultural policy expertise to AID.

A.5. Establishment of Agricultural Policy Makers' Networks

Findings

Little has been, nor could be, done to link policy makers between countries: their tenure of office is quite limited. A major effort was undertaken to help establish a network of policy analysts on the African sub-continent: this was done cooperatively with FAO. The reports of this effort are positive. However, overall there has been insufficient cooperation among policy-related projects with networking activities. As discussed in III.B.3. below, country specific workshops which help increase dialogue between policy analysts and policy makers are judged to be very desirable activities.

Recommendations

This output should be re-defined: a) to emphasize networking of policy analysts, not policy or decision makers; b) so that cooperation with other AID or other donor projects with policy

networks is encouraged; and c) so that networking is given lower priority in phase II of the project.

B. Country-Specific Assistance Activities

As indicated below and in Appendix 9, far more country assistance activities were accomplished than planned. This project has enjoyed an unusual high degree of popularity among field missions. The attention given by AID and other donors to the need for host country policy reform created a demand for the services provided by APAP. And the generally high professional quality of the expertise provided created additional demand.

The project's implementors were concerned that the country-specific assistance activities lacked focus. Based on field mission interest and the track record at that time, five policy areas for country activities were identified in the second year of APAP implementation. The areas were:

- Diagnosis and prioritization of policy issues through policy inventories
- Developing food security strategies
- Analyzing issues related to privatization
- Price incentives to agricultural production
- Developing indigenous capacity for policy analysis

These policy areas provided a clear focus for country-specific activities and, while not rigidly adhered to, did help differentiate APAP from indefinite-quantity-contract (IQC) sources of technical assistance. More importantly, this focus provided the opportunity to build up a systematic body of knowledge and lessons learned of value in addressing priority areas in future policy analysis efforts.

General Recommendations for III B:

The current areas of policy focus should be continued, subject to reconfirmation by field missions and regional bureaus in the design stage of phase II of the project. Given AID's recent statements of its worldwide concerns, the employment, income and natural resource implications of agricultural policies should be considered. Yet based on experience to date with five areas, only two or three more should be added.

The phase II design should include provision to assure that experiences from these activities are organized into a coherent and systematic body of knowledge and lessons learned that is well

documented for further use in policy analysis efforts. The resource-intensive nature of developing a coherent and systematic body of knowledge from diverse country reports prepared by different people at different times for different purposes should be recognized.

B.1. Conducting Country-Level Policy Analyses and Studies

Findings

The project paper called for 18 country-level policy analyses and studies during the five year Phase I of the project. During the first four years, 22 analyses and studies were completed; about half of these were funded by field missions.

Recommendation

The above general recommendation particularly applies to this activity.

B.2. Designing and Evaluating Agricultural Policy Projects or the Policy Components of Agricultural Projects

Findings

The AFAP contractors were quite responsive in implementing this activity of the project. The contract supplied teams for 19 project design and evaluation efforts in its first 4 years, compared to 27 proposed over 5 years in the project paper; most of these were in the AFR and LAC regions.

LA and ANE regional bureau personnel indicated that the initial comparative evaluation of policy and planning projects served as a valuable source in guiding important structural, contextual and substantive decisions on project design.

Recommendation

Lessons learned from these design and evaluation efforts should be analyzed and included in the phase II revision of the agricultural officers' guidelines.

B.3. Planning and Conducting Country Workshops and Seminars

Findings

To date 9 country-specific and 4 regional workshops have been conducted. And 3 more are planned in year 5 of the project. This compares with 16 workshops proposed in the project paper.

The project organized, through the OSU subcontract, formats for three general types of workshops, namely: a. skills development, b. policy makers and c. country institution building/policy systems. The workshop approaches developed and

used are innovative and flexible. Workshops have been used as training mechanisms, for information transfer, and to foster dialogue between analysts and decision makers.

The project has clearly been demand driven. The number of requests for workshops and seminars has not been as great as for studies and analyses. This can be explained in part by the somewhat larger cost and effort needed by missions to organize and conduct workshops. And mission concern that workshops and seminars are unmanageable or unpredictable. Also, country specific material is needed prior to a workshop; the analyses and studies undertaken frequently reach the appropriate decision makers without the need or desire for a seminar. The major responsibility for conducting APAP workshops was given to DSU.

The workshops conducted have been successful. As indicated in III.A.5., improving communications between policy analysts and policy makers is important and country-specific workshops have been very effective in increasing the dialogue between policy analysts and policy makers. It appears that when a workshop is linked to an existing mission policy project, there is greater interest in and/or resources for its support. The impact of workshop efforts continue to be observed. For example, the Liberian MDA is currently organizing a second national seminar on their own with the results of the initial APAP workshop as their starting point.

APAP staff conducted or assisted with a number of other related workshops and seminars. Examples include State-of-the-Arts Seminars for AID officers and a symposium at the 1986 Annual AAEA meetings.

Recommendations

More attention should be given to the benefits which accrue from seminars or workshops which bring together the policy analysts and the policy makers of a given country. It needs to be recognized that sufficient planning time and support are needed to accomplish this goal; the value of this mechanism for facilitating dialogue more than justifies the effort needed. Core funding should be provided to supplement mission funding of this activity.

B.4. Providing Technical Assistance to Ongoing Projects

Findings

During the first four years, 15 technical assistance teams were provided to missions as compared to the 5 year plan of 18 teams. The users of APAP in support of existing mission projects expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the work done by those provided by the project. The work by APAP in the assistance of a given existing project was spread over several

months or years and involved two or more TDY's to the country. In one case, Zaire, a follow-on project built in funding specifically to utilize the services of AFAP staff in the new project.

The initiation of and/or the testing of a significant portion of the more conceptual outputs of AFAP are associated with the interactions with existing mission projects. The existing project provided an institutional arrangement already in place. Data sources were readily identifiable or the data had already been assembled by the mission project. The problems needing answers had been recognized by the staff members of the cooperating host country institutions; this helped legitimize the work of AFAP. The process of policy dialogue may be as important for acceptance of recommendations as the soundness of the analysis. The use of long term advisors, such as in Sri Lanka, or assisting resident advisors on existing projects, as in Liberia or Zaire, facilitates the dialogue.

Recommendation

In phase II of AFAP, stronger encouragement should be given to developing six to eight linkages with existing mission projects. It is particularly desirable that the contractor(s) most responsible for the conceptual work and for the synthesizing work have these linkages to allow consideration of their work in an applied area.

IV. SPECIFIC ISSUES

A. Consistency With AID's Current Agenda

Findings

The AFAP implementors' interpretation of the project objectives and purpose has been consistent generally with AID's "policy dialogue" agenda and with the new ARDN focus.

That is, AFAP has been very responsive to the field missions' needs for help with policy dialogue/implementation. In fact, some implementors have observed that policy analysis, per se, has received less attention than the project's designers intended. The missions gave high priority to, and therefore funded, help in policy dialogue/implementation that AFAP could provide. Such help was not readily available elsewhere. Much of this was related to "non-project" or "program" assistance using PL 480 and ESF as leverage for policy reform.

From 1982 until recently, the ARDN focus was to: "-- enable countries to become self-reliant in food, assure food security to their populations, and contribute to broadly-based economic growth." The new ARDN focus is to: "-- increase the incomes of the poor majority and to expand the availability and consumption

of food while maintaining and enhancing the natural resource base." Both emphasize increasing food availability and consumption, the goal of APAP. However, more attention is given up front to income and natural resources in the new statement.

Other considerations have arisen since APAP was launched, including reduced S&T annual budget levels, increased concern about the role of U.S. agriculture in the world economy, and further deterioration of some African LDC's agricultural policy environment. However, these do not suggest any significant changes should be made in the design or the conduct of phase II.

Recommendations

Phase II of APAP should: a) continue to assist missions in policy dialogue/implementation tasks, but give increased emphasis to empirical analytical efforts and institutionalizing that capacity in host countries; and b) include increasing incomes, expanding food availability and maintaining natural resources, per the new ARDN focus statement, in the project goal of the phase II project paper.

B. Contribution to "State-of-the-Art"

Findings

The APAP project has made a substantial contribution to the state of the art of policy dialogue by documenting and reinforcing AID's approach of true dialogue with, and participation of, host country policy makers. This participative process of policy dialogue, especially well documented in the reports on Sri Lanka and Kenya, and well explained in the guidelines, is one of the most important and effective contributions of the project.

In addition, the project has succeeded in translating many of the policy issues into sensible terms that non-professionals can understand. This is a significant accomplishment, and not easy to do.

However, the project has not seriously addressed some of the major issues that arise in policy dialogue. The single greatest lacuna here is the problem of using border prices as a reference point for domestic price policy and for the evaluation of agricultural projects. It can be argued that border prices represent opportunity costs of commodities and therefore should be used. However, developing countries also have opportunity costs for the use of foreign exchange earnings. Therefore border prices must be adjusted for the shadow prices of foreign exchange to be valid. Also, there is the issue of using border prices derived from an international market that is totally out of equilibrium because of commodity dumping programs.

Similarly, there is little serious discussion of macro-economic fiscal and monetary policy issues. If these subjects are not in the scope of this project then that should be made clear and the passing references to these issues deleted from the text. This may be a high priority area for AID, but not for this project. If fiscal and monetary policy were to be included in the scope of APAP, then an extraordinary level of resources and attention would need to be devoted to it.

One of the most difficult and important problems in agricultural policy is the choice of appropriate methodologies. These range all the way from the deductive methods of traditional economic theory through detailed econometric models to simple declarations of ideological faith. Of course there is no single methodology that is appropriate for all of the problems of agricultural policy analysis, but there should be criteria for selecting the appropriate methodology for specific problems.

Another important problem in the field of agricultural policy analysis for developing countries is the lack of an international data set suitable for this analysis. There is an urgent need to have data on crop production compiled by irrigated and non-irrigated areas, fertilizer consumption by major crops, and indices of input and output prices at the farm level. Until this data is compiled in a coherent way, the scope of empirical policy analysis will be severely limited.

