

# ReSAKSS-SA Workshop Report

## Launching of the Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System for Southern Africa (ReSAKSS-SA)

Report of the Regional Stakeholders' Workshop,  
Johannesburg, South Africa, October 4-5, 2006

Chilonda Pius, Femi Olubode-Awosola and Isaac Minde (editors)



Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support  
System for Southern Africa (ReSAKSS-SA)

**Workshop Report**

Report of the Regional Stakeholders' Workshop on

**‘Launching of the Regional Strategic  
Analysis and Knowledge Support System  
for Southern Africa (ReSAKSS-SA)’**

Johannesburg, South Africa,  
October 4-5, 2006

**Chilonda Pius, Femi Olubode-Awosola and Isaac Minde (editors)**

March 2007

**International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT)**

**and**

**International Water Management Institute (IWMI)**

The Regional Stakeholders' workshop on "Launching of the Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System for Southern Africa (ReSAKSS-SA)," was hosted by the International Water Management Institute (IWMI) and the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) in collaboration with the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), the Southern African Development Community (SADC), Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) of the African Union Commission (AUC).

**Citation:**

Chilonda Pius, Femi Olubode-Awosola and Isaac Minde (eds.) 2007. Report of the Regional Stakeholders' Workshop on "Launching of the Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System for Southern Africa (ReSAKSS-SA)", Johannesburg, South Africa, October 4-5, 2006. ReSAKSS-SA, IWMI and ICRISAT, Pretoria, South Africa.

**The editors:**

Pius Chilonda is the Sub-Regional Coordinator for the ReSAKSS-SA, IWMI, Pretoria, South Africa; Femi Olubode-Awosola is a Post-Doctoral Research Fellow (Agricultural Economics), IWMI, Pretoria, South Africa and Isaac Minde is Senior Scientist (Economics), ICRISAT, Bulawayo, Zimbabwe.

*The ReSAKSS-SA aims to identify and assess strategic options for agricultural growth particularly poverty alleviation in southern Africa. ReSAKSS-SA supports review and learning processes in the region to contribute to the successful implementation of agriculture and rural development strategies with particular emphasis on Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) and Southern Africa Development Community Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (SADC RISDP). ReSAKSS-SA is jointly implemented by the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) and the International Water Management Institute (IWMI), in collaboration with the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), regional and national partners.*

*The ReSAKSS-SA is a multi-donor initiative funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the Department for International Development (DFID), and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA).*

**For more information, contact:**

Sub-Regional Coordinator  
Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System  
for Southern Africa (ReSAKSS-SA)

**International Water Management Institute (IWMI)**

Private Bag X813  
Silverton 0127  
Pretoria, South Africa  
Telephone: +27 (0)12 845 9100  
Facsimile: +27 (0)12 845 9110  
E-mail: [resakss-sa@cgiar.org](mailto:resakss-sa@cgiar.org)  
Website: [www.resakss-sa.org](http://www.resakss-sa.org)

# Table of Contents

<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>A synthesis of major outcomes</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Chapter 1</b>	<b>1</b>
Opening session: Introduction, objectives and overview of ReSAKSS-SA	1
<b>Chapter 2</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 ReSAKSS strategic analysis issues in the context of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) and the Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (RISDP) growth objective	4
2.2 ReSAKSS-SA/FANRPAN country level analysis	12
2.3 Panel discussion: Identify regional priorities for strategic analysis for ReSAKSS-SA	18
<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1 Knowledge management issues in the context of Southern Africa	23
3.2 Identifying challenges and opportunities for knowledge sharing and management	30
<b>Chapter 4</b>	<b>34</b>
4.1 ReSAKSS-SA work plans	34
4.2 Plenary review of work plans	36
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>41</b>
Closure	41
<b>Appendixes</b>	<b>42</b>
Agenda	42
List of participants	47

# Abbreviations

ADB	African Development Bank
AIMS	Agricultural Information Management System
AU	African Union
SADC	Southern African Development Community
FANR	Food Agriculture and Natural Resources
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CGIAR	Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
DFID	Department for International Development
DSDG	Development Strategy and Governance Division
EIS AFRICA	Environmental Information Systems -Africa
FANRPAN	Food Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FEWSNET	Famine and Early Warning System Network
FIVIMS	Food Insecurity and Vulnerability Information and Mapping Systems
ICRISAT	International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IITA	International Institute for Tropical Agriculture
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
PPLPI	Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Plan
R&D	Research and Development
ReSAKSS	Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System
ReSAKSS-SA	Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System for Southern Africa
RECs	Regional Economic Communities
RISDP	Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan
RVAC	Regional Vulnerability Assessment Committee
SAHIMS	Southern African Humanitarian Information Management System
SAP	Structural Adjustment Programme
SARPN	Southern African Regional Poverty Network
SDMX	Statistical Data and Metadata Exchange
SIMA	Strengthen the National Market Information System
UN	United Nations
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VAC	Vulnerability Assessment Committee
WFP	World Food Programme

# A synthesis of major outcomes

The regional workshop of the Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System for Southern Africa held in Johannesburg, South Africa on 4-5 October 2006 was a key milestone in the institutionalisation of the sub-regional SAKSS node for Southern Africa. The thematic focus of the two-day forum was 'Launching of the Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System for Southern Africa (ReSAKSS-SA)'. It was hosted by the International Water Management Institute (IWMI) and the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) in collaboration with the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), the Southern African Development Community (SADC), Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) of the African Union Commission (AUC). Key outcomes of the workshop included:

1. Stakeholder endorsement and buy-in. The regional meeting brought together 61 delegates from 20 regional and international partner institutions including ( number of participants in brackets): SADC(2); COMESA(1); NEPAD(2); WFP(1); USAID(3); FAO(3); SAHIMS(1); SARPN(2); HSRC(2); DFID(1) Southern Africa Trust(1); International Universities(3); Regional Universities(3); FANRPAN(1); FEWSNET(1); IFPRI(5); SAKSS–East & Central Africa(1); IWMI(5); ICRISAT(2) and SADC members states: Malawi(4); Mozambique(4); South Africa(6) and Zambia(2). This high level attendance and subsequent participation in the development of a joint 2007-09 programme of work for the ReSAKSS was a clear signal of stakeholder endorsement, as well as, relevance of the programme. The meeting provided an opportunity for different stakeholders to commit to undertaking different tasks on behalf of the network.
2. ReSAKSS-SA – instead of SAKSS-SA. A technical meeting for the core partners, convened alongside the workshop on 6 October 2006 to discuss governance issues, agreed that in order to reflect better the demand-side of SAKSS, the Africa-wide SAKSS should be referred to as the Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Management System (ReSAKSS) – to differentiate it from the international SAKSS coordinated by the CGIAR (IFPRI). This would enable the international SAKSS to provide demand-driven support to the regional SAKSS (ReSAKSS). The sub-regional nodes would, thus, be referred to as ReSAKSS with a sub-regional suffix – e.g. ReSAKSS–SA. This shift in name will create more regional ownership and focus. ReSAKSS–SA will focus on supporting the SADC–RISDP and NEPAD's CAADP objectives and targets. The technical meeting was attended by: Margaret Nyirenda and Bentry Chaura from SADC–FANR directorate; Chikakula Miti from COMESA secretariat; Richard Mkandawire and Ousmane Badiane from NEPAD; Pius Chilonda, Isaac Minde, David Rohrbach and Hilmy Sally representing ReSAKSS–SA; Godfrey Bahigwa from ReSAKSS–ECA; Michael Johnson and Shenggen Fan, from IFPRI representing the international SAKSS; and Jeffrey Hill from USAID – Washington, representing donors.
3. ReSAKSS-SA Steering Committee. The technical meeting on ReSAKSS–SA governance also recommended that a ReSAKSS-SA steering committee (SC) be constituted as an immediate next step, chaired by the Director SADC–FANR in order for SADC to give its support and help to empower the network and to take ownership of the agenda. Margaret Nyirenda, the Director of SADC–FANR who was present in the meeting, observed that the issue of ownership was very important, because stakeholder buy-in would be very difficult if all analyses and findings are said to be from IFPRI. She indicated that it would be better

if findings could be referred to as coming from the ReSAKSS-SA. She agreed that, indeed, the governance and leadership of ReSAKSS-SA needs to be with SADC. The meeting further recommended that COMESA and NEPAD should be members of the SC, with FAO and a donor partner as observers. The meeting recommended that it would also be good to have a national representative on the committee. The first meeting of the committee is scheduled for April 31, 2007.

