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Team Structure & Project Goal

▪ Research Team
  • ISSER (Ghana), Dr Felix Asante
  • ISRA (Senegal), Drs Djiby Dia and Sadibou Fall Cheickh
  • AFRISA (Uganda), Dr Patience Rwamigisa
  • University of Kiel (Germany), Dr Christian Henning
  • University of Hohenheim (Germany), Dr Regina Birner
  • IFPRI (USA), Drs Michael Johnson, Ousmane Badiane and Sam Benin

▪ Project Goal
  • “To conduct research on African policy processes in close collaboration with stakeholders and policy makers with a view to increasing political performance that results in more effective and poverty-oriented policies and strategies.”
Approach and Outputs

- **Approach**
  - Applying both *qualitative* and *quantitative* research methods in the context of actual policy processes, in this case, the CAADP implementation process.

- **Targeting 4 major outputs**
  1. Development of *methods for analyzing the policy process*
  2. Analyzing the *links between policy and development outcomes*;
  3. Improved *understanding agricultural policy processes*
  4. Development of *tools* that policy-makers, policy analysts and stakeholders can use to identify and assess different policy scenarios.
Research & Methods based on the Intervention logic of CAADP
Policy Outcome $[Z]$

- GDP-Growth
- Poverty
- Sustainability

Economy

Policy Input $[Y]$

Agricultural policy programmes

Non-agricultural policy programmes
Relevant Research Questions

I. Understanding Growth-Poverty linkages
   • Identifying key sectors of pro-poor growth (PPG): beyond the ag v. non-ag nexus
   • What makes sectors to be key for PPG? (size versus structure).
   • Assessing potential trade-offs among competing policy goals (e.g. poverty versus urban consumer income or special sector interests).

II. Understanding Policy-Growth linkages
   • Agricultural versus non-agricultural public expenditures (PAE versus non-PAE)
   • Allocation of resources across CAADP-pillars and policies

III. Understanding Policy-Choices
   • Political beliefs
   • Political incentives
   • Political knowledge

IV. Designing Policy-Choices
   • Understanding the role of a) Government, b) Stakeholders, c) Donors, and d) Voters on the political feasibility of efficient PPG strategies
Methodological & Theoretical Approach

**Step 1: Discourse analysis (qualitative)**
Policy network based coalition framework approach
- Identification of relevant stakeholder and interest groups: Expert interviews,
- Identification of relevant policy concerns and policy beliefs: Discourse analysis
- Identification of relevant coalitions: Expert interviews and discourse analysis
* Mockshell and Birner, *Food Policy*, 2015

**Step 2: Policy network analysis (quantitative)**
- Analysis of policy network clusters and beliefs (*Policy Brief).

**Step 3: CGPE modeling and simulations (quantitative)**
(*CGPE, Henning 2013)
The CGPE model

Modeling Political Participation
- Extended Baron-Grossman-Helpman Model
- Voting Module: Probabilistic Voter model
- Lobbying Module: Extended Grossmann / Helpman lobbying model incorporating policy networks

Modeling political belief formation
- Extended Friedkin-model, including naive observational and communication learning in policy networks among governmental and non-governmental organizations
Modeling Political decision-making
- Extended Baron-Ferejohn model of legislative bargaining

The CGPE model
Modeling Economic response to policies
- Policy Impact function
- Micro-Macro-linked CGE

The CGPE model
Road Map of Presentations

I. Policy-growth-poverty (PPG) linkages
   ▪ Beyond the Agriculture-Non-agriculture Nexus: Key sectors and key policies of an effective PPG-strategy in Ghana, Senegal and Uganda, by Christian Henning (University of Kiel).
   ▪ Agricultural Productivity Effects of Public Spending in Ghana, by Sam Benin (IFPRI)

II. Assessing participatory and evidence-based political processes
   ▪ Political Economy of PPG-Policies: A theoretical framework, by Christian Henning (University of Kiel)
   ▪ Comparing CAADP Goals and Policy Options in Ghana, Senegal and Uganda, by Michael Johnson (IFPRI)
   ▪ Assessing Political Feasibility and Efficiency of policy options in Ghana, Senegal and Uganda, by Christian Henning.