Recommendations

1. The APAP project should concentrate more on articulating some of the difficult conceptual issues involved in policy analysis. A means of doing this would be through consultancy reports by leading authorities who represent differing views of the issues. In addition, there should be more empirical work on the different kinds of policies followed by different countries over the past three decades and the practical results of these policies.

2. The APAP should sponsor a seminar of 10-15 experienced agricultural policy analysts to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of alternative methodologies applied to the problems of analysis specific to the APAP. This group may evolve into a council of advisors to review and discuss the reports of the APAP.

3. The APAP should coordinate with AID/PPC/CDIE's Economic and Social Data Service (ESDS) to create a special agricultural policy analysis data base to complement the general data base being developed by ESDS along lines suggested above.

C. Clarity and Relevance to AID of APAP Focus

Findings

The APAP focus on economic policy as it affects the agricultural sector of LDC's is sufficiently clear and very relevant to AID. There is widespread recognition that agricultural sector performance, which usually dominates the economy, is very dependent on the LDC's economic policy environment. Therefore, AID attaches continuing priority to policy reform in poorly performing LDC economies. The APAP has contributed significantly to policy reform efforts of AID.

Recommendation

Phase II of APAP should continue to focus on those economic policy areas discussed in III.B. above, which are supportive of AID's policy reform efforts.

D. Strategies for Developing Host Country Policy Analysis Capacity

Findings

The most logical manner for developing host country capacity, given AID's current set up, is through bilateral projects. S&T can be instrumental in supporting this effort with the provision of training materials.

APAP has been highly effective in terms of responsiveness to requests from field missions and host country institutions. It has not been so effective to date in distilling relevant knowledge from field experience, incorporating other related sources of information (from within and outside of AID), and disseminating the results to AID and host country personnel. USAID field missions are an appropriate conduit for dissemination to analysts and decision makers in host countries.

-- The focus of this effort should include not only the experience with "diagnostic tools" (eg., agricultural sector assessments, policy inventories, development of policy agenda), but also focus on "analytical tools" that clearly and simply demonstrate the effects of current policies and implications of changes in policies. And the use of AID's policy dialogue levers i.e., DA, PL480, ESF and local currency generations (resource allocation).

-- Given the importance of agricultural policy in AID, it is imperative that APAP have an appropriate role vis-a-vis regional bureaus, field missions and host country institutions. Specifically, that S&T should serve as a "cleaning house" of materials and experts; Regional Bureaus should be tracking policies as they

relate to specific regional and country strategies; USAID's are the "front lines" in the policy action, and the linkage to host country institutions.

-- All AID agricultural officers, and especially agricultural economists, tend to be isolated from their professional peers. This is true to some degree even in AID/W. There is currently no mechanism for bringing AID agricultural economists together. APAP is a natural locus for regular meetings of interested agriculturalists to discuss agricultural policy-related concepts and problems that transcend bureau interests.

Recommendation

Emphasis should be placed on the "clearing house" function of providing USAID's with materials that can be used in ongoing or proposed agricultural policy-related projects for developing host country capacity. This last year of phase I, as well as phase II, should give more attention to dissemination of current knowledge. Funds must be provided explicitly for this function.

E. Effectiveness of the Type of Contract Services Currently Used

Findings

The unplanned contract mode used by APAP (a private firm as the prime contractor, with two private firms and one university as subcontractors) has been quite effective for phase I. Therefore, it appears appropriate to use the same contract mode for phase II. However, another option that could give AID more control (and more administrative chores), involving three different mechanisms, has been suggested. The development of analytical teaching materials could be handled through a cooperative agreement with a university; an IQC with a firm could be used for the short term design, evaluation and analytical support functions; and an in-house contractor (similar to the CDIE model) could handle dissemination of materials.

A related issue is whether the current contract should be extended, or new contract(s) or other mechanisms be opened for competition. Continuation of the current contract involving three private firms and a university, would provide the opportunity to retain some of the existing institutional knowledge that could be instrumental in the development and dissemination of materials needed in the next phase of the APAP. On the other hand, there has been a significant turnover of personnel under the contract.

Recommendations

Phase II should be rebid, using the current contract mode, unless an internal AID S&T review of the option mentioned above

suggests otherwise. In phase II, funding for the university subcontractor should be substantially increased over phase I. And the project paper should provide for the use of short-term contracts with other firms, both US and local LDC.

F. Quality of Services Provided to Field Missions

Findings

All individuals interviewed gave uniformly high marks for the quality of services rendered by APAP. The project staff have clearly recognized the tasks demanded and responded with what was requested at a relatively high level of quality. A review of the reports has raised some questions about the apparent lack of the APAP staff building upon each other's activities, but this has caused no dissatisfaction among the clients.

Fifteen missions responded to the inquiry about the quality of services provided by APAP. Without exception, the responses were positive and the evaluation of the capability of the technical advisors was reported as well qualified and the quality of performance as very good. In one response (Madagascar) there was a complaint about the length of time taken to complete a final report (one year after end of the TDY), but even in this instance, the mission detailed the problems which caused the delay, expressed an understanding of the delay, praised the quality of the report and indicated they have budgeted for FY 1988 APAP services. A second mission (Senegal) also expressed disappointment with delays in receiving written reports but was pleased with the timely arrival of the technical assistance and rated their analysis as good. Mission after mission noted their desire to continue to receive the same high quality of assistance as they had experienced with APAP and often spoke of advisors arranging their schedules to accommodate the mission and of advisors working long hours.

A significant minority (6 of 15) noted the high cost of the service but in every case justified the expenditure because of the quick response or the very good quality of the work. The cost was frequently compared to IQC's cost. The ease of using the buy-in process was cited and appreciated.

Recommendations

With this large number of satisfied missions, APAP should continue to provide the high quality services with its same or a similar type of buy-in process. Care does need to be taken to ensure that the activities undertaken clearly fit the framework of the project goals and not pose as an IQC under another name.



G. Future Demand for APAP Services

Findings

Fifty two Missions responded to a cable inquiry about the possible future demand for APAP services and a relative ranking of importance to the Mission program of broad, general policy areas. A copy of the outgoing cable is in Appendix 5. The responses by Bureaus were twenty-four from Africa, fifteen from Latin America, and thirteen from Asia-Near East.

Nine responding Missions indicated a high degree of interest in some use of APAP technical assistance in the current fiscal year. Twelve out of twenty-four or (50 percent) of the Africa Missions responded with moderate or high interest in the use of APAP technical assistance sometime during the next six years. Eight of thirteen (62 percent) Asia-Near East Missions had a moderate or a high response for some of the APAP technical assistance services and seven of fifteen (47 percent) Latin American Missions indicated the same.

It seems particularly relevant to note that of the total of twenty-seven missions responding with more than a passing interest in the technical assistance services of APAP, twenty-one matched their level of interest with an indication of about the same level of ability to contribute to the funding of the work. Of the remaining six, two overtly indicated no funds and four did not respond to this area of questioning.

Forty of the fifty-two missions responded with an indication of the ranking of one or more of seven general areas with respect to their future policy dialogue agenda. In thirty-eight of the forty responses, at least one of the areas was ranked of high importance. Private sector development was almost universally ranked of high importance as an agenda item. Agricultural trade and the need to develop local analytical expertise were next in importance. The agenda item listed in the cable receiving the least amount of attention was that of micro-computer applications. This reaffirms observations given in personal interviews that teaching the use of this tool should accompany a particular analysis and not be undertaken in isolation.

Recommendations

With continued strong, broad based demand for project services, work should proceed with the design of phase II. This planning process does need to recognize that a single, central project will not be able to respond to the wide variety of problems missions face. Phase II should carefully construct the limits within which any contractor will be expected to operate. The process of setting bounds while allowing response to changing areas of priority is delicate and may require mid-term adjustment. Missions have identified agricultural trade as requiring more attention in phase II. Agricultural trade

should be subsumed under the current food security area of policy focus. And as an alternative to the sometimes cumbersome mission "buy-in" mechanism, the "field service agreement," ala the S&T/RD ARIES Project, should be considered for phase II.

H. Relationship to Other S&T Projects with Policy Components

Findings

Interviews with the S&T officers responsible for projects with agricultural policy-related components indicate that there is no overlapping or duplication of effort with the APAP. The projects reviewed are: "Consumption Effects of Agricultural Policies", "Agricultural Marketing Improvement Strategies", "Employment & Enterprise Policy Analysis" and "Food Security in Africa".

Recommendation

The relationship of APAP to other AID/W projects with agricultural policy-related components should be examined again during the design of phase II, with the objective of assuring coordination and/or complementarity. This also applies to international entities engaged in agricultural policy analytical efforts, e.g., the International Food Policy Research Institute and the World Bank.

I. Progress To Date in Achieving the Project Purpose

Findings

The project purpose per the APAP project paper is:

"Improved knowledge and understanding by LDC and AID decision-makers about key policy issues and constraints affecting agricultural and rural development in LDC's."

This is difficult, if not impossible, to measure very precisely, but those formerly assigned to missions whom we interviewed unanimously opined that APAP had achieved its project purpose as stated above. Also the cables from missions in Appendix 4 provide numerous positive examples of APAP's impacts.

Given the difficulty of measuring the above, the project paper outlined three evaluation criteria as being easier to evaluate as follow:

a) Capacity building impacts (impacts on the capacity of AID and host country institutions to analyze decision-makers' policy questions effectively, in a timely manner and with quality analysis).

b) Consciousness raising impacts (impacts on the awareness of AID and host country decision-makers about the need for data and analysis as an ingredient to more rational decision-making).

c) Policy impacts (impacts on host country policy decisions and field mission strategy to handle policy issues).

The project paper called for a monitoring and evaluation system. This included further development of the evaluation criteria and evaluations of teams sent to field missions and workshops with annual reports. In addition, three external evaluations with field visits to selected countries were planned.

Because of budgetary and time constraints placed on AFAP's leadership, plus the perception that the project was doing well, the monitoring and evaluation system has not received the attention envisaged by AFAP's designers. At this time, probably it would not be cost-effective to try to "catch up". But had the system been used, it would be less difficult to measure AFAP's impact on missions and host countries.