4. Components of the ReSAKSS–SA work plan. The meeting agreed that the 3–year (2007-09) ReSAKSS–SA programmatic thrust will be based on three strategic components:
  - Strategic analysis: Targeting improvements in agricultural policy and investment decision making. It will focus on conducting analyses of key strategic options for increasing agriculture growth rates in ways that measurably contribute to poverty reduction in southern Africa.
  - Knowledge management: Targeting the improvement of access to and use of higher quality data in policy analysis. It will focus on the development of a knowledge management system that will ensure that effective knowledge sharing processes are put in place to allow both input and access by data providers, analysts and policy and decision makers in southern Africa.
  - Capacity building: Targeting the improvement of the analytical skills of national and regional researchers and policy analysts in ways that allow them to effectively contribute to informing the policy and decision making processes in southern Africa.
5. ReSAKSS operational framework 2007-2009. The meeting discussed and agreed that ReSAKSS-SA will implement the three programme components over the next three years through five interrelated activities:
  - monitoring progress of agricultural growth, poverty reduction and investment
  - identifying region-wide options for accelerating agricultural growth and poverty reduction
  - identifying options for increasing agricultural productivity
  - knowledge management and sharing, and
  - capacity building.
6. Monitoring and evaluating progress of agricultural growth, poverty reduction and public investments will involve three sub-activities:
  - identifying existing data and priorities for sustainable gap filling
  - reviewing national and regional agricultural growth and poverty trends, and
  - monitoring and evaluating agricultural spending and allocation
7. Identifying region-wide options for accelerating agricultural growth and poverty reduction will involve three sub-activities:
  - identifying challenges and opportunities of regional integration for economic growth and poverty alleviation
  - identifying optimal regional integration pathways for different countries, and
  - assessing alternative regional R&D strategies.



8. Identifying options for increasing agricultural productivity will be achieved through three sub-activities:
  - preparing key policy briefs on alternative policy and investment options for improving productivity
  - identifying salient features affecting the performance of regional agricultural research collaboration, and
  - monitoring the impacts of non-tariff barriers in regional agricultural trade.
9. Knowledge management and sharing will be achieved through:
  - establishing a ReSAKSS–SA ICT platform
  - developing an analytical framework for the SADC Agricultural Information Management System(AIMS), and
  - carrying out policy dialogues
10. Capacity Building – ReSAKSS–SA will conduct demand-driven training workshops and seminars aimed at building the capacity of national and regional researchers and analysts to conduct analyses that effectively inform policy and investment decisions in the region.
11. Key concerns and strategic questions – participants observed that ReSAKSS–SA will have to respond to the following key issues and questions.
  - Identifying key agricultural performance indicators (at least 10) in the region and monitoring these on a regular basis
  - How will ReSAKSS–SA work with SADC to develop and set up coordination mechanisms?
  - How will ReSAKSS–SA work with different countries and national nodes?
  - How will regional programmes be supported?
  - How will ReSAKSS–SA support the CAADP country round table processes?
  - How will ReSAKSS–SA support dialogue and review processes?
  - How will ReSAKSS–SA support existing networks?
  - What infrastructure and media format will ReSAKSS–SA utilize?
  - How should ReSAKSS try to interact with political processes to ensure sustained interest?



# Chapter 1

## Opening session: Introduction, objectives and overview of ReSAKSS-SA

### Keynote remarks

**IWMI:** *Hilmy Sally, Head Southern Africa Office*, noted in his welcoming remarks that the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) had set a target for African countries to spend 10% of their budgets on agriculture in order to realise its potential and countries in the region had committed themselves to achieving agricultural growth of 6% annually as their contribution to reversing the unfavourable trend in development indicators. ReSAKSS-SA could play a role by generating knowledge through research and analysis to give decision makers a range of options for investments in agriculture that harness physical, social and economic capital. He said there was also a need to look at how to share this knowledge through partnerships, collaboration, policy dialogue, workshops and networks. He stressed the importance of cutting issues included strengthening capacity and providing knowledge to decision makers at national, regional and local level. The measure of our success will be the extent to which knowledge is applied in policy. At this workshop we aim to come up with viable plans and activities for ReSAKSS-SA.

**ICRISAT:** *David Rohrbach, Principal Scientist*, indicated that ICRISAT is working in partnership with IWMI to establish the initiative in Southern Africa. The aim is to identify other partners that could collaborate in the ReSAKSS-SA. Southern Africa has some of the worst agricultural growth rates in the world. If you look at yields of cereal grains there has been very little growth compared to China or the USA and Sub-Saharan Africa is struggling to reach agricultural growth of 2.5% a year. Despite the call to increase agricultural budgets to 10% in a country like Zimbabwe the budget allocation for agriculture has dropped from 2.5% to 2.1% and the agricultural research institutes are now weaker than they were twenty years ago. Short term humanitarian relief is attracting increasing funding; a sign of the failure to promote crop production. We have to ask where these short-term commitments are heading? There is a sense of frustration but also a sense that there are solutions if institutions in the region can build stronger links. This is one of the purposes of this workshop.

**SADC FANR:** *Bentry Chaura, Senior Programme Manager*, Agricultural Information Management System (AIMS), SADC FANR highlighted the fact that agriculture is the largest sector in the region accounting for close to 40% of GDP and 70% of employment. He observed that despite the problems facing agriculture, the region would not be able to alleviate poverty without achieving growth in this sector. Member states have been implementing agricultural programmes but the results have not met expectations and for the most part agriculture in the region is going backwards. We should ask if we have the right policies, strategies and programmes and whether we are using the right information? These are the issues that ReSAKSS-SA is trying to look at. The SADC secretariat is giving its full support to the programme and can help with information in some areas. We share the same objective of reducing poverty as ReSAKSS-SA.

**NEPAD:** *Richard Mkandawire, Agriculture Advisor*, stated that ReSAKSS-SA is pivotal for implementing NEPAD's agricultural programme. NEPAD initiated a resurgence of interest in agriculture in 2003 when the Heads of Government Summit endorsed the CAADP as a tool and process to revive agriculture in Africa. Since then the international community has given its support to the programme. The process incorporated consultations with all the regional economic communities (RECs) to identify interventions that can help to implement the CAADP at regional and country level. SADC has come forward as a prominent player. Analytical work will identify problems, ways to move towards the 6% agricultural growth target, and establish a regular process of review at country level. We need sound information and mutual learning between and within countries. ReSAKSS-SA can help to document the reasons for those successes and can also contribute to the CAADP process by helping to strengthen local institutions, universities, civil society and governments. Farmers' organisations and other key players interested in the revival of agriculture will come to play a part in CAADP which has the full backing of the AU and the international community.



## Objectives of the workshop

*Pius Chilonda, Sub-Regional Coordinator*, ReSAKSS-SA, outlined the objectives of the workshop, which were to launch the Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System for Southern Africa (ReSAKSS-SA), to review what ReSAKSS-SA has been doing to date, to assess how ReSAKSS-SA can best partner with both SADC and COMESA in southern Africa, and to present and discuss the ReSAKSS-SA proposed work plans. If we can come out with clear guidelines for the work plans the workshop will be successful.

Southern Africa faces the problem of persistent poverty and countries in the region are unlikely to achieve the MDG 1 – halving poverty by 2014. With most people in the region living in the rural areas achieving a 6% agricultural growth rate by 2015 is an important target. We have to ensure that additional agricultural expenditure contributes to achieving this target. ReSAKSS-SA's response to this challenge has three components

- a strategic analysis initiative targeting improvements in agricultural policy and investment decision making;
- a knowledge management system for improved access to, and use of, higher quality data in policy analysis and
- a capacity strengthening initiative to build analytical capacity in the region.

In outlining the programme to date he stated that in February 2005 a regional stakeholder meeting endorsed the ReSAKSS-SA initiative as a CAADP early action in the region. During 2005 an inventory of regional capacities was compiled, a regional office was established earlier this year and SADC FANR has informally endorsed the programme. Strategic assessments of country trends in the agricultural sector are under way. Partners include the CGIAR centres in the region, ICRISAT, IWMI and IFPRI and regional institutions including NEPAD, SADC-FANR, COMESA, FANRPAN, SAHIMS, SARPN, EIS-AFRICA, and the HSRC. ReSAKSS-SA is having ongoing discussions with stakeholders and is exploring relationships with national institutions including universities, government policy units, statistics units and national agricultural research institutes, and international institutions such as FAO and Michigan State University.

## Informing and guiding the CAADP implementation process through ReSAKSS

*Ousmane Badiane, Africa Coordinator, IFPRI*, indicated how he saw ReSAKSS role in supporting the implementation of CAADP. A major element of the CAADP agenda has been to improve the design and implementation of policies. CAADP's four main pillars will guide agricultural investment. The acceptance of mutual accountability and better cooperation across borders are also main features. Agriculture differs from other NEPAD sectors in that it is basically a private sector led business and farmer's organisations and other stakeholders play a major role. Over the last two years ReSAKSS has worked to align development assistance from Africa's partners with CAADP objectives and principles. This has now been secured. Other major features of ReSAKSS's work being securing the commitment of national governments to work with partners and the private sector, developing tools for policy dialogue and improving governance in the sector in order to do business better. At regional level the challenge for the regional economic communities (RECs) is to take ownership of CAADP, as they have to coordinate all NEPAD programmes. They need to establish regional structures for coordination and governance that bring together farmers, government and other stakeholders to support the national implementation processes. We need a more effective planning process and the translation of expenditure into assets and public goods. ReSAKSS can provide knowledge support for planning review and dialogue. Countries should use the ReSAKSS round tables to establish partnerships for successful implementation of CAADP, a peer review process and dialogue to track implementation, performance and the progress towards meeting commitments which were agreed on. They need to develop a CAADP compact to guide implementation that includes commitments on sector policies, public expenditure and development assistance. To provide effective support SAKSS's transition to ReSAKSS needs to expand its regional networks, its coverage of countries, and its coverage of the sector. It needs to build up the regional nodes, create demand and ownership through low cost country nodes that link with end users, and align its agenda to be relevant to policy concerns. We need to do this because if NEPAD fails it will be a long time before the world will listen to Africa again.