III. Discussion

IV. Introduction to the interactive policy tool-kit 'CAADP-LAB', by Johannes Hedtrich and Christian Henning (University of Kiel).
The PEBAB Credo

- “Identifying effective solutions for central economic problems appears to be a problem of linking abstract economic theory with feasible political practice” (Stiglitz 'Whither socialism').

- In other words, “theoretical models provide a useful tool for understanding complex economic processes, processes which require policy action (politics) in order to actually change the world”.

More about the PEBAP Project: https://pebap.agrarpol.uni-kiel.de/
Comparing CAADP Goals and Policy Options in Ghana, Senegal and Uganda

by

Michael Johnson, IFPRI
Policy network survey & analysis

- Conducted in 2013 in all three countries using carefully constructed survey questionnaires (unit of observation = an organization).

- Targeted organizations carefully selected and from snow balling (but only by significance of nominations).

- Relative interest and preferred positions of an organization on a specific CAADP policy issue were elicited.

- Data collected helped to identify the relative interests of an organization for:
  - A specific policy goal (X);
  - Desired policy goal targets (Z);
  - Preferred budget share allocations across a) CAADP pillars (P); and b) subprograms (S), including non-ag policies.

- Using cluster analysis, similarities and/or differences were identified and grouped together regarding their relative interests.
Senegal - Policy interest of stakeholders
Ghana - Preferred allocation for CAADP-2025 compared to CAADP-2015

Relative shares

Donors Private sector Government Research 2015 Targets

Water
Export Crops
Storage

Land
Livestock
R&D

Food Crops
Roads
Extension
Senegal - Preferred allocation for CAADP-2025 compared to CAADP-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>Private sector</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>2015 Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export Crops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export Crops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export Crops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Uganda - Preferred allocation for CAADP-2025 compared to CAADP-2015

Relative shares

Donors
Private sector
Government
Research
2015 Targets

- Water
- Farm machinery
- Storage
- Land
- Farm inputs
- Roads
- R&D
- Extension
Ghana - Preferred allocation by cluster for CAADP 2025 (% of national budget)
Uganda - Preferred allocation by cluster for CAADP 2025 (% of national budget)

**CP1**
- Extension
- R&D, Markets (support)

**CP2**
- R&D
- Extension, Markets (roads)

**CP3**
- Markets (roads)
- R&D & extension

**CP4**
- R&D and Extension, Markets

- **NR - Water**
- **FM - mechanization**
- **MA - Storage**
- **RM - Input**
- **MA - Roads**
- **HR - R&D**
- **HR - Extension**

Share of national budget
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Key Findings

- There are varying patterns across the countries – especially as priorities shift from CAADP 2015 to 2025, e.g.
  - Ghana: FM(inputs) & MA(roads) $\rightarrow$ HR(R&D and extension)
  - Senegal: FM $\rightarrow$ HR(R&D and extension) and MA (both)
  - Uganda: HR(R&D and extension) and MA (both) $\rightarrow$ HR(R&D and extension) and MA (support services only)

- Within each country, some broad agreement on CAADP goals for 2025 – but divergent across countries (Ghana – Growth, Senegal – poverty & budget, Uganda – environment & growth)

- Despite broad consensus, however, some conflicting positons do arise within each country:
  - Ghana: One group of organizations (mostly governmental) allocated less to agriculture than the majority of stakeholders (7.6 relative to over 11%)
  - Senegal: Ranged from 10% to over 14%
  - Uganda: Ranged from 9.6% (majority – mostly government and donors) to 16%

- Conflicting CAADP strategies of stakeholders and politicians are mainly induced by diverging policy beliefs and not driven by differences in fundamental political goals.
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