Recommendations

The evaluation criteria listed above should be reviewed again during the design of phase II and possibly revised. The criteria thus selected should be developed further and monitored during phase II. A monitoring and evaluation system similar to that outlined in the project paper for phase I should be implemented in phase II. It should provide for annual project review and modification.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Overall Conclusions

Overall, this project has been very successful in reaching its stated objectives. It was well designed and generally has been well implemented by its AID project officer(s) and contractors. With some modifications in design, adequate funding and careful selection of the contractor(s), phase II could be even more effectively implemented.

The following should be considered in the design of phase II of AFAP:

A.1. Changes Needed in Current Project Design

a) Phase II of AFAP should continue to focus on policies that affect LDC agricultural sectors and assist missions in policy dialogue/implementation tasks, but give increased emphasis to

empirical analytical efforts and institutionalizing that capacity in host countries.

b) The current areas of policy focus should be continued, subject to reconfirmation by field missions and regional bureaus in the design stage of phase II of the project. Also at that time, field missions and regional bureaus should be queried with regard to adding other areas of policy focus, eg., those identified in recent AID worldwide policy statements. Agricultural trade should be given increased attention under the aegis of the current food security area of policy focus.

c) The phase II design should include provision to assure that experiences from these activities are organized into a coherent and systematic body of knowledge and lessons learned that is well documented and disseminated for further use in policy analysis efforts.

d) In designing phase II, provision should be made for updating each of the phase I documents midway through phase II, and adequate S&T core budget should be available in phase II to allow additional country-level activities to update, test and disseminate both sets of guidelines.

e) The policy makers networking activity should be re-defined to emphasize networking of policy analysts, not policy or decision makers; cooperation with other AID or other donor projects with policy networks should be encouraged; and networking should be given lower priority in phase II of the project.

f) In phase II of APAF, stronger encouragement should be given to developing six to eight linkages with existing mission projects. It is particularly desirable that the contractor(s) most responsible for the conceptual work and for the synthesizing work have these linkages to allow consideration of their work in an applied area.

g) The relationship of APAF to other AID/W projects with agricultural policy-related components should be examined again during the design of phase II to assure coordination and/or complementarity. Also this applies to other international entities engaged in agricultural policy analytical efforts.

h) The evaluation criteria listed in IV. I. above should be reviewed again during the design of phase II and possibly revised. The criteria thus selected should be developed further and monitored during phase II. A monitoring and evaluation system similar to that outlined in the project paper for phase I should be implemented in phase II. It should allow for annual project review and modification.

A.2. Appropriateness of Current Contract Mode

Phase II should be rebid, using the current contract mode, unless an internal AID S&T review of the option mentioned in IV. E. above suggests otherwise. In phase II, funding for the university subcontractor should be increased substantially over phase I. And the project paper should provide for the use of short-term contracts with other firms, both US and local LDC. As an alternative to the sometimes cumbersome and always time consuming (for APAP management) mission "buy-in" mechanism, the "field service agreement," ala the S&T ARIES Project should be considered for phase II.

A.3. Modifications Needed to Support AID's New ARDN Focus

a) Increasing incomes, expanding food availabilities and maintaining the natural resource base, per the new ARDN focus statement, should be included in the project goal of the phase II project paper.

b) Given AID's recent statements of its worldwide concerns, the income and natural resource implications of agricultural policies should be considered as policy areas deserving more attention in phase II. Yet based on experience to date with five areas of policy focus, only two or three more should be added. Fiscal and monetary policy would require resources and attention beyond those available to this project, so should not be included in the design of phase II.

B. Specific Concerns

B.1. Turnover in AID Project Officers and Contract Directors

The turnover of AID project officers and contract project directors has to some degree adversely affected project implementation. More troubling is the fact that the project director position to be filled by an experienced agricultural policy professional has been vacant since the last incumbent resigned some eight months ago. Although only nine months remain in phase I, this position should be filled as soon as possible. And the position of the full-time administrative officer should be continued, thus allowing the policy specialist to focus on the worldwide activities, per III.A. above. The prime contractor informs us that it expects to fill the vacant policy professional position within the next two months.

B.2. Role of the University Subcontractor

The university subcontractor has performed well, its influence having been much greater than its share of APAP funding would suggest. It has clearly provided much of the intellectual

leadership for, and the positive image of, the project. A larger role for a qualified university would help allay concerns with regard to the quality of policy analysis work undertaken, as well as dissemination of lessons learned from the APAP experience. In designing phase II, the funding and participation level of the university should be substantially increased. Also a mechanism to improve access to other university faculty should be employed in phase II.

B.3. Policy Analysis vs. Policy Dialogue/Implementation

As indicated above in IV.A., given the importance and interdependence of these kinds of policy activities, both should be continued in phase II. However, the policy dialogue/implementation process should be more thoroughly supported by policy analysis, especially that of an empirical nature. Thus overall more emphasis should be given to empirical policy analysis.

B.4. Coherency of Body of Knowledge Flowing from Project

As indicated in Appendix 2 and in III. and IV. above, APAP documents must be organized and edited into a coherent body of knowledge with lessons learned that can be useful in future policy activities. Given its importance, a qualified technical editor should be employed as soon as possible to work with APAP's implementors in completing this task during this last year of phase I. And adequate core funding should be provided in phase II to assure that country level experience is tested and refined, organized and edited into a coherent body of knowledge with lessons learned which can be given wide dissemination.

C. Other Recommendations

C.1. Regarding the comparative evaluation of AID-funded agricultural policy and planning projects, the country-specific studies and conclusions should be reviewed by the Missions and AID officers in charge of the projects at the time, and their comments published in a third volume. Also, a more formal statistical analysis of these findings, using analysis of variance or other techniques, should be done to see what if any systematic relationships can be discovered.

C.2. Regarding the agricultural officers' guidelines, this document should be finalized and widely disseminated throughout AID and to others concerned with LDC agricultural policy analysis as soon as possible. However, the substantive components of this document should be reviewed, integrated with the more analytical documents and the rationale for conclusions better explained (partly by cross-references). All of the APAP contract entities should be involved in this effort.

C.3. Regarding the policy analysts' guidelines, while this document is in sufficiently good shape to send to Missions as a preliminary document for immediate use, it could be substantially improved through expanded treatment of certain issues, pro and con, and by cross-references to other AFAP documents before final publication (as explained in IV.B. below).

C.4. The roster of agricultural policy consultants would benefit from the addition of more of those development specialists who have had long-term experience in policy analysis units in LDC governments. These persons can be identified by asking, for example, ten recognized as the leading policy authorities to list their top ten choices, and through a review of past agricultural policy analysis projects funded by AID and other donor agencies. Also the roster should be made available to those institutions, both private and public, currently providing agricultural policy expertise to AID.

C.5. Lessons learned from AID-funded policy project design and evaluation efforts should be analyzed and included in the phase II revision of the agricultural officers' guidelines.

C.6. More attention should be given to the benefits which accrue from seminars or workshops which bring together the policy analysts and the policy makers of a given country. It needs to be recognized that sufficient planning time and support are needed to accomplish this goal; the value of this mechanism for facilitating dialogue more than justifies the effort needed. Also provision should be made in phase II to develop training manuals from the training materials developed in phase I.

C.7. Regarding AFAP's contribution to the "state-of-the-art", the project should concentrate more on articulating some of the difficult conceptual issues involved in policy analysis. A means of doing this would be through consultancy reports by leading authorities who represent differing views of the issues. In addition, there should be more empirical work on the different kinds of policies followed by different countries over the past three decades and the practical results of these policies.

C.8. Regarding strategies for developing host country policy analysis capacity, emphasis should be placed on the clearing house function of providing USAID's with materials that can be used in ongoing or proposed agricultural policy-related projects. This last year of phase I, as well as phase II, should give increased attention to the dissemination of current knowledge.

PROJECT EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK

- A. Project Title Agriculture Policy Analysis Project
- B. Project Number # 936-4084
- C. Contracting Entities
- Prime contractor
Abt Associates, Inc.
- Subcontractors
Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc.
Abel, Daft and Earley, Inc.
Oklahoma State University
- D. Project Management U.S.A.I.D. (ST/AGR) - Phillip E. Church
Abt Associates, Inc. - Stephanie Wilson
- E. Type of Review Interim evaluation

F. Summary and Background: The Agriculture Policy Analysis Project (APAP) was authorized in 1983 to: 1) synthesize AID lessons and experiences about how to assess the impact of economic policy on agriculture sector performance; and 2) assist USAID missions in building LDC institutional capacity to conduct their own analysis in support of formulating and monitoring economic policies affecting the sector. With funding from the ST/AGR core budget and from mission buy-ins, APAP started officially on September 30, 1983 when AID signed a contract with Abt Associates, Inc. to undertake a number of worldwide and country activities implementing the project.

Worldwide activities consist of: 1) the comparative evaluation of AID-funded agricultural policy and planning projects; 2) preparation of a set of AID agriculture officers guidelines; 3) preparation of a set of LDC policy analyst guidelines; 4) development of a roster of agricultural policy consultants; and 5) establishment of agriculture policy makers networks.

Country activities include assistance to USAID field missions in: 1) conducting country-level policy analyses and studies; 2) designing and evaluating agriculture policy projects or the policy components of agriculture projects; 3) planning and conducting country workshops and seminars; and 4) implementing policy studies in support of mission projects.

The APAP is approaching the completion of its fourth year of operation the status of these activities and the outputs of the project to date are contained in the documents listed under Section (I) below.

32

G. Rationale for a team evaluation: The APAP is completing the fourth year of the first five-year phase of its project life. ST/AGR is preparing to implement the second five-year phase of APAP and seeks the guidance of a team evaluation to:

- 1) assess the need for any change in current project design particularly regarding the mix of worldwide and country activities undertaken to date;
- 2) validate the appropriateness of a competitively procured contract with a mix of private firms and U.S. universities as an effective project implementation mode; and
- 3) determine any project modifications needed to make APAP wholly supportive of the Agency's new ARDN focus.