### Questions for Southern Africa

- How would you like to work with SADC to set up coordination mechanisms?
- How to work with countries and national nodes?
- How to support regional programmes?
- How to support country round table processes?
- How to support dialogue and review processes?
- How to use existing networks?
- What infrastructure and media format?



# Chapter 2

## 2.1 ReSAKSS strategic analysis issues in the context of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) and the Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (RISDP) growth objective

*Chair: Michael Johnson, Research Fellow/Africa ReSAKSS Coordinator, IFPRI*

### What is the current status of poverty, food security and agricultural growth in Southern Africa?

*Pius Chilonda, Sub-Regional Coordinator, ReSAKSS-SA*, noted that the situation in Southern Africa is characterised by poverty and lack of food security. CAADP's vision has called for African countries to improve the productivity of agriculture to achieve a 6% growth rate. SADC's RISDP calls for a similar growth rate in agriculture. The current and historical growth rates for agriculture are much lower and agriculture has stagnated, failing to keep up with the growth trend GDP rates in the SADC. At the same time the population has tripled from 1996 and 2001. He pointed out that we needed to do something to improve growth in agriculture, which is still the major source of employment in region, if we are to achieve MDG 1 and reduce poverty by half by 2014.

If we look at poverty trends we see that 8 of the 14 countries in the region are low-income countries and overall poverty has increased. The DRC has the lowest GDP per capita. Looking at the persistence of poverty in the region, although the picture is mixed, overall we see poverty is on the increase. While there has been some progress in Botswana, Swaziland and Mozambique, overall poverty remains pervasive. In Zambia 83% of people in rural areas are living below the poverty line. In general there are more poor people in rural than in urban areas.

Turning to food security he indicated that Southern Africa has among the highest proportion of under-nourished people in the world with a high proportion of people consuming less than 2,000 calories a day. The Southern African region has seen a decline in agricultural production. He pointed out that if we excluded South Africa we see that agriculture GDP as a percentage of total GDP is much lower in SADC countries than in other developing countries. There has been a marked decline in the number of kilograms of cereal produced per capita, with maize production in Zambia declining from around 200kg per capita to around 100kg over the last forty years. One of the problems causing this is low agricultural productivity. If we look at the agricultural value added per worker per year we see that it has grown in OECD countries but has remained very low in sub-Saharan Africa. The share of agriculture GDP in total GDP was highest in the low-income countries in region. Given the importance of agriculture in the economies of these low-income countries improved strategies to promote agricultural growth were needed. Maize productivity was much lower in the SADC region than in other developing countries and the picture was the same for livestock with beef productivity per animal among the lowest in the world. All this showed that agriculture has under performed in the region and needs urgent attention.

## Strategic options for achieving growth and poverty reduction: Analytical agenda to support CAADP

*Shenggen Fan, Division Director, DSDG, IFPRI*, indicated that the questions that we needed to look at included what were the key challenges, what were the strategic options for agriculture, what were the opportunities for regional cooperation and what was the agenda needed to support CAADP? Although the reasons for choosing the 6% agricultural growth and the 10% budget allocation targets were not clear it was important for heads of state to set targets and they needed analytical support to measure progress towards those targets. However, the 6% growth target was a big challenge as very few countries in the world had achieved that level of agricultural growth. Even China and Vietnam only achieved this level of growth for short periods.

We needed to know what the opportunity cost was of achieving 10% expenditure on agriculture? Some studies showed that agricultural growth was a precondition for other sectors to take off but this had to be applied to the country situation.

Using the MDGs as the framework 6% growth was about right on average. However, requirements vary from country to country. We needed to look at these variations in the round table discussions. We also needed a common definition of agricultural spending to measure when a country had achieved the target? Without this countries could simply reallocate spending. The definition should include:

- agricultural research and extension, agricultural technical or professional education;
- irrigation;
- input and output subsidies for agricultural commodities (we can debate whether subsidies can sustain long term growth) and
- rural infrastructure that is directly linked to agriculture.

Was 10% expenditure enough to reach 6% growth? Some countries would need to spend more than this to achieve MDG1. And if they did achieve this target how would they allocate this spending efficiently between the four CAADP pillars and within each pillar? Once they had allocated expenditure countries needed a framework to assess the impact of investments and policies on growth and poverty reduction. Lastly, regional integration was very important. African countries were very small and could not afford to have their own development agenda, particularly in terms of infrastructure and research. They had to work together and share technologies and investment.



## Exploring growth linkages and market opportunities for agriculture in Southern Africa

*Alejandro Nin Pratt and Xinshen Diao, Development Strategy and Governance Division IFPRI*, gave a presentation that focused specifically on economic linkages in the region as the channel through which we could transmit growth in the region. Trade policy, transport, transaction costs were all barriers to integration, while lack of diversification of exports was also a concern. A unique characteristic of the region was that it included middle and lower income countries and economic linkages had the potential to play a central role in regional integration and agricultural development.

The scenarios were run on a regional computer generated economics (CGE) Computable General Equilibrium model that analysed South Africa as the engine of growth in the region. The model could combine growth in agricultural productivity in low-income countries and non-agricultural growth in middle-income countries. For example if non-agricultural production and profits increased in South Africa these sectors demanded more labour and capital and the agricultural sector suffered while increased non-agricultural output led to increased income and increased demand for food resulting in increased imports or reduced exports of food.

If South Africa's GDP grew at 4.5% a year food consumption increased and there was an increase in production of staple crops and livestock in low-income countries. This had a larger effect in these countries than increasing growth in other sectors. When we added this to growth in non-agricultural sectors in middle-income countries we saw that it gave an additional push to growth, showing that growth linkages benefit low-income countries. However, it was not enough to wait for South Africa to grow; we needed to increase agricultural production in low-income countries.

### **Strategic options for achieving CAADP's agricultural growth targets**

*Duncan Boughton, Michigan State University*, indicated that the objective was to describe how agricultural marketing systems would need to evolve to help meet the 6% growth target as marketing was essential for long-term sustainable agricultural growth. New farming technology led to increased supply of farm products and this could lead to lower prices making the new technologies no longer profitable and discouraging farmers. There were two major types relating to state led single channel systems, and more recently a global programme with strong emphasis on technological innovation. State-led integrated single channel systems were very successful in promoting agricultural growth but their enormous cost contributed to a macroeconomic crisis and to structural adjustment programmes. The global programme based on demonstrating systems to farmers was successful in increasing agricultural productivity but credit and marketing systems were not able to service the surpluses. This pointed to the need for an enabling environment as well as new technology and for a financially sustainable programme that would not bankrupt the treasury. It presented a very complex analytical problem.

How could we make the demand curve more elastic? One way was to develop the regional market with better transport, more diversified food consumption and better storage capacity. Removing trade and policy barriers was critical. These elements depended heavily on government policy. Then we needed public investments that raised the long-term productivity and competitiveness of rural farm families. There were serious political economy issues in making these investments because there were sharp trade offs between long term productivity investments and trying to feed people in the short term through providing things like starter packs and through drought relief. There were also problems with making input subsidies effective and in many cases they were not efficient in realising long-term results.

Could we find ways to make the trade offs less sharp? We had to spend on food aid but could we get more growth from it? How could governments change from direct intervention to a stable policy environment with clear rules and greater consultation between government and the private sector?

How could we support governments to reallocate budgets towards securing long-term benefits? How could we build and maintain policy analysis and strengthen linkages with policy makers?

Countries needed national policy analysis capacity with strong links to national governments. There is need for big investments in dialogue capacity between the public and private sectors to create mutual confidence and we needed consultation at regional level.



## Implementation status of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) in Southern Africa

*Barbara Kalima-Phiri, Southern Africa Trust*, noted that to be effective PRSPs required a needs-based policy approach that helped citizens to claim their basic rights and promoted sustainable livelihoods through asset driven interventions. In addition governments needed to create an enabling environment for small farmers. With donor support PRSPs had become country level frameworks for implementing the MDGs with the focus on key constraints affecting poverty reduction in countries. According to the World Bank 49 countries, half of them in Africa had PRSP processes. In Southern Africa they included Angola, the DRC, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia. Mozambique and Tanzania were in the second stage of implementation. The other countries in the region were not highly indebted poor countries (HIPC) and had been working on their own poverty reduction strategies.

The key implementation issues were:

- ownership of the programme and process;
- financing, with global discussion of donor alignment;
- participatory processes in implementation and
- poverty reduction impact.

*Ownership:* harmonising PRSPs with other national development plans was time consuming and in the meantime lack of coordination undermined the development process. Funding, outside consultants and the oversight role of the World Bank and IMF had often influenced priorities. It was important for poor people to endorse the programmes.

*Finance:* donors needed to align development aid to country priorities ensuring that it went into budget support so that governments could determine priorities. Donor funding to civil society organisations (CSOs) needed to be aligned with the PRSP. Debt servicing obligations also affected PRSP financing and donor support had made countries more accountable to donors than to citizens.