H. Specific issues for evaluation:

- 1) The project objectives and purpose are contained in the PP, "log frame" and contract. Determine the degree to which the contractor's and AID's interpretation of these objectives is consistent with AID's "policy dialogue" agenda and with the new ARDN focus.
- 2) One purpose of APAP is to develop and field test policy analysis tools - guidelines for AID agriculture officers and for LDC policy analysts. How effectively have these guidelines and their testing been carried out?
- 3) The scope of agriculture policy is broad. Is the APAP focus on economic policy as it affects agriculture sufficiently clear and relevant to AID?
- 4) There are a range of strategies for building LDC policy analysis capacity and for designing and implementing agriculture policy analysis projects to support this process. Has the project adequately developed and articulated these strategies in its guidelines and case studies? What has been the field missions' reactions?
- 5) APAP country assistance activities are to be undertaken as much to develop, test and disseminate guidelines as they are to provide direct assistance in support of mission programs. How effectively has this been carried out? How has the dependence on mission buy-in funding for country assistance work affected this process?
- 6) Reduced funding availabilities, the new ARDN focus, increased concern over African agriculture policy issues and the role of US agriculture in the world economy are all new realities that have emerged since APAP was originally designed and initiated. What do these new conditions suggest as regards to changes in the conduct of the project during its second phase?
- 7) Assess the effectiveness of the competitively procured contract with prime and subcontracting firms and institutions used to implement the project.

I. Recommendations to be made: As part of its evaluation work the team will produce a set of recommendations on how the ST/AGR Agriculture Policy Analysis Project can best be redesigned for implementation during its second five-year phase of operation.

J. List of documents to be reviewed:

- 1) The APAP Project Paper - PP
- 2) The APAP contract with Abt Associates, Inc.
- 3) APAP work plans and Annual report - 1983-1987
- 4) Guidelines and comparative analysis of AID agriculture policy projects
- 5) APAP country case studies and staff papers
- 6) APAP country technical assistance reports
- 7) APAP workshop and network meeting reports and technical papers
- 8) Agency policy papers, focus statements and other relevant documents
- 9) Other documents and reports as identified by ST/AGR as appropriate

Note: While the evaluation team will make no trips to overseas missions to collect information or conduct interviews, it will prepare a questionnaire to be cabled to the field for missions to complete as regards:

- a) Experience with APAP services;
- b) Anticipated needs for APAP services during the second phase of the project;
- c) Guidance on the types of agriculture policy issues of greatest concern which APAP should address.

K. Composition of evaluation team: The team will consist of three members:

- 1) A senior AID agriculture development officer (active or retired) who will serve as team leader;
- 2) A senior agricultural economist with policy analysis experience and preferably with a U.S. university base;
- 3) The ST/AGR Office program officer.

The ST/AGR APAP project officer will serve as a resource person and will coordinate regional contacts through the APAP Project committee which is made up of members of the Agriculture Policy technical sub-committee of the AID Agriculture Sector Council.

L. Dates and places of the evaluation: The evaluation will take place in the ST/AGR Offices in Washington, D.C. and will begin in late September or early October 1987. The duration of the evaluation will be approximately 30 days. The evaluation team will submit its final report to ST/AGR within 90 days of the start of the evaluation.

A GENERAL OVERVIEW OF THE APAP

David Seckler

G1. The purpose of these comments is to provide a general overview of the APAP as background for the discussion of specific subjects in the APAP evaluation.

G2. First, the APAP documents appear to be the product of a more-or-less random selection of topics, issues, styles, levels of sophistication, and opinions than a coherent and integrated product of a policy analysis team. It appears that the various authors have not read many of the other documents--or, if they have, have not found it necessary or desirable to refer to them. Part of this problem is probably due to different assignments, given at different times, and different conditions of demand and supply for documents over time. However, the time is long past due in this project for the team members to sit down together to edit and organize these documents into a coherent whole. Once this is done there should be a "reader's guide" to the documents so that people with particular interests would know where to find information on subjects of interest.

G3. A good focal point for organization of these documents would be Roger Norton's excellent paper, "Agricultural Policy Analysis Methods and Case Studies: Agricultural Issues in Structural Adjustment Programs". This paper provides an excellent survey of the major issues in terms that people can understand and is a good point of departure for those who wish to go upward into more rigorous analyses of issues, such as in some of the OSU documents, or downward into more specific and applied documents, such as the "Agricultural Policy Analysis Guidelines", the "Manual for Agricultural and Rural Development Officers", and the country studies. A reader's guide, together with cross-referencing between documents, would show readers the way through this otherwise difficult thicket of documents, simultaneously providing analytical justifications and practical applications along the way.

G4. Second, one of the major dangers of policy analysis is to believe that one has the solutions and that all one needs to do is persuade others to implement them. In this way "policy dialogue" degenerates into "policy monologue". One of the significant accomplishments of the APAP team, and of USAID generally, has been to avoid a dogmatic approach to economic policy. However, the APAP team has not gone sufficiently far in

explaining to others--or, in cases, perhaps understanding themselves--what may be called their proper "scope of work"; what they can and cannot do as policy analysts. The documents need a clear philosophical and methodological orientation to the fundamental principles of policy analysis (or welfare economics) along the following lines.

65. Proper policy analysis presents people with a menu of policy choices and consequences that they can evaluate for themselves in terms of their own subjective values, and/or the values of those they represent. The ultimate policy chosen is beyond the scope or ability of policy analysts because they do not have access to these subjective values. Nor do foreign analysts have the detailed knowledge of specific conditions of time and place necessary to know what will work and not work in a developing country. The policy analyst can only be an advisor to local policymakers. Thus such value-laden words as "efficiency" should be avoided in policy analysis. It is much better to use terms such as "cost-effectiveness", which forces the analyst to understand the objectives the analysis is attempting to achieve.

66. For example, most countries of the world, whether developed or less developed, have similar basic agricultural policy objectives:

1. A reasonable degree of food self-sufficiency.
2. Low cost food for the poor.
3. Provision of rural employment and livelihoods.

Certain countries, such as the United States, have been able to achieve all three objectives, usually at enormous cost in the form of agricultural subsidies. Other countries, like Japan, have had to sacrifice some objectives (1 and 2) for others (3). The policy analyst always has the choice either of accepting these and similar objectives and then attempting to find the most cost-effective means of reaching different levels of satisfaction of the objectives, or the analyst can argue with the objectives. The latter is a futile, counter-productive, and economically illegitimate exercise. As Oscar Wilde might have said, the economist knows the price of everything, but the value of nothing. This basic fact of welfare economics is not sufficiently appreciated because there is a natural temptation to use one's own values in the analysis, rather than the values of those the policy is intended to serve.

67. Third, it is important that the APAP documents explain the degree of controversy surrounding the various policy issues being discussed. For example, there is virtually no controversy about non-tariff barriers to imports (like quotas), if for no other reason than that one can make the tariff as high as one wishes. However, there are controversies about trade liberalization for developing countries, and, even if trade liberalization is accepted, issues of import substitution or export promotion remain controversial.

G8. Perhaps the highest degree of controversy surrounds the question of deficit financing in fiscal policy. For example, the government of Indonesia has a constitutional provision that it cannot go into debt. If this provision had been introduced as a consequence of policy dialogue it would have been greeted by some as a signal accomplishment. However, this provision may be causing a demand recession in Indonesia because of the inability to replace demands previously generated by petroleum exports. It certainly is causing severe problems of disbursements of donor hard-currency funds for projects because of constraints on local currency contributions. The donors have now been forced to reduce the counterpart contributions to projects because of this problem! Here is an excellent example of the interaction between macro-economic policy and the agricultural sector, even down to the level of agricultural projects.

G9. Nearly every professional economist agrees that deficit financing is an appropriate tool of fiscal policy under the appropriate conditions. The argument centers mainly on the conditions, not the principle, of debt. These conditions and issues should be part of the APAP documentation.

G10. Another example is fertilizer subsidies. Most experienced agricultural economists would agree that subsidizing fertilizer is an appropriate policy at least through the learning by doing stage of agricultural development. But it also can be argued that even after this stage it is a cost-effective means of subsidizing food costs, as long as the country is low on the production function. Then, if someone argues that subsidizing food costs is not desirable, the argument returns to the issue of objectives discussed above.

G11. In sum, some of the major issues in agricultural policy analysis can be ranked in terms of a descending order of degrees of disagreement among professionals, and/or sensitivity to specific conditions, roughly as follows:

- Fiscal/growth policy
- Monetary policy
- Import substitution
- Domestic prices adjusted to border prices
- Direct food subsidies
- Agricultural input subsidies
- Privatization
- Internal restraints on trade
- Non-tariff barriers
- Export promotion (developing countries' perspective)
- Development of financial markets
- Development of commercial law and enforcement procedures

G12. One of the interesting things about this list is that there is a high correlation between degree of controversy and the level, in terms of macro-economics, of the policy issue. Also, much of the controversy could be diminished by proceeding from general statements about policies to policy solutions to problems in specific countries, under specific conditions of time and place. As noted before, one of the contributions the APAP team can make is to list the specific conditions under which the various general policy issues may be expected to have different effects.

G13. In sum, there are three important criteria by which the policy documents should be appraised.

--Do they provide a balanced view of the state of knowledge, including controversies and ignorance of specific effects, with respect to specific issues?

--Do they reflect the objectives of policymakers in the countries concerned, or other objectives, and do they carefully explain the objectives to be served whatever they are?

--Do they carefully analyze the assumptions and conditions under which the recommended policies will serve the stated objectives and when not?

These conditions are not sufficient for good policy analysis, but they are necessary.

PERSONS INTERVIEWED BY EVALUATION TEAM

AID/WASHINGTON

David Bathrick S&T/AGR
 Vince Cusumano S&T/AGR
 Phillip Church S&T/AGR
 Roberto Castro S&T/AGR
 Robert Young S&T/RD
 Tom Mehen S&T/RD
 Nicolaas Loykk S&T/N
 Mike Korin ANE/TR/ARD
 Richard Suttor ANE/TR/ARD
 Tom King LAC/DR/ARD
 Dave Joslyn LAC/DR/ARD
 Steve Wingert LAC/DR/ARD
 Emmy Simmons AFR/DF
 Ronnie Daniel AFR/SWA
 Ernesto Lucas AFR/TR
 Richard Hough FVA/FFP/AFR
 Hope Sukin FVA/PPM
 Don McClelland PFC/PDPR

ABT ASSOCIATES

Stephanie Wilson
 William Levine
 Gerard Martin
 Cheri Rassas
 Charles Hanrahan
 John Tilney

ABEL DAFT AND EARLEY

Martin Abel

ROBERT R. NATHAN

John Beyer
 Jennifer Bremer-Fox

Wes Weidemann
 Ozzie Blake

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

William Abbott
 Conrad Evans
 Arthur Stoecker
 Dean Schreiner
 Jim Trapp

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

APPENDIX 4

OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

PAGE 01 STATE 329261
ORIGIN AID-07

2772 057625 AID2385

STATE 329261

2772 057625 AID2385

ORIGIN OFFICE SIAG-02
INFO AAAT-03 AFEA-03 AFSA-03 AFFW-04 AFCA-03 AFTR-05 PPPP-02
PPDC-01 SAST-01 AGRI-01 RELO-01 /029 A2 1030

INFO LOG-00 COPY-01 /061 R

DRAFTED BY: AID/ST/AGR/EPP: PCHURCH: NG
APPROVED BY: AID/ST/AGR: DOBATHRICK
AID/ST/AGR/EPP: VCUSUPANO AID/AFR/TR/ARD, KPRUSSNER (PHONE)
AID/AFR/SA/SM: GJONES (INFO)
AID/AFR/CCVA/L: CSTEEL (INFO) AID/AFR/SWA/GCLCBOY, YJOHN (INFO)
AID/AFR/CCVA/GTEG-B, PEARES (INFO) AID/AFR/CCVA/ZTBC, OBERNIUS (INFO)
AID/AFR/CCVA/CCE: PGUILD (INFO) AID/AFR/EA: JRIVERA (INFO)
-----#72544 301146Z /Z:

R 211316Z OCT 87
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO AMEMBASSY DAKAR
AMEMBASSY MONROVIA
AMEMBASSY NIAMEY
AMEMBASSY NOUAKCHOTT
AMEMBASSY LOME
AMEMBASSY BAMAKO
AMEMBASSY ANTANANARIVO
AMEMBASSY KINSHASA
AMEMBASSY YAOUNDE

UNCLAS STATE 329261

ACM AID

C O R R E C T E D C O P Y (TEXT THROUGHOUT)

E.O. 12356: N/A

SUBJECT: EVALUATION OF MISSION SERVICES PROVIDED UNDER
S T AGRICULTURAL POLICY ANALYSIS PROJECT (APAP) 936-4884

1. ST/AGR REQUESTS HELP FROM ACTION AFR USAIDS IN
EVALUATING SERVICES PROVIDED UNDER SUBJECT (APAP)
PROJECT. DURING ITS FIRST FOUR YEARS OF IMPLEMENTATION
APAP HAS PROVIDED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES TO FIELD
MISSIONS IN THE DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION AND VALUATION OF
POLICY ANALYSIS PROJECTS OR ANALYSIS INITIATIVES IN THE
AGRICULTURAL SECTOR. SPECIFIC APAP SERVICES PROVIDED TO
AFR MISSIONS INCLUDE:

- 1.1 SENEGAL (FY84): POLICY ANALYSIS;
- 1.2 MONROVIA (FY85): POLICY ANALYSIS AND WORKSHOP;
- 1.3 MAURITANIA (FY85-86): PROJECT DESIGN AND POLICY
ANALYSIS;
- 1.4 NIGER (FY85): TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE;
- 1.5 MALI (FY86/87): POLICY ANALYSIS AND PROJECT DESIGN;
- 1.6 MADAGASCAR (FY86): POLICY ANALYSIS AND WORKSHOP;
- 1.7 TOGO (FY86/87): POLICY ANALYSIS AND PROJECT DESIGN;
- 1.8 CAMEROON (FY87): PROJECT DESIGN;
- 1.9 ZAIRE (FY87): TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

2. WITH RESPECT TO ABOVE ASSISTANCE PLEASE KEY
RESPONSES TO FOLLOWING QUESTIONS. INDICATE N/A IF NOT
APPLICABLE.

2.1 WERE APAP CONSULTANT SERVICES PROVIDED IN A TIMELY
FASHION? IF NOT, EXPLAIN CIRCUMSTANCES AS YOU BEST
UNDERSTAND THEM.

2.2 WERE APAP TECHNICAL ADVISORS QUALIFIED FOR THE
REQUIRED TASKS?

2.3 IF APPLICABLE, DID TECHNICAL ADVISORS HAVE SUITABLE
LANGUAGE EXPERIENCE?

2.4 PLEASE RATE QUALITY (GOOD, FAIR, POOR) OF THE
FOLLOWING APAP SERVICES:

2.4.1 T.A. IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DESIGN
EVALUATION;

2.4.2 T.A. IN POLICY ANALYSIS;

2.4.3 TRAINING WORKSHOPS FOR POLICY ANALYSTS;

2.4.4 PUBLICATIONS (ANALYTICAL STUDIES,
GUIDELINES, CASE
STUDIES)

2.5 PLEASE COMMENT ON THE COST OF THE APAP SERVICES AND
ON THE EASE AND UTILITY OF USING THE APAP BUY-IN
MECHANISM TO ACCESS THOSE SERVICES.

2.6 PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE ANY IMPACT ON POLICY
ANALYSIS CAPACITY BUILDING AND/OR POLICY DECISION-MAKING
IN THE HOST COUNTRY TO WHICH APAP SERVICES MADE A
CONTRIBUTION.

2.7 PLEASE ESTIMATE YOUR MISSION DEMAND (HIGH, MEDIUM,
LOW) FOR THE SERVICES IN 2.4 ABOVE OVER NEXT FIVE YEAR
PHASE OF THIS CENTRALLY FUNDED PROJECT?

2.8 RATE IMPORTANCE (HIGH, MODERATE, LOW) OF THE
FOLLOWING POLICY AREAS IN THE MISSION'S FUTURE POLICY
DIALOGUE AGENDA:

2.8.1 INPUT PRICE POLICY;

2.8.2 CONSUMER PRICE POLICY;

2.8.3 PRIVATE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT;

2.8.4 FOREIGN EXCHANGE AND AGRICULTURAL TRADE
POLICY;

2.8.5 BUILDING HOST COUNTRY POLICY ANALYSIS
CAPACITY;

2.8.6 AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY ANALYSIS;

2.8.7 MICRO-COMPUTER APPLICATIONS IN POLICY
ANALYSIS.

2.8.8 OTHER -- PLEASE SPECIFY

3. PLEASE CABLE RESPONSES: ST/AGR, ATTN: PCHURCH, APAP
PROJECT OFFICER. REPLIES REQUESTED NOT LATER THAN NOVEMBER 13.
THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP. WHITHEAD

UNCLASSIFIED

10

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

APPENDIX 5
OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

PAGE 01 STATE 356494
ORIGIN AID-09

8658 067198 AID5116

STATE 356494

8663 067192 A1

ORIGIN OFFICE STAG-01
INFO AAAP-03 AFEA-02 AFCA-03 AFFM-04 AFCW-03 FPA-02 ANPD-01
APPD-04 ANLA-01 LAGE-02 LAGA-02 LADP-04 LADR-03 AFTR-05
DIRM-02 ANTR-04 SACT-01 ES-01 AGRI-01 STFA-01 ANME-03
RELO-01 LACA-03 ANEA-02 ANEG-02 ANWA-01 ANSA-03
/073 A4 319

INFO LCG-09 /088 R

DRAFTED BY: AID/ST/AGR/EPP.PCHURCH:NG

APPROVED BY: AID/ST/AGR:COBATHRICK

AID/ST/AGR/EPP, VCUSUPAHC AID/ES, GJOE

-----#33426 180324Z /38

P 180316Z NOV 87 ZEX

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO AID WFLOWICE PRIORITY

UNCLAS STATE 356494

ADM AID

E.O. 12356: N/A

TAGS:

SUBJECT: DEMAND FOR MISSION SERVICES FROM S&T
AGRICULTURAL POLICY ANALYSIS PROJECT (APAP) 935-4864

1. ST/AGR REQUESTS INDICATIONS OF FUTURE DEMAND BY USAGDS FOR AGRICULTURE POLICY ANALYSIS SERVICES PROVIDED UNDER SUBJECT APAP PROJECT PHASE I DURING THE CURRENT 1988 FISCAL YEAR AND BY DURING A PROPOSED SECOND FIVE YEAR PHASE OF THE PROJECT THROUGH FY 1994.
2. WITH RESPECT TO ABOVE ASSISTANCE PLEASE KEY RESPONSES TO FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:
 3. ESTIMATE MISSION DEMAND (HIGH, MEDIUM, LOW) FOR THE FOLLOWING APAP AGRICULTURE POLICY ANALYSIS SERVICES DURING THE REMAINDER OF FY 1988:
 - 3.1 T.A. IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DESIGN EVALUATION;
 - 3.2 T.A. IN POLICY ANALYSIS;
 - 3.3 TRAINING WORKSHOPS FOR POLICY ANALYSTS;
 - 3.4 PUBLICATIONS (ANALYTICAL STUDIES, GUIDELINES, CASE STUDIES).
 4. PLEASE ESTIMATE MISSION DEMAND (HIGH, MODERATE, LOW) FOR THE SAME SERVICES IF NO 3 ABOVE FOR THE PERIOD FY 89-94 FROM A CENTRALLY FUNDED AGRICULTURE POLICY ANALYSIS PROJECT.
 5. INDICATE MISSION CAPACITY TO FUND THESE SERVICES IN NO 3 ABOVE (STRONG, FAIR, POOR) THROUGH BUY-INS TO APAP.
 6. RATE IMPORTANCE (HIGH, MODERATE, LOW) OF THE FOLLOWING POLICY AREAS IN THE MISSION'S FUTURE POLICY DIALOGUE AGENDA:
 - 6.1 IMPLT PRICE POLICY;
 - 6.2 CONSUMER PRICE POLICY;
 - 6.3 PRIVATE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT;
 - 6.4 FOREIGN EXCHANGE AND AGRICULTURAL TRADE POLICY;