*Participatory processes:* clear mechanisms for participation were set up in the process of developing PRSPs but not for the implementation phase. Countries needed to define the roles of CSOs and the private sector, which benefited through contracts.

*Poverty reduction impact:* misalignment between country level poverty targets and the MDGs had created difficulty in translating goals into annual budgets. There was a lack of clarity on what drives poverty reduction with public spending on sectors like health not necessarily contributing to poverty reduction. We needed the right mix between a rights based approach and a sustainable livelihoods approach.



We needed more cost effective techniques for monitoring, for example, we needed to go and talk to people rather than using sophisticated techniques. Civil society could play a key role in monitoring poverty trends and what programmes were delivered.



## Sequencing of investments for agricultural growth, poverty reduction and food security

*Andrew Dorward, Imperial College London*, indicated that his presentation looked at broad processes of agricultural growth, poverty reduction and food security and lessons for sequencing. We need transformations at livelihood level so that people are no longer poor and also structural transformations that tie in with economic structures and social demographic structures. It is helpful to consider three broad kinds of livelihood strategy: hanging in and surviving; stepping up in agriculture; and stepping out into non-agricultural activities. Economic transformation in poor rural areas requires technology change and productivity increases tied to institutional and infrastructural change to promote exchange and coordination. This involves property rights, the development of markets and social protection. A number of ‘traps’ make this difficult to achieve.

### Micro trap

Poor smallholder farmers are vulnerable with low incomes and limited resources. To overcome this they need an injection from outside. Social protection, better markets and infrastructure could all help them get out of this micro level trap. Problems that prevent this from happening included poor infrastructure, poor health and high transaction costs with a meso-trap constraining private sector investment.

### Meso trap

Small farmers face high risks from multiple sources, price variability and high input and transaction costs. In addressing food insecurity they are often forced to use their resources to grow food. Input suppliers have to sell in narrow time windows and incur high interest and spoilage costs if they had to carry over stocks. Farm finance involves high transaction costs and risks. People are dispersed and difficult to reach. Produce purchasers have to make difficult investments in the face of unsure supply. Everybody in the system faces costs and risk. If they all worked together it would be easier, but there are commonly big coordination problems.

Three types of coordination are needed. First, vertical coordination is needed between buyers and sellers within supply chains to ensure that supply and demand match each other in terms of quantity, quality, timing and price of goods and services offered and required. Second, horizontal coordination is needed between different players doing the same thing. Situations where this may be important include supplying credit, providing public goods like extension services, setting quality standards, training and overcoming small transaction sizes. Farmers’ organisations could help to overcome problems of scale.

The third type of coordination needed, particularly in smallholder agriculture, is complementary coordination between different actors in a supply chain. If the supply chain does not deliver what is needed, other investments do not generate expected returns. If someone makes an investment at one point in the supply chain this is very risky if other people are not going to

support that investment. This is a problem in thin (and developing) markets but is not usually a problem where there are established markets with lots of players. Here the state could play a role (for example the integrated rural development approach tried to overcome these problems).

Private sector coordination solutions are found particularly where there are cash crops with good returns but needing a big investment. This is often better achieved working with large farms but if, for reasons such as land tenure, this is not possible then investments in complementary coordination may be viable - but there may then be problems from commercial suppliers gaining and abusing market power. In general private investments in complementary coordination can work with high value products, usually only with some sort of external support and with well-organised farmers. There are big problems with staple food crops because the incentives to invest are not there as low barriers to entry prevent private investors from capturing the returns to their investments.

How can sustainable intensification be achieved in staple crop production? This was achieved through the green revolution in Asia where the state played an active role in coordination and in providing some subsidies to coordinated supply chain development, but this was not very successful in Africa, and Asia has moved on: once there are larger volumes of production and markets were established then coordination problems became less intense and the need for government interventions decreased and indeed often became counter productive. Liberalisation policies are, however, unlikely to succeed without prior attention to market and coordination development.

These are very complex transitions to manage; different types of interventions are needed at different times. Timing is critical as is trust, because people need trust if they are to invest. Flexibility is also needed in responding to markets and natural forces like climate. Some areas will not develop agriculturally because conditions are too difficult. Often the short-term personal returns are also not linked to the longer-term growth triggers. In the short and medium term we may have to deal with non-market mechanisms but in long term we want to deal with market mechanisms. How can we move from one to the other? Macro economic management is also very important, as fiscal stability is needed for this to take place.



## *Discussion*

- How will learning be shared and will there be enough resources to avoid conflict over shared resources?

This is a historic opportunity for CGIAR to be at the centre of a broadly shared agenda and to have the biggest impact ever in its history in Africa. There are enough resources for the next few years if we collaborate and share them. The link with the country round table process is an opportunity to bring in more partners and look at all the plans so that countries can plan to the best of their ability. To sustain dialogue you need to build on country institutional mechanisms. There is no blueprint.

- What are the reasons for the SADC regions poor agricultural performance? Perhaps it has no comparative advantage in agriculture and people should get involved in other areas.

It is true that agriculture forms a lower percentage of total GDP in the better off countries, but the question remains what to do with the people who are in the agricultural sector now. We need to improve agricultural productivity. We also need to look at what are the pay offs if we invest in other sectors but no country in the world has done well without a productive agriculture sector. The aim of this programme is to find out why agriculture is lagging and to examine options for accelerating agricultural growth.

- How do we achieve greater efficiency in agriculture expenditures and can we identify where we need to make the investments? How reliable is the data? How can we ensure that small farmers and women, who are the majority of farmers in some areas, benefit from investments and get greater access to markets?

The question of efficiency is very important. At the moment we have not distinguished what is efficient. There are two ways to correct inefficiencies. One is to reallocate spending to efficient sectors. The second is to find out why inefficient spending is inefficient. This study may be more difficult to do with the data available in Africa but it is do-able. We should be able to cost irrigation systems and we should be able to calculate their benefits. We need to do this for other areas as well so that we can disaggregate the 6% growth target. This has big implications for the distribution of expenditure. The majority of poor farmers are farming traditional crops so we would have to look at who would benefit more from different kinds of expenditure and what the trade offs are. I have not seen spending disaggregated by gender and am not sure that it would help. However, spending does have different implications by gender.

- An enabling environment requires secure ownership of property. We need to look at how different types of tenure contribute to increasing agricultural productivity. The distribution of farm size also needs attention. If it is uniform there are no big equity problems. An enabling environment also requires better access to regional markets. Why is the progress in opening borders so slow? Can the RECs play a bigger role and can ReSAKSS-SA play a role?

Land ownership has had a big impact on economic growth but it has to be developed in the context of local tenure. Michigan State University (MSU) is looking at the best way forward to support growth through land title. We know that if countries get it wrong it can have bad consequences. Lack of capacity for continuous analysis and dialogue slows progress. Politicians need to be confident that things will work. ReSAKSS-SA has an important role here in supporting CAADP objectives.

- In India state subsidies helped smallholders initially but over time they were used by politicians and became inefficient. There is a time dimension to subsidies.

In India fertiliser subsidies had a good long-term impact. This is a complex issue and we need to look at ways of doing it.

- How should ReSAKSS-SA try to interact with political processes to ensure sustained interest? What skills are needed and are there examples where this works on a sustainable basis?

How do we build national capacity in a sustainable way and capturing the attention of politicians? We are facing this challenge in Mozambique. The government is anxious to get results and thinks there have been enough studies. It doesn't want to hear more policy analysis. So there is a tough challenge. The CAADP process, which involves heads of state in peer review processes, encourages policy makers to take note of policy analysts. This peer group process is crucial. CAADP can play a role in identifying the things that work.

- What areas of focus does the analysis of the PRSP process suggest for the ReSAKSS-SA agenda?

Focus areas include analysis that shows policy alignment at local, national and regional level to help to target interventions for poverty reduction. The second is institutionalising civil society engagement in difficult debates, such as those around macroeconomic policy for example, and exploring opportunities to formalise and enhance CS participation in the RECs.

- The presentation made a convincing case for the CAADP because of the failure of the PRSP process to address agricultural issues. Are there any data showing the resources that have been put into agriculture?

The World Bank and IMF have supported some spending on agriculture in the past but trade has been seen as more important than agriculture in driving poverty reduction.

- There is a developing consensus in the international community that supports providing services to African farmers. What can make this approach feasible given the disappointing results of previous government intervention in Africa? How sure can we be of the validity of the model you have presented?

There is a recognition that liberalisation has not delivered so people are asking what now? Production of food staples in Africa has not advanced and it is difficult to come up with examples of sustainable intensification without some outside coordination. People are looking at past experience to see what was good and what was not successful. In addition, part of the reason why liberalisation was not successful was that it was not properly implemented and we need to look at what is politically feasible. There is a lot of uncertainty in the model; we are dealing with very complex systems. Implementation can be done well or badly. Empirically if we look for large-scale intensification of cereals production the model is robust. But there has to be some external coordination.

- We never see work on entrepreneurship; on what motivates first movers and how to scale this up.

Entrepreneurship is important. The questions are how big are the risks that entrepreneurs can take and how rapidly they can move. We need something to happen on a big scale in Africa. This needs theoretical and practical research.