6.5 BUILDING HOST COUNTRY POLICY ANALYSIS CAPACITY;

6.6 AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY ANALYSIS;

6.7 MICRO-COMPUTER APPLICATIONS IN POLICY ANALYSIS.

6.8 OTHER - PLEASE SPECIFY

7. PLEASE CABLE RESPONSES: ST/AGR, ATTN: PCHURCH, APAP PROJECT OFFICER. REPLIES REQUESTED NLT DECEMBER 18. THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP. SHLLTZ

UNCLASSIFIED

TABLE 1. FUTURE MISSION DEMAND FOR APAP SERVICES
AFRICA BUREAU COUNTRIES -- FY 88

Country and Region	Design Ioplem. 3.1	Policy Analysis 3.2	Training Workshop 3.3	Publi- cations 3.4
(Scale: 3=High, 2=Medium, 1=Low)				
Botswana				
Burkina Faso	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Burundi				
Cape Verde	1.00	2.00	1.00	
Chad	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ethiopia				
Ghana				
Guinea	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Guinea-Bissau				
Kenya	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Liberia	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Madagascar		3.00	3.00	
Mali	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50
Mauritania	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Niger	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00
Rwanda	1.00	2.00	3.00	
Somalia	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00
Sudan	3.00		1.00	2.00
Swaziland	1.00			
Togo	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Zaire	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00
Zambia	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
REDSO/WCA	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
AFRICA AVERAGE	1.53	1.59	1.68	1.46

Results of Cable Responses to State #329261 and State #358494

TABLE 2. FUTURE MISSION DEMAND FOR APAP SERVICES
AFRICA BUREAU COUNTRIES -- FY 89 - FY 94

Country and Region	Design Implem. 4.1	Policy Analysis 4.2	Training Workshop 4.3	Publi- cations 4.4
(Scale: 3=High, 2=Moderate, 1=Low)				
Botswana	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Burkina Faso	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00
Burundi				
Cape Verde	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Chad	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ethiopia				
Ghana				
Guinea	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00
Guinea-Bissau				
Kenya	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Liberia	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50
Madagascar		3.00	2.00	
Mali	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50
Mauritania	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Niger	1.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
Rwanda	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Somalia	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Sudan		3.00		3.00
Swaziland	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50
Togo	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00
Zaire	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
Zambia	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
REDSO/WCA	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00
AFRICA AVERAGE	1.74	1.87	1.69	1.75

Results of Cable Responses to State #329261 and State #358494

TABLE 3. FUTURE MISSION CAPACITY TO FUND APAP SERVICES THROUGH BUY-INS
AFRICA BUREAU COUNTRIES -- FY 88 - FY 94

Country and Region	Design Implem. 5.1	Policy Analysis 5.2	Training Workshop 5.3	Publi- cations 5.4
(Scale: 3=Strong, 2=Fair, 1=Poor)				
Botswana				
Burkina Faso	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Burundi				
Cape Verde	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Chad	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ethiopia	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ghana				
Guinea	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Guinea-Bissau				
Kenya				
Liberia	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Madagascar	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mali				
Mauritania				
Niger	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Rwanda	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Somalia				
Sudan	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Swaziland	1.00			
Togo	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Zaire	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Zambia	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50
REDSO/WCA	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
AFRICA AVERAGE	1.78	1.90	1.96	1.96

Results of Cable Responses to State #329261 and State #358494

TABLE 4. FUTURE MISSION DEMAND FOR APAP SERVICES
ASIA/NEAR EAST BUREAU COUNTRIES -- FY 88

Country and Region	Design Implem. 3.1	Policy Analysis 3.2	Training Workshop 3.3	Publi- cations 3.4
(Scale: 3=High, 2=Medium, 1=Low)				
Afghanistan	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Burma	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Egypt	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00
Fiji				
India	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00
Indonesia		2.00	2.00	3.00
Jordan		3.00	3.00	
Morocco	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Nepal	2.00	3.00	1.00	3.00
Oman	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Pakistan	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Philippines	3.00			
Tunisia	1.50	1.50		
Yemen Arab Rep.	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00
ANE AVERAGE	1.32	1.71	1.27	1.70

Results of Cable Responses to State #329261 and State #358494

10

TABLE 5. FUTURE MISSION DEMAND FOR APAP SERVICES
ASIA/NEAR EAST BUREAU COUNTRIES -- FY 89 - FY 94

Country and Region	Design Implem. 4.1	Policy Analysis 4.2	Training Workshop 4.3	Publications 4.4
(Scale: 3=High, 2=Moderate, 1=Low)				
Afghanistan				
Burma	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Egypt	2.00			
Fiji				
India	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Indonesia	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Jordan		2.00	2.00	
Morocco	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50
Nepal	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
Oman	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Pakistan	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Phillippines				
Tunisia				
Yemen Arab Rep.	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
ANE AVERAGE	1.50	1.72	1.61	1.69

Results of Cable Responses to State #329261 and State #358494

TABLE 6. FUTURE MISSION CAPACITY TO FUND APAP SERVICES THROUGH BUY-INS
ASIA/NEAR EAST BUREAU COUNTRIES -- FY 88 - FY 94

Country and Region	Design Implem. 5.1	Policy Analysis 5.2	Training Workshop 5.3	Publications 5.4
(Scale: 3=Strong, 2=Fair, 1=Poor)				
Afghanistan				
Burma	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Egypt				
Fiji				
India	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Indonesia	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Jordan		2.50	2.50	
Morocco				
Nepal	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00
Oman	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Pakistan	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Phillippines				
Tunisia				
Yemen Arab Rep.	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
ANE AVERAGE	1.86	1.94	1.81	1.86

Results of Cable Responses to State #329261 and State #358494

46

TABLE 7. FUTURE MISSION DEMAND FOR APAP SERVICES
LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN BUREAU COUNTRIES -- FY 88

Country and Region	Design Implem. 3.1	Policy Analysis 3.2	Training Workshop 3.3	Publi- cations 3.4
(Scale: 3=High, 2=Medium, 1=Low)				
Belize	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00
Bolivia	2.00	1.00	1.00	3.00
Costa Rica	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Ecuador	1.00			
Haiti	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Honduras	2.50	2.00	1.00	1.00
Guatemala	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Jamaica				
Peru	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00
RDO/C	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
LAC AVERAGE	1.61	2.00	1.25	1.63

Results of Cable Responses to State #329261 and State #358494

TABLE 8. FUTURE MISSION DEMAND FOR APAP SERVICES
LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN BUREAU COUNTRIES -- FY 89 - FY 94

Country and Region	Design Implem. 4.1	Policy Analysis 4.2	Training Workshop 4.3	Publi- cations 4.4
(Scale: 3=High, 2=Moderate, 1=Low)				
Belize	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00
Bolivia	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00
Costa Rica	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Ecuador	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Haiti	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Honduras	1.00	2.50	2.00	1.00
Guatemala	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Jamaica				
Peru	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
RDO/C	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
LAC AVERAGE	1.44	1.61	1.33	1.33

Results of Cable Responses to State #329261 and State #358494

TABLE 9. FUTURE MISSION CAPACITY TO FUND APAP SERVICES THROUGH BUY-INS
LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN BUREAU COUNTRIES -- FY 88 - FY 94

Country and Region	Design Implem. 5.1	Policy Analysis 5.2	Training Workshop 5.3	Publi- cations 5.4
(Scale: 3=Strong, 2=Fair, 1=Poor)				
Belize	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Bolivia	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Costa Rica	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ecuador	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Haiti	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Honduras	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Guatemala				
Jamaica	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Peru				
RDO/C	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
LAC AVERAGE	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75

Results of Cable Responses to State #329261 and State #358494

TABLE 10. MISSION'S EVALUATION OF IMPORTANCE OF APAP FUTURE POLICY DIALOGUE AGENDA
AFRICA BUREAU COUNTRIES

Country and Region	Input Pricing 6.1	Consumer Prices 6.2	Private Sector 6.3	Trade Policy 6.4	Host Country Capacity 6.5	Commodity Analysis 6.6	Computer Applications 6.7	Other Areas 6.8
(Scale: 3=High, 2=Moderate, 1=Low)								
Botswana								
Burkina Faso	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	
Burundi								
Cameroon	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	A
Cape Verde	1.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	
Chad	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	B
Ethiopia								
Ghana								C
Guinea	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	
Guinea-Bissau								
Liberia								
Madagascar	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
Mali	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00			D
Mauritania								
Niger	1.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	
Rwanda	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
Senegal	3.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	E
Somalia	3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	
Sudan	1.50	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
Swaziland	1.00	1.00	3.00	2.50	3.00	1.00	1.00	
Togo	3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	
Zaire	1.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	
Zambia	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	
REDSO/WCA	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	
AFRICA AVERAGE	2.26	2.12	3.00	2.50	2.65	1.44	2.00	

- NOTES: A. Identification of incentives and disincentives which the government provides to the agricultural sector to spur growth.
 B. Two issues: (1) Export development; and (2) Watershed development planning.
 C. Design and implementation of auctions of food aid commodities.
 D. Cereals policy reform.
 E. Future agricultural sector program planning.

Results of Cable Responses to State #J29261 and State #358494

TABLE 11. MISSION'S EVALUATION OF IMPORTANCE OF APAP FUTURE POLICY DIALOGUE AGENDA
ASIA/NEAR EAST BUREAU COUNTRIES

Country and Region	Input Pricing 6.1	Consumer Prices 6.2	Private Sector 6.3	Trade Policy 6.4	Host Country Capacity 6.5	Commodity Analysis 6.6	Computer Applications 6.7	Other Areas 6.8
(Scale: 3=High, 2=Moderate, 1=Low)								
Afghanistan	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
Burma	3.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	
Egypt	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	
Fiji								
India	3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	
Indonesia	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
Jordan	1.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	
Morocco								
Nepal	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	A
Oman	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	B
Pakistan								
Philippines	3.00			3.00		3.00		C
Sri Lanka	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	D
Tunisia	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	E
Yemen Arab Republic	3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	
ANE AVERAGE	2.50	2.00	2.64	2.42	2.64	2.17	2.00	

- NOTES:
- A. Transportation subsidies.
 - B. Analysis of agricultural practices and programs on water use.
 - C. Potential economic impacts of alternative land reform programs.
 - D. Producer price policy.
 - E. Irrigation water pricing and management.

Results of Cable Responses to State #329261 and State #358494

TABLE 12. MISSION'S EVALUATION OF IMPORTANCE OF APAP FUTURE POLICY DIALOGUE AGENDA
LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES

Country and Region	Input Pricing 6.1	Consumer Prices 6.2	Private Sector 6.3	Trade Policy 6.4	Host Country Capacity 6.5	Commodity Analysis 6.6	Computer Applications 6.7	Other Areas 6.8
(Scale: 3=High, 2=Moderate, 1=Low)								
Belize/Belize City	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.50	3.00	3.00	
Bolivia/LaPaz	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	
Costa Rica	1.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	
Dom Rep/Santo Domingo								
Ecuador/Quito	3.00	3.00	2.50	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	
El Salvador/San Sal	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	
Guatemala/Guatemala	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	
Haiti/Port-au-Princ	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	
Honduras/Tegucigalp	1.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	
Jamaic /Kingston	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	
Panama/Panama City	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	
Peru	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	
RDD/C/Bridgetown	1.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	
ROCAP/Guatemala	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	
LAC AVERAGE	2.00	2.23	2.65	2.62	2.27	2.23	1.85	

NOTES: A. Commodity price stabilization issues.

B. Three issues: (1) commodity exchange; (2) private sector analysis; and (3) ag data and market

Results of Cable Responses to State #329261 and State #358494

AGRICULTURAL POLICY ANALYSIS PROJECT
COUNTRY AND REGIONAL ACTIVITIES
YEARS I - IV

<u>AFRICA</u>		<u>YEAR</u>	<u>ACTIVITY</u>	<u>ACCOUNT</u>
Cameroon				
•	Agriculture Management and Planning Project Evaluation - John Fliginger, Lyle Calvin, Larry Herman, Murl Baker March 19, 1987 Abt	IV	5	M-513
Ecowas				
•	Technical Papers and Final Report: A Symposium on Incentive to Agricultural Production in West Africa Stephanie Wilson, Frank Ofei, O.P. Blaich Rex Daly, C.J.B. Bola-Clarkson Bernard Koundiano, Ministry of Rural Development, Kwame Asafu-Adjei April, 1985 Abt/RRNA	II	9	9
Liberia				
•	Increasing Capacity for Agricultural Policy Analysis in Liberia Luther Tweeten, Dean Schreiner February, 1984 OSU	I	7	S&T-701
•	Activity Report on Liberia, Ivory Coast, and Cameroon Luther Tweeten, James Trapp January, 1985 OSU	II	8	S&T-804
•	Components of an Overall Development Policy for Liberian Agriculture Luther Tweeten March, 1985 OSU	II	8	S&T-804
•	Costs, Benefits, and Income Redistribution from Liberian Rice Policies Luther Tweeten, Boima Rogers March, 1985 OSU	II	7	M-711

54

- Liberian Rice Policy: Rice Self-Sufficiency Versus Rice Security
James Trapp, Boima Rogers, Rudene Wilkens
March, 1985
OSU II 7 M-711
 - Representative Farm Planning Model for Liberia
Francis Epplin, Joseph Musah
February, 1985
OSU II 7 M-711
 - Activity Report on Liberia Workshop
Luther Tweeten, James Trapp
April, 1985
OSU II 7 M-711
 - Tutorial Introduction to Musah86: A Microcomputer Program for LP
Elton Li
OSU II 7 M-711
 - Notes on the Roles of Microcomputers in Agricultural Policy Analysis in Developing Countries
Elton Li, Roger Norton
OSU II 8 S&T-804
- Madagascar
- Trip Report
Wesley Weidemann
April, 1985
RRNA II 5 S&T-507
 - Trip Report - APAP's Participation in the Madagascar Agricultural Rehabilitation Support Project (MARS)
Cheri Rassas
December, 1985
Abt III 8 M-817
 - Trip Report
Marty Makinen, Steve Block
January, 1986
Abt III 8 M-817
 - Report on the Agricultural Policy Analysis Seminar
Marty Makinen, Elliot Berg
January 30-February 1, 1986
Abt III 8 M-817

- Report on the Economic Reform Program in Madagascar
Elliot Berg
October, 1987
Abt IV 8 M-822
- Madagascar Food for Progress Evaluation
Richard Hough, Jerry Martin,
Nicholas Jenks
June 1-14, 1987
Abt IV 5 M-518
- Malawi
 - Draft Material Prepared in Development of Agricultural Policy Component of USAID/Malawi's CDSS.
Richard Newberg
February, 1984
RRNA I I S&T-106
- Mali
 - Consolidating Cereals Market Reform in Mali: An Analysis of Current and Potential Roles for Public and Private Sector Institutions in the Grain Market
Jennifer Bremer, Lynn Ellsworth
July 11, 1986
Abt/RRNA III 8 M-820
 - Evaluation of Title II, Section 206 Project in Mali (688-0230)
Jennifer Bremer
February, 1987
RRNA IV 5 M-516
- Mauritania
 - An Analysis of the Effects of an Increase in Grain Prices: Mauritania
J. Anthony Bottomley
Linda Markey
September, 1984
RRNA I 1 S&T-110
 - Evaluation Report: Mauritania PL 480 Title II, Section 206 Program
Donald McClelland
December, 1985
RRNA II 1 S&T-119
 - Draft Program Paper: PL 480, Section 206
Axel Magnuson, Jennifer, Bremer,
Phil Steffan, Rex Wingard
October, 1985
Abt/RRNA II 5 M-509

24

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary Design of the Mauritania Household Income, Consumption, and Expenditure Survey David Sahn, Phil Parker, John Zins November 14, 1985 Abt/RRNA 	III	1	M-120
Niger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Niger: Agricultural Policy and Credit Reforms Wesley Weidemann, Theodore Cook July, 1984 RRNA • Initial Terms of Reference for Policy Management Component, ASDG; Letter of Transmittal for Draft Papers and Followup (memorandum) Axel Magnuson July, 1984 Abt 	I	8	S&T-806
Niger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trip Report Wesley Weidemann October, 1985 RRNA 	II	8	S&T-806
Senegal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trip Report, Senegal-February 9, 1984 (memorandum) Axel Magnuson/Charles Steedman Sheldon Gellar March, 1984 Abt • Agricultural Sector Policy Analysis: Draft Short Paper Axel Magnuson, Charles Steedman, Sheldon Gellar, John Eriksen Francine Kane April, 1984 Abt • Draft Final/USAID Review: Senegal Agricultural Policy Analysis Axel Magnuson, Charles Steedman Sheldon Gellar, John Eriksen Francine Kane September, 1984 Abt 	I	1	S&T-101
		I	1	M-102
		I	1	M-102

Togo	•	Togo Cereals Liberalization Economic Reform Program Axel Magnuson, Jerry Martin, Charles Hanrahan May, 1986 Abt	III	1	M-121
	•	Notes on DESA Fieldtrip to Maritime Region Jerry Martin July 17, 1986 Abt	III	1	M-121
	•	Report of USAID Statistical Advisors in Cooperation with DESA Personnel Philip M. Parker, William H. Wigton in cooperation with Mr. Ayikoe Amaui and Mr. Lebene Kougbenya August 13, 1986 Abt/RRNA	III	1	M-121
	•	Implementation Phase of AEPRP Axel Magnuson September 7, 1986 Abt	III	1	M-121
	•	Enquete Statistique Sur la Liberalisation des Exportations de Cereales par le Togo September 8, 1986	III	1	S&T-122
	•	Recommendations on Improving DESA's Capabilities Philip M. Parker September 9, 1986 RRNA	III	1	S&T-122
	•	Report on AEPRPD T.A. Philip Parker December 1-19, 1986 RRNA	III	1	S&T-122
	•	Programme AEPRP Liberalisation des Exportation de Cereales par le Togo Deuxieme Prevision de Rocolte: Campagne Agricole 1986-1987	III	1	S&T-122
Zaire	•	Specific USAID Concerns with Respect to the Policy Area; Agricultural Statistics in Zaire Francis LeBeau February, 1984 RRNA	I	1	S&T-105

•	Agricultural Statistics in Zaire: Environment, Situation and Prospects Henri Josserand May, 1984 RRNA	I	5	5
•	Options for Future USAID Support of Agricultural Statistics in Zaire James Riordan May, 1984 Abt	I	5	5
•	Options for Future USAID Support of Agricultural Statistics in Zaire James Riordan May, 1984 Abt	I	5	5
•	Toward Improved Agricultural Policies Policies in Zaire: Issues and Options for USAID Kenneth Farrell June, 1984 RRNA	I	1	S&T-105
•	Overview of Zairian Agricultural Policy Issues and Recommendations for Policy Research Agenda Steve Block, Bechir Rassas, Charles Hanrahan March, 1987 Abt	IV	1	M-125
•	The Zaire Area Sampling Frame: Status and Requirements for Completion and Implementation Rodney Kite, Bechir Rassas April, 1987 Abt	IV	1	M-125
Africa Regional				
•	Africa Bureau ADO/RDO Workshop, Harare, Zimbabwe, December 6-9, 1983 James Riordan December, 1983 Abt	I	9	9
•	Report on FAO Workshop on Experiences in Agriculture Sector Planning in Africa Lehman Fletcher September, 1984 Abt	I	9	9