- I come from a coffee growing area. People produced but there were no buyers at acceptable prices so people decided to grow something else. You can have good policies but you may not be able to control the situation.

We don't have an answer; this involves global market issues.

- Have you attempted to link this analysis to different types of countries to see its relevance to the ability of countries to use different kinds of agricultural investment?

We are working on developmental typologies and policy issues for countries at different stages of development. Kenya is in the process of intensification, fertiliser markets have thickened enough to work by themselves. This needs more work.

## 2.2 ReSAKSS-SA/FANRPAN country level analysis

*Chair: Barbara Kalimi-Phiri, Southern Africa Trust*

### **Production and investment trends in the agricultural sector in Malawi: any prospects for economic growth and improved rural well-being?**

*Charles Jumbe, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Malawi*, indicated that the Ministry of Agriculture was working with FANRPAN on the economic importance of land use patterns, production and productivity trends in agriculture. Malawi had a population of 12 million people mostly living in rural areas. Poverty was above 60% in rural areas and HIV was also high at about 14%. Most parts of the country experienced recurrent food shortages from December to March. Agriculture was an important economic activity for the rural poor accounting for about 40% of the economy and about 90% of export earnings. It was politically important for the government to show how it would deal with agriculture. The 1970s saw some investment in rural infrastructure and from 1998 the government had a starter pack programme for small farmers.

Agriculture's share of total GDP had fallen from about 70% in 1970 to between 35-40% currently. The smallholder sector made up about 70% of the agricultural economy with the remainder comprising an estate sector focused on commercial production. The question was where to put the emphasis. There was a move to boost production through irrigation.

There had been increased investment in capacity building and training since the mid 1990s and in irrigation equipment, farm implements and fertiliser. Rural infrastructure had also seen increased investment but not enough to open up the rural areas. Recently investment in agriculture had increased to 13%. The question was whether this investment would achieve the 6% growth target set by CAADP. Challenges included the fact that agriculture was still recovering from the recent food crises, the effects of past under investment in the sector, the continued use of productivity enhancing technologies and the impact of the HIV pandemic. The bottom line was the political will to invest in agriculture.



### **Public investments in Zambia's agriculture: Quantity and/or quality**

*Emma Malawo, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Zambia*, said that agriculture accounted for over 60% of employment in Zambia. The objectives were to achieve accelerated growth in the sector, poverty reduction and income growth, through a private sector led strategy

with government providing infrastructure and support. Agriculture's share of the national budget had fluctuated. It had been higher in the 1980s and then started to decline due to reforms in Zambia. After 1991 there had been increased state involvement in agricultural marketing with state imports of staples due to drought. Trends in internal budget allocations showed an increase in personal emoluments while capital expenditure had been neglected and equipment run down.

Donor funded programmes overlapped and there was no effective coordination with the national development framework. There was also a lack of coordination between incoming and outgoing projects. The trend was to focus on input and output subsidies with 80% of funding going to two maize programmes. The question was whether the additional maize was worth the cost of the fertiliser? Growth-enhancing programmes had limited political appeal and despite the known high returns and poverty reducing impact they attracted little interest.

Growth factors included irrigation, research, technology and extension, soil fertility management, markets and infrastructure. Government was allocating more resources to growth driving programmes in agriculture in the Draft Fifth National Development Plan (2006-2010) but expenditure remained below the 10% CAADP target.



## **Strengthening Mozambican capacity for agricultural productivity growth, policy analysis, and poverty reduction**

*Gilead Mlay, Michigan State University and Bruno Araujo, Eduardo Mondlane University,* pointed out that the first part of their presentation was a specific case study of a project that had benefited from a long-term partnership with Michigan State University, USAID and the government ministry. This long-term partnership was showing some fruits and some challenges. The two main objectives were:

- expanding the availability of appropriate crop, livestock and natural-resource management technologies for smallholder farmers and
- accelerating the uptake of those technologies by strengthening policy institutions and market information services

This implied harnessing the synergies between technology, markets and policy.

There were four project objectives.

- Strengthen the capacity of the new agricultural research institute (IIAM) to identify and disseminate improved crop, livestock and natural resource management technologies by training social scientists and integrating them into operational zonal research centres.
- Strengthen capacity of the Directorate of Economics to implement the National Agricultural Survey (TIA).
- Strengthen capacity of the Directorate of Economics to provide a supportive policy environment.
- Strengthen the National Market Information System (SIMA).

The strategy involved five steps. The first was to ensure a favourable policy environment. Agriculture and agricultural productivity were included in the second PRSP (PARPA II). The ministry's strategy was based on a market driven value chain perspective with a commitment to

policy debate and balancing the interests of different stakeholders. The second step was to ensure adequate data for analysing rural household incomes. The low-income quintile derived most income from crops whereas high-income households were less dependent on them. Therefore to improve income through agricultural productivity we had to focus on crops. Step three involved building socio-economic capacity in the agricultural research system, a key element that was lacking in the Mozambican system. Step four involved identifying research priorities to guide the household survey. Data showed that maize and cassava had the highest value for poverty reduction, followed by sweet potato and groundnuts. Looking at agricultural zones showed that high potential zones had higher poverty reduction potential. Step five was to prepare a dedicated investment plan for agricultural productivity investment that benefited from the priority setting that had been done. Human capacity building was a key element to complement the investment strategies.



## **Agriculture and poverty trends in the South African economy from 1970 – 2004**

*Charles Machethe, University of Pretoria*, began by saying that socio-economic trends showed that South Africa was doing well in relation to other African countries. However, according to available data, poverty and the poverty gap had increased slightly between 1996 and 2001 for all race groups with an estimated 30 to 40 % of the population living in poverty. Although the urban poverty rate was increasing, most poverty in South Africa was rural, with about 68% of people in rural areas being poor.

The share of income held by Africans had increased although whites still had the largest share of total income. Inequality had increased slightly in all race groups since 1996. South Africa continued to have one of the highest GINI coefficients in the world. Agriculture did not play as big a role in the South African economy as in other African countries accounting for 3-4 % of GDP. GDP growth had fluctuated in recent years. The Department of Agriculture received a relatively small share of the budget. Actual expenditure as opposed to the percentage budget allocation increased from the 1950s to late 1970s and then declined. It was now very small. South Africa was said to be one of the countries where farmers received the least support

Studies indicated that agriculture had great potential to reduce poverty but this would require investment in the smallholder agricultural sector, in infrastructure, in human capital and in research. Growing the smallholder section would not be enough; it needed to be combined with enhancing linkages between agriculture and the non-agricultural economy. Looking at government initiatives, the land reform programme had not redistributed enough land and where land had been redistributed government had not provided adequate support services. There was a new programme to address this issue. Government was also working on irrigation infrastructure and was rehabilitating some schemes. There was a feeling that government moved too fast in withdrawing support from smallholder agriculture.



## *Discussion of country papers*

### Introduction

The ReSAKSS-SA work plan includes assessments of agricultural trends and poverty at regional and national level. This will go into an annual publication from ReSAKSS-SA. ReSAKSS-SA has already initiated country studies in Mozambique, Malawi, Zambia and South Africa. It held a capacity building workshop in August to discuss data collection and other issues. The teams agreed to prepare presentations for this workshop and get guidance on how to improve analysis and therefore we would like to hear about the indicators and methodologies that we should be focusing on.

We should start to look forward to how investment should be allocated in future. We would also like to hear any concerns about data that has not been included in the analysis so far and issues about methodology.

### Questions and comments

- There is no mention of the impact that HIV/AIDS is having on agricultural production. Is it contributing to declining production?
- The apparent decrease in capacity to service farmers, especially smallholder farmers, is a concern.
- How does knowledge contribute to agriculture?
- If South Africa subdivides land to give to the landless how will it ensure that they become productive citizens? Why do we always protect smallholder farmers when we know that most of them will be geared to subsistence and not the market?
- What is keeping us out of world markets?
- Can we link historical policies with the outcomes?
- Gender is an important issue that needs to be addressed. Most of those engaged in agriculture are women and policies need to take this into account to address the concerns of the people on the ground.

### Malawi

The 2001 Malawi study looked at the impact of HIV/AIDS, which has led to a vacancy rate of 52% in the Ministry of Agriculture. Malawi is training extension workers to replace those who have died. The national statistics office in Malawi has worked with the World Bank to develop poverty indicators. In future it will do household studies to assess poverty based on the new methodology. You cannot interfere with a person's land in Malawi but we are re-allocating unused land to people. Supporting smallholder agriculture is key in Malawi because it is responsible for 70% of national food production. If you compare the cost of providing food support there is a case for supporting this sector. Overall policy outcomes have not been so good. What we present is a sample of what government is trying to promote. The issue of gender is complex and relates to production and ownership of assets. In most cases household farms are a unit and it is not possible to split women and men. It is a concern that women are not given due respect.



## Mozambique

It is not a case of protecting small farmers. Most of the poor have less land and depend on crop production. If you want to alleviate poverty you have to address their situation and also look at how to commercialise them.

## Zambia

HIV affects a lot of extension workers in Zambia and has impacted on extension services. The allocation of resources to extension services is not adequate. We have tried to include HIV/AIDS in the training of agricultural extension officers so that they can transmit the information to farmers in rural areas.