ASIA/NEAR EAST

ANE Bureau				
•	Guidelines on Information Sources for Agricultural Import and Export Analysis (Draft Report) Abel, Draft & Earley August, 1987 ADE	IV	5	M-520
Bangladesh				
•	Towards a New PL-480 Title III Agreement with Bangladesh. James Riordan Steven Block Marty Makinen November 14, 1985 Abt	II	1	M-116
Egypt				
•	Privatization of Agricultural Input Supply-Constraints and Opportunities for Reform Jennifer Bremer February 11, 1986 RRNA	III	5	M-510
•	Demand for Nitrogenous Fertilizer in Upper Egypt and Potential Supply of Marketing Services Jennifer Breme-Fox, James Fitch, Bechir Rassas, Robert Benton April 1987 RRNA	IV	1	M-123
Pakistan				
•	Implementing the Economic Analysis Network William Carlson May, 1984 RRNA	I	8	S&T-807
•	Agricultural Sector Support Draft PAAD-Pakistan Jennifer Bremer, William Scott March-April, 1987 RRNA	IV	5	M-514
Sri Lanka				
•	Final Report Rolando Jiron September, 1985 Abt	II	8	M-809

	•	Agricultural Diversification Action Plan for Sri Lanka Rolando Jiron and Interministerial Task Force- Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Finance and Planning, Ministry of Trade, Mahaweli Development Authority June, 1987 Abt	IV	8	M-819
Thailand					
	•	Agricultural Planning Project Evaluation Sopin Tongpan, James Fay June, 1984 RRNA	I	5	S&T-504
Tunisia					
	•	Tunisia's Economic Adjustment Program: Impact on Lower Income Groups Edgar J. Ariza-Nino, Cheri Rassas March, 1987 Abt	IV	5	M-517
	•	A Compensatory Food Aid Program for Tunisia Jim Pines March, 1987 Abt	IV	5	M-517
	•	Development of Agricultural Exports in Tunisia John Abbott, Bechir Rassas July, 1987 Abt	IV	1	M-126
Asia/Near East Regional					
	•	Attached Memoranda Regarding Visits Respectively in Bangkok, Jakarta, and Manila Stephen Fitzsimmons Jonathan Hodgdon March, 1984 Abt	I	9	9
	•	Macroeconomic Factors and Agricultural Trade: Case Studies of Egypt, Jordan and Morocco Maury Bredahl November, 1984 RRNA	I	1	S&T-108

- Macroeconomic Policy and Agricultural Development: Egypt, Morocco and Jordan
Maury Bredahl
March, 1985
RRNA II 1 S&T-108

LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN

- Antigua
- A Policy for Agriculture in Antigua and Barbuda
Oswald Blaich
August 10, 1987
RRNA IV 5 M-511
- Bolivia
- Recommended Scope of Work in Agricultural Policy Analysis Under the Bolivia Policy Reform Project
Hylke Van de Wetering
August, 1984
RRNA I 8 S&T-805
- Costa Rica
- Draft Scope of Work: USAID/Costa Rica's Agricultural Sector Development Assistance Strategy: An Analysis of Constraints and Potential Responses
James Riordan
April, 1984
Abt I 1 S&T-107
- Dominican Republic
- Dominican Republic: Effects of Section 213 of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act
Dean Schreiner
December, 1983
OSU I 1 S&T-801
 - Consultant's Report on Price Control Policy in the Dominican Republic
Marvin Kusters
February, 1984
RRNA I 1 S&T-107
 - PID: Agricultural Policy Analysis Project: Draft Outline
James Riordan
October, 1984
Abt I 5 M-501

- Agricultural Policy Analysis:
Draft Project Identification
Document
James Riordan
January, 1984
Abt

I 5 M-501
- Consultant's Report:
Institutional Analysis
John Strasma
June, 1984
Abt

I 5 M-501
- Activity Report on Dominican Republic
Roger Norton
February, 1985
OSU

II 8 S&T-801
- Dominican Republic Workshop
Roger Norton
July, 1985
OSU

II 7 M-713
- Activity Report-Agricultural Policy
Analysis Project in Dominican Republic
Annual Crop Model
Carlos Benito
September 25, 1986
OSU

III 7 M-715
- Livestock Product Demand in the
Dominican Republic
James Trapp
November 14, 1986
OSU

III 7 M-715
- Activity Report-Consultancy with
the Unidad de Estudios Agropecuaria
Consejo Nacional de Agricultura -
Dominican Republic
Carlos Benito
July 16, 1986
OSU

III 7 M-715
- An Orientation Manual for Commodity
Analysts
Oswald Blaich
August, 1987
RRNA

IV 8 M-823

- Dominican Republic Policy Model Workshop
December 1-4, 1986
Santiago Tejada, Teofilo Suriel,
Carlos Benito, Arthur Stoecker,
Larry Watkins, James Osborn,
Francis Epplin, Elton Li
January 7, 1987
OSU

IV 7 M-715
 - Summary of Advisory Support Services
Provided the Economics Study Unit (UEA)
of the Dominican Republic National
Agricultural Council
Dean F. Schreiner
January 23, 1987
OSU

IV 7 M-715
 - Dominican Republic Agricultural Economics
Policy Studies Unit (UEA) Review and
Evaluation
John Strasma
January 7, 1987
OSU

IV 7 M-715
- Ecuador**
- Implementation Plan for Strengthening
Private Sector Participation in
Agricultural Policy Formulation
James Riordan
June, 1985
Abt

II 5 M-506
 - Trip Report
James Riordan
June, 1985
Abt

II 5 M-506
- El Salvador**
- Draft Scopes of Work: Agricultural
Policy Inventory, Agricultural Marketing
Policy Analysis, and Policy Analysis of
Agrarian Reform Debt
Phillip Rourke, Loren Parks,
James Riordan
February, 1984
Abt/RRNA

I 1 S&T-103
 - An Inventory of Policies Affecting
Agriculture in El Salvador
Phillip Rourke, Arthur Mann,
Otto Samayoa, Edgar Ariza-Nino,
Carlos Ibanez-Meier, Francis Masson
August, 1984
RRNA

I 1 M-109

Guatemala				
•	Inventario y Analisis de la Politica Economica y Su Relacion con la Agricultura en Guatemala Rolando Jiron, Otto Samayoa U. October, 1986 Abt	III	1	S&T-117 M-118
•	Final Report on the seminar on Economic Policies and their Relation to the Development of the Agricultural Sector of Guatemala Rolando Jiron, Cheri Bassas January 23-24, 1987 Abt	IV	1	M-118
Honduras				
•	Agricultural Policy Support Under SPATS James Riordan June, 1985 Abt	II	1	M-115
Jamaica				
•	Trip Report for Jamaica to Make Preparations for Policy Analysis Workshop Luther Tweeten, Darrell Ray September, 1984 OSU	I	7	S&T-702
LAC Bureau				
•	Guidelines for Supporting Agricultural and Rural Development in Latin America and the Caribbean Charles Hanrahan, Edgar Ariza-Nino John Tilney, Roland Jiron June 1987 Abt	IV	5	M-519
Panama				
•	Development of Agricultural Management and Policy Planning Project Paper (memorandum) James Riordan January, 1984 Abt	I	5	M-502
•	Private Sector Study for Agriculture, Panama: Consultant Report to USAID/Panama Richard Simmons March, 1984 Abt	I	5	M-502

167

- Report to USAID and the DNPS/MIDA on Status and Recommendations of Agricultural Information System in Panama
James French
March, 1984
Abt I 5 M-502
- Agricultural Policy Formulation and Management Project: Institutional Analysis and Policy Formulation: Consultant's Report to USAID/Panama
John Strasma
March, 1984
Abt I 5 M-502
- Agricultural Policy Formulation and Management Project: Consultant's Report on Program Management Submitted to AID/Panama
Rafael Diez
March, 1984
Abt I 5 M-502
- Sections of Agricultural Policy Formulation and Management Project Paper
James Riordan
March, 1984
Abt I 5 M-502
- Private Sector Support Component of Agricultural Policy Formulation and Management Project (memorandum)
James Riordan
April, 1984
Abt I 5 A-502
- Peru

 - Analisis de la Politica Agraria Dentro del Contexto de Objetivos Nacionales y Sectoriales: El Caso del GAPA en Peru
Roger Norton
May, 1984
OSU I 8 S&T-802
 - Trip Report: Peru
Luther Tweeten
July, 1984 I 8 S&T-802

65

ROCAP

- A Strategy for Strengthening CORECA Country Policies in Priority Areas of Agricultural Development
James Riordan, Dean Schreiner/
Lehman Fletcher
April, 1984
Abt, OSU I 8 S&T-803
- Thoughts on CORECA (memorandum)
James Riordan, Dean Schreiner
May, 1984
Abt/OSU I 8 S&T-803
- Report on Visit to the CORECA Agricultural Policy Analysis Project, San Jose, Costa Rica, 24-26 July 1984
Lehman Fletcher
July, 1984
RRNA I 8 S&T-803
- Report on CORECA Agricultural Policy Studies
Lehman Fletcher
June, 1985
Abt II 9 9

Latin America and Caribbean Regional

- Evaluation of the Latin American and Caribbean Agricultural Planning and Policy Project (LACPLAN/PROPLAN)
Dean Schreiner, Ralph Hanson
September, 1984
OSU I 5 S&T-503

AADPA CONFERENCE

- Procedures for Implementing the Expert Consultations on Agricultural Market Intervention and Price Policies for Anglophone Africa
Dean F. Schreiner
May 16, 1986
OSU III 9 9
- Report of the Mission to Tanzania, Zambia, and Uganda for Purposes of Selecting Country Representatives in Implementing the AADPA Expert Consultant
Dean Schreiner
July 10, 1986 III 9 9

OSU

- Marginal Utility of Income Estimated and Applied to Economic Problems in Agriculture
Luther Tweeten, Gilead Mlay
August 20, 1986
OSU III 9 9
- Liberia and Tanzania Trip Report
James Trapp
December 16, 1986
OSU III 9 9
- Anglophone Expert Consultation -- Second Country Visit to Uganda and Kenya and Meetings in Dakar, Senegal and FAO Rome
Dean F. Schreiner, Isaac J. Minde
January 5, 1987
OSU IV 9 9
- Anglophone Expert Consultation -- Second Country Visit to Zambia, Ghana and Rome
Luther Tweeten
January 5, 1987
OSU IV 9 9

BUREAU FOR PROGRAM AND POLICY COORDINATION/WID

- A Manual for Conducting A Policy Inventory in the Agricultural Sector
Jennifer Bremner, Laurene Graig
Rekha Mehra
September, 1987
RRNA IV 7 M-716

66