## South Africa

We are not talking about protecting small farmers. It is not enough to make land available without providing support services. The South African government withdrew support to smallholder farmers too soon. If you look at experience in Africa and elsewhere you see that smallholder farmers do perform if they are provided with support services.

## General comments

- When we talk about the contribution of agriculture to GDP and employment in most cases we are only talking about primary agricultural goods and not processed products. Once it is processed it becomes an industrial good. Don't we need to look at goods that are made using agricultural products and at agriculture's contribution to the development of other industries?
- We need to focus on developing indicators that support the CAADP framework and how we can add value to the statistics that are already available. What kind of indicators do we need to make cross-country comparisons? Definitions, sources and measures are important issues.
- We need to look at what countries are doing to enable investment to take place. We need to look at whether agricultural policy is putting in place the building blocks that will justify investment.
- Why did the study on South Africa only use data for 2001? Have different trends emerged over the last five years? The 1998 and 2003 surveys in Zambia are not comparable although the paper compares them. We have to look at data limitations.
- If we are monitoring agricultural growth and its relation to poverty we need to look at the structure of agriculture, at commercial versus smallholder agriculture. Whether farms are deficit or surplus producers and price levels for food, price variability and export prices are all very important to the health of agriculture.
- If farmer support services are critical in South Africa what are the options for delivering them and in what areas are we likely to get the biggest impact for these services?
- Spatial analysis is a key component of ReSAKSS-SA that we have not talked about?

## South Africa

The reasons for using data from 2000 are that we had limited time to prepare and in many cases we had to use World Bank data that only goes up to 2000 or 2002. If we use different data sources then we are comparing things that are not the same. We will take the need for more up to date data into consideration in preparing the final report. In most cases agriculture's contribution to GDP would be much higher if we included processed products. In South Africa primary agricultural products make up 3–4% of GDP but including processed products takes this up to about 14%.

## Mozambique

Data is still a big problem in Mozambique. Depending on the source you can end up with completely different data. It is important to address this issue so that we can come up with consistent data to enable us to compare countries.

- Can agriculture retain scientists in competition with other sectors?
- The studies do not seem to have addressed the problem of getting better and more consistent data. Success will depend on the quality of data that is fed into the network. What is the experience of access to reliable data in countries and what are the problems?
- An agricultural census is very expensive. As the ReSAKSS-SA network we can only draw the attention of governments to the need for good data. The task goes beyond the resources of ReSAKSS-SA.

The regional overview comparing trends in the different countries is very important. We need to compare national data sets with those from other sources, identify differences and show how we can improve the quality of the data we use. Capacity building is at the heart of ReSAKSS-SA. We are working with the FAO to build a conceptual framework for agriculture in the region. We can't make decisions on faulty information.

## Malawi

We recognise the importance of problems with data. In Malawi we have different data collectors that are not coordinated. This makes it very difficult to compare different data sets. Planning ministries need to play a role in developing comparable data sets. There are also different data sets from the FAO and World Bank. We will highlight this in the final report.

Analysing data is the best way to highlight problems with it. We should encourage the collectors of data to do analysis so that they see the problems.

## Closing questions and comments

- Can ReSAKSS-SA prescribe the types of data that it wants to be able to compare across countries?

It is important to have official data. The SADC has a link with national governments, which are supposed to submit data to it at regular intervals. We need to help the SADC to come up with a conceptual framework at regional level that will enable comparisons across the region. At the

same time we are working with the FAO to help develop data collecting capacity at national level.

Despite the importance of having official data we should not discount the collection of data through surveys and other means. Although it is supplementary it is still very important.

There are serious institutional issues with different departments collecting information for their own needs. We will have to address the institutional dimension to find solutions.

In general we need an agricultural information system for the SADC that is comparable among member states and this is now recognised at a much higher level.

## **2.3 Panel discussion: Identify regional priorities for strategic analysis for ReSAKSS-SA**

*Chair: Isaac Minde, Senior Scientist (Economics), ICRISAT*

### **Purpose**

To identify regional priorities for strategic analysis in Southern Africa based on current knowledge, the needs and expectations of SADC, COMESA, NEPAD, donors, countries and other stakeholders.

### **Opening remarks from panel members**

*Shenggen Fan, Division Director, DSDG IFPRI* said that we needed a minimum set of indicators to monitor the progress of CAADP – a baseline and 5-10 benchmark indicators. Some possibilities included agricultural GDP, poverty, agricultural expenditure, productivity, land use and labour. We needed to identify data sources and common definitions for these indicators so that we could aggregate data.

Secondly we needed to look at regional integration. We had seen yesterday how GDP growth and agricultural productivity could link countries and the role that growth in South Africa could play in the region. We needed ways to monitor regional trade and technology, and set priorities for agricultural research on a regional basis rather than every country doing its own thing.

Thirdly we needed to look at regional institutional arrangements. Once we had done the analysis how would we institutionalise it? Could the existing institutions handle the regional priorities? Did we need new thinking on reforming institutions?

*Jeff Hill, Senior Agricultural Advisor, USAID* stated that it was very important to understand the dynamics and options for improving economic governance in Southern Africa. We had to look at the institutions at regional level and the challenges facing implementation of CAADP in the region. There were different regional organisations and issues about their links and ways of working. We needed discussion between them. The other economic governance issue was the private institutions that had to play a role in CAADP. CAADP had to be inclusive. Did we have the institutions to give voice to the private sector and civil society in the process? We needed more information on these issues.

He went on to point out that it was important for ReSAKSS-SA's analytical and service agenda to align with and support the CAADP process. We needed baseline information and a strategic set of indicators to help with monitoring in the peer review process and we needed to look at different regional development analyses and compare the different types of investments needed. The third CAADP pillar had raised important issues about the right investments needed to address short-term food insecurity and long term growth issues. CAADP was mainstreaming the concern with the chronically vulnerable and this needed to be put at the centre of the longer-term development process. There were a substantial number of political issues around that.

Another area was achieving greater efficiencies through joint planning in the region and where we could achieve greater efficiencies. We needed to analyse country and regional budget allocations and see what share of the overall agricultural budget should be spent at regional and country level to improve efficiencies in the agricultural sector. For this we needed evidence-based analysis grounded in what had been done.

*Emma Malawo, Deputy Director, Department of Planning, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives* said that in Zambia agriculture played an important role and was the major source of employment in rural areas. Zambia was allocating resources through education, infrastructure, research, technology and fisheries but no analysis had been done on what investment would bring the highest returns and help Zambia to achieve 6% agricultural growth. The department was working with the Central Statistics Office (CSO) to monitor the implementation of the development plan but lacked baseline data. An agricultural census was done in 2000 and there were plans to do another in the next two years but the government was still looking for resources to do that. Zambia needed to work with the region to see what investment was required to reach 6% agricultural growth.

*Chikakula Miti, Agricultural Development Expert, COMESA* stated that the body was one of the biggest stakeholders in the region as it shared a number of member states with SADC. COMESA member states had agreed to co-operate in agriculture and other sectors to co-ordinate the implementation of CAADP amongst other things. They had identified priority areas for indicators. The major goal was to improve food security. For this COMESA needed to know the number of countries receiving food aid and the impact that food aid was having on their economies. Policy harmonisation was important and the body was implementing the COMESA investment area to harmonise investment policies in the region so that investors did not face different policies. COMESA needed to know what the public and private sectors were investing in agriculture and how it would help to raise agricultural production and growth to 6%. Other needs included indicators on the adoption of appropriate technologies by farmers and on investment in educational development. COMESA, as a trading block, encouraged internal and external trade, and would like to know the growth in internal trade and what trade barriers existed in the region including non-tariff trade barriers.

### ***General discussion***

We need analysis that relates to these needs that can help us to improve on decision making and policies related to basic needs and that will show partners that harmonising policies and opening borders will bring real benefits.

- How do COMESA and SADC co-operate given that they both have their own priorities? Zambia is a member of both groupings and has to deal with both of their priority areas.

COMESA is working closely with SADC because it is aware of the overlapping membership. A task force meets annually to look at programmes that both RECs are implementing. This year there was a joint workshop on fertiliser strategy and there is close consultation on seed harmonisation policies and on other areas.

- What research is being done on technology adoption, for example on seed?

Work on appropriate technology could include seed or other things like irrigation equipment. COMESA is working closely with structures on the ground. Member states have identified priority areas for research. We facilitate that to ensure the best technology is available at farm level.

We need to analyse existing initiatives in the region, identify gaps and see where we can add value. We also need to look at the status of existing projects in the region. Civil society needs to know what is going on and at what stage various programmes are. The view from civil society is that SADC committees are not functional. How civil society can contribute to the programmes and ReSAKSS-SA itself poses a challenge.

- At policy level we hear about harmonisation but if you want to export tomatoes to South Africa it is difficult; similarly if you want to import equipment into Malawi. Do we understand what is happening on the ground? What is the impact of restrictions on the movement of people, of visas and other things?
- What will be the outcome after a year or three years? What will we do with the data? This is not clear.

The region needs concrete, evidence-based analysis that will help to decide in which areas to invest. The information will be used to improve policy.

Is ReSAKSS-SA engaged in any process to identify needs? Do we have links to key stakeholders in the agricultural sector and in the private sector? We need more clarity about how processes at national level link to the regional level.

ReSAKSS-SA held a stakeholder workshop with representatives from the region last year to discuss issues in the region. The need for strategic analysis emerged. ReSAKSS-SA was also discussed at the CAADP meeting in Maputo and endorsed as an early action for CAADP in the region. Subsequently we have had discussions with NEPAD, SADC and COMESA around the need for ReSAKSS-SA and its focus. The focus is on regional issues but it is also intended to work at national level and bring in people from all sectors. At country level it will try to bring all stakeholders into the discussion. The process is ongoing and we are looking for input from stakeholders in the region.

ReSAKSS-SA is not an isolated agenda. It has ongoing links with both ICRISAT and CAADP. One of its purposes is to feed strategic analysis into the debates in the region. We need to prioritise within that context.

- How should SAKSS strike a balance between providing the best analysis in the short term against the other area of building capacity for analyses in the region?

Capacity is critical but the philosophy of ReSAKSS-SA is not to build it for its own sake. We need to identify the necessary areas for capacity building.

We are hoping to learn a lot from the regional focus about problems facing agricultural development. There is a demand for the information partly due to the MDGs but also because countries are asking why the information they need to make decisions is not there. We need to establish priorities and find out what evidence is available to inform the debates? ReSAKSS-SA is not there to set the priorities but to provide the data and analysis for the decision makers. We cannot go far without the data to inform the dialogues. Building capacity is a longer-term issue given the problems with education in the area. ReSAKSS-SA is already collaborating with partners and this will help to strengthen capacity.

It seems that the criteria used to rank priorities should include:

- helping government, donors, the private sector and civil society make evidence based choices on where to concentrate resources to meet the MDGs;
- asking why things that are not helping are on the agenda;
- identifying binding constraints that need to be addressed to achieve the objectives;
- assisting coordination between foreign and domestic development assistants and
- focusing on those strategies, programmes and policies that will leverage or influence investment that addresses the priorities.

Where will ReSAKSS-SA put the emphasis? We have talked about higher-level policy and tracking progress on CAADP. But there are also very specific concerns about how to accelerate poverty reduction through agricultural development. The criteria for deciding on those priorities are missing.

Our aim is to do the best to inform the CAADP process. CAADP is already there and we are trying to fine tune and identify the main issues for Southern Africa. We should think about getting the process right. COMESA has identified clear indicators that they would like us to help them monitor. But when it comes to strategic analysis under the four pillars there is hesitation. Can we look at priorities under each pillar and then sequence them. We need to have a systematic way of identifying the priority areas.

I was at a meeting last week on CAADP implementation, which looked at where the regions are. COMESA will be developing three new integrated programmes for the first three pillars. It is important to be aware of this. Are the areas identified as priorities the ones that will give the most impact? It is not clear if there is a collective process to take this important step forward in Southern Africa.

Closing remarks from panel

Shenggen Fan

ReSAKSS is an international public good providing knowledge for development and a platform to promote dialogue. ReSAKSS can support any development initiative – there is a big demand

for it. In this case it is supporting CAADP because CAADP has high political commitment. The aim is to strengthen capacity in the region working with what is already there. There is great potential for countries in the region to work together. COMESA talked about monitoring the adoption of technology but more important is to set up policy to share technology. For example there is no incentive to share seed. This is an important issue. Another is how to set up institutions to promote regional cooperation? Countries in the region have great potential for greater integration with South Africa. This will be win-win for everyone. We need to look at how we can work together.

### Jeff Hill

We have been talking about a regional level capacity for strategic analysis to focus on the regional agenda. This is what ReSAKSS-SA is doing. There are also clearly things that need to take place at country level. What is happening in Mozambique is an example. This requires long-term resources. ReSAKSS-SA needs to build on what is happening at country level to raise its profile but it should not replace country efforts. It should add value to them and focus on regional issues. We should not replace the need for focused investment at country level.

### COMESA

Consultation with major stakeholders is important. COMESA has signed a MOU with regional stakeholder bodies and is trying to bring them all in. The next step is to set up four specific reference groups that will analyse issues in the four pillars. ReSAKSS-SA has a very important role in this and will be invited to participate in the reference groups.

# Chapter 3

## 3.1 Knowledge management issues in the context of Southern Africa

*Chair: Phumzile Mdladla FEWSNET Regional Representative*

### Informing policy (and investment) decisions: Data requirements

*Joachim Otte, Coordinator, PPLPF/AGAL, FAO* indicated that his presentation looked at pro-poor livestock policy initiatives in Vietnam. To make good policies stakeholders needed to have a voice and decision makers must be prepared to listen. This required increased awareness, mechanisms for stakeholder engagement, and guidelines on policies that have worked and those that have failed.

Vietnam had a high proportion of poor people. Rural incomes were about half of urban incomes on average so there was a strong reason to focus on rural areas. The poorest households were very subsistence oriented. Almost all their income was from crops or livestock. The project tried to encourage these households to become more market oriented. The elements of the pro-poor policy were to focus on assets that the poor had and to increase returns, productivity and demand. We looked at why people could not improve their income? The main constraint was access to credit. The second was access to livestock services, for example, animal health, followed by access to inputs and market information.

We looked at current policy. The government did not provide services and was more interested in promoting industry than agriculture. In the agricultural sector the main focus was on crop production and on promoting rural industrialisation and modernisation for exports. This meant that the policy did not have a pro-poor focus. The policy process was very top down and was shaped by the party line and bureaucrats. It focused on party structures. Policy implementation depended on the local chief's agenda.

The policy making process needed to use, and reconcile, a number of different information sources including informal ones. You would not find all you needed from one source. You had to work with a network of data providers and you also needed metadata – information about information. Data and analysis were necessary but not sufficient to improve policy making. You also had to target policy makers and package information in the right way.



### Vulnerability in Southern African countries

*Elliot Vhurumuku, Food Security Officer, World Food Programme/ FAO/ SADC/RVAC* pointed out that the mandate of the Vulnerability Assessment Committees (VACs) was to strengthen regional vulnerability assessment systems.

Malnutrition continued to be very high in some areas of Lesotho, Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe and there was also a high incidence of underweight, which was normally associated with hunger.



The incidence of diseases was also high including malaria, HIV, TB and cholera. This also had an impact on food security.

Deaths associated with HIV had increased and this was related to the growing number of orphans. Access to safe drinking water remained a challenge and was as low as 35% in some rural areas of Swaziland. More than 55% of districts in Zambia did not have access to safe drinking water. However, meal frequency and dietary diversity had improved in 2006 compared to 2005. The percentage of households with low dietary diversity had decreased. Dropouts from primary education remained a problem with the main reasons given being inability to afford school fees, death in the family, chronic illness in the family and acute malnutrition.

The table showed that the number of food insecure people in the region had decreased, as had the percentage of the population affected by food insecurity. However, some of the insecurity was chronic rather than transitory.

The categories of households that experienced the highest levels of food insecurity were female-headed, elderly, those with chronically ill members, those hosting orphans and asset poor households. The percentage of vulnerable households in these categories differed across countries.

Coming to shocks and hazards the categories were economic, including increased grain prices and inflation, increasing dependency ratios due to the increasing numbers of orphans, deaths robbing families of labour and income and consuming resources, adverse weather and climatic conditions and governance, for example, corruption.

The example from Malawi showed that the commonest shocks differ from district to district. The example from Zimbabwe showed the main community challenges and priorities. Together these underlined the need to look at shocks and hazards and what people said before targeting social assistance and not just to think about food aid. The reasons why vulnerability still existed included interventions that were not targeted at addressing the main shocks and hazards, inappropriate government policies and increased erosion of assets.

## *Discussion*

- Was the assessment done early as it still shows high levels of malnutrition despite the good harvests?
- The incidence of food insecurity shown for Zambia is zero but the summary showed that there are still high levels of food insecurity despite the good harvest. There is an apparent conflict.
- Are the methods of data collection comparable across countries?

## *Elliot Vhurumuku*

The malnutrition surveys were done in May in most countries and are indicative. In most cases the rates are not far off the 30x30 cluster and appear to be a more or less representative sample. The high levels malnutrition are due to chronic rather than transitory food insecurity.

If you look at the current report for Zambia you will see that we do not have the populations of the affected districts. This is the reason for the zero. We still need to find out how to address this.

The regional VAC is looking at harmonising the methodologies for comparability. We are moving towards a situation where although we may not have common methodology across countries the results will at least be comparable.



## **The SADC Agricultural Information Management System**

*Bentry Chaura, Senior Agricultural Information Management Officer, AIMS, SADC* indicated that most of the activities in SADC were now centralised in the four clusters including Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources (FANR). There were also some cross cutting units like HIV/AIDS and gender. FANR has six coordinating units:

- Agricultural Information Management Systems (AIMS);
- Crop Development;
- Livestock Development;
- Agricultural Research and Development;
- Natural Resources Management and
- Environment and Sustainable Development.

In the past information was kept in the coordinating countries. This led to overlap and duplication, incompatible data formats, loss of data when projects came to an end or when funding was not available. AIMS set out to centralise data collection and established an integrated, coherent information system that would support the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the RISDP and NEPAD in the region. The immediate objective was to harmonise information management, reduce duplication and support member states in their information gathering and to ensure a sustainable system.

### **Main activities to achieve the objectives were:**

- Assessment and analysis of requirements, existing resources and capabilities – partly done;
- Development of regional information strategy – through regional consultations;
- Development of the design for a sustainable information systems infrastructure, tools and environment to support the needs of FANR regular programme and project activities & other stakeholders;
- Development of the software components and implementation in close consultations with member States – software development, installation and testing and
- Building capacity within FANR and Member States in data gathering, analysis, dissemination and exchange – management/executive seminars & training courses.

### **Progress**

- Assessment and analysis of requirements – highlighting existing resources and capabilities;
- Food security data base transferred from Harare;

- FANR AIMS Committee formed – meets every month;
- Some resources for sub-systems available – under livestock and research projects and
- Consultations with member states ongoing – especially through livestock and research projects.

### *Discussion*

- When will the system come into operation and what form will support to countries take?

### *Bentry Chaura*

The intention is to be operational as soon as possible but at the moment resources are a problem. One activity will be training. Initial resources from the FAO for the famine early warning system came in the form of technical staff to set up the system. SADC took over this support function but continual staff turnover in countries has resulted in a continuing need for training. In addition AIMS would like to set up data base systems in member states to give them access to the information that they need. This will require resources including hardware and software.

Consultation with COMESA, which is also setting up an agricultural information system, is important given the overlapping membership.

We are aware of this but at the moment there is not much cooperation between the two regional bodies on information.

### *COMESA*

COMESA is developing a system with the assistance of the ADB. The web site will be up and running by the end of the year but there are problems with data collection and sustainability. Information will come from member states. The previous system collapsed when the donors withdrew. The new system will be based on existing market information systems in the region.



## **What are the challenges of policy research, analysis and dialogue in Southern Africa?**

*Douglas Merrey of FANRPAN* pointed out that FANRPAN was:

- a multi-country policy research and advocacy network;
- a multi-stakeholder policy dialogue platform;
- a multi-partner network of agricultural research institutions;
- a multi-country pool of researchers and policy analysts;
- an autonomous regional FANR policy outfit and
- a knowledge management and information exchange network.

It was recognised by governments, universities, the private sector and civil society as a source of expert policy research and analysis on food agriculture and natural resources. FANRPAN's strength was based on its network of country nodes rather than the secretariat, which was what most people saw. Its effectiveness depended on strong nodes with the secretariat kept lean. (The Board of Governors was not very active and needed to be revitalised.) The strategic planning workshop in September provided the elements of a new strategic plan, which was a refinement

rather than a radical departure from the past. The proposed thematic areas emphasised alignment with CAADP, RISDP and national priority areas. They were:

- regional trade policies (an area neglected in the past);
- food security (policies and strategies for targeting the poor);
- agriculture-health nexus (disease can have a significant impact on agriculture and people's well being);
- agricultural productivity (farming systems, contract farming and innovation systems);
- trans-boundary natural resources (water, disease and pest migration, collective action) and
- cross-cutting issues (capacity building and knowledge management).

Looking at the policy cycle FANRPAN was good at economic research but not as good at carrying it through to policy advice and needed to develop capacity in this area. Doing only the research part limited potential impact. Policy makers were overloaded so information must be useful and well targeted. This would require new skills and capacities. This meant that FANRPAN had multiple roles in addition to research such as facilitating dialogue and capacity building. One issue was whether FANRPAN should act as an advocate, given the diversity of membership, or provide research-based evidence to those who did the advocacy.

Partnerships were critical to FANRPAN's success. Its interests were aligned with those of IWMI, ICRISAT, IFPRI and ReSAKSS-SA. Its capacities complemented their work and its country nodes provided capacity to do analysis and facilitate policy dialogues. It had regional capacity to manage comparative studies and it also had convening capacities. It had an established web site.

FANRPAN needed to strengthen itself to meet regional expectations and a partnership with ReSAKSS-SA provided this opportunity. ReSAKSS-SA brought the opportunity to train young professionals while FANRPAN's national nodes were well placed to assist the CAADP implementation process. FANRPAN looked forward to a long-term partnership with ReSAKSS-SA to promote food security in Southern Africa.

## *Discussion*

- The thematic areas do not seem to address the regional dimension of CAADP and none of them are directly growth related. FANRPAN has to focus on what it can do but also has to look at how to do things in region. One way is to form mixed teams from across the region. Is there a strategy for doing this?
- Can you give examples of success stories in influencing policy making?
- How does FANRPAN, as a regional body, work with SADC?

## *Douglas Merrey*

It is true that the themes are generally not growth oriented. We see regional trade policies as being growth oriented but the themes need more work.

FANRPAN has done a reasonable job of putting together mixed teams from CGIAR centres and combining people from overseas universities and people from the region.

There are lots of things to be done and it is not a very big network. If you try to do too much the results may not be of such good quality. We developed the themes as part of a business plan to attract funding. This does not mean that we will not add other things.

There have been some successes at national level. ACF in Zambia now manages the FANRPAN network there and has had a significant impact on the budget for next year. There are also a lot of small things but there will be more in the future.

In the past FANRPAN has responded to a request from the SADC Council of Ministers for independent policy advice. While we were based in Harare we had a formal MOU with the agriculture unit in Harare but this fell away after the move to Botswana. We are in the process of formalising the relationship. FANRPAN has a formal MOU with COMESA.

- Working with FANRPAN nodes to get access for the CAADP agenda is a good idea. Malawi will begin discussions in the next two weeks. Is FANRPAN connected to this?

Douglas Merrey

In some countries the permanent secretaries are quite actively involved with the nodes. Lindiwe Sibanda our CEO will be at the Malawi meeting.

## **MDGs and vulnerability to natural and socio-economic shocks**

*Georges Tadonki, Programme Manager at SAHIMS* said the organisation provides technical support on data storage, security and improved access. The main job was to ensure that data was available and useful to analysts. A partnership with ReSAKSS-SA was a good idea because it was in the business of knowledge production and SAHIMS was in the business of providing secure knowledge management. The aim was a kind of Google search engine for development. At the moment it was difficult to get answers with the available tools. Agriculture, along with food security, was one of the best-served groups on the continent regarding data collection and access.

SAHIMS had been working with SADC VAC, which was moving from food security to a more holistic concept of vulnerability. They were talking of linking this to monitoring the MDGs. Working on a sectoral basis was less of a challenge but when you brought information together to analyse vulnerability there were many overlaps and systems for monitoring the data.

The continent had a very low technology base but very complex data was being used with most of the technology imported. We needed to get African scientists involved in developing the tools that we were using. There were too many partners and an inflation of activities related to data management. In South Africa alone, and only in food security, we had more than 20 programmes and mostly they did not work together.

SAHIMS had identified four key areas.

*Statistical data standards.* There was no agreed common standard for collecting and sharing information for vulnerability analysis. We did not use national statistical nomenclature and we were not involved in developing it. SAHIMS was trying to get involved in Statistical Data and Metadata Exchange (SDMX). We needed more involvement with Southern African countries contributing to SDMX.

*Geodata standards.* We produced a lot of data but we did not look at metadata. It was difficult to produce metadata for the data sets we were getting.

*Dissemination infrastructure.* We had several dissemination initiatives and tools but they were not connected – they were sectoral.

*National capacity.* We needed to strengthen national capacity for analysis and modelling. It was getting stronger and we were collecting more data. The main issue was the capacity to generate our own analysis.

With the SADC VAC we had a simple project. The VAC had been collecting data but none of the countries involved had a VAC database or a VAC information management system. The project would develop national VAC data repositories. There was a well-developed tool available in the MDG environment and we would test that in the VAC context. We now had three countries and would include Malawi. It was working quite well and we were hosting quality assurance meetings. The exercise had also resulted in the reevaluation of VAC indicators. Next year countries would be using indicators from the SDMX standard. When VAC started the main aim was to identify beneficiaries and measure reduction in dependency. Now it was more involved in trying to set goals and targets. Once we had the DevInfo system for the VAC this would happen. Then all the VACs would use one database to generate reports.

## **Discussion**

- What opportunity is there to expand this to the other VACs?
- Many of the VACs use information-gathering methodologies that are accurate but the information is not hard statistics, how do we get this into a database?
- Are you dealing with the issue of property rights to this data?

## **Georges Tadonki**

All four countries have completed the data inventory and customisation of the database templates and two have done the data entry. The VACs rely heavily on qualitative information from many sources. DevInfo can handle this and the information will be cleaned. Some VACs are less quantitative than others. The VACs are very aware of this and are becoming more quantitative and are training VAC teams on quantitative techniques. The RVAC is helping national VACs to put together a comparable VAC framework. It is difficult but we are advancing.

If the four countries are successful we will look at the lessons and then next year will extend it to other countries. Countries that do not have a VAC DevInfo will develop it. The DevInfo software is free.

The first country to complete VAC data is Zimbabwe and the database is the property of the country. But the whole DevInfo database can run on a CD so it is very easy to disseminate.

For more information go to [www.devinfo.org](http://www.devinfo.org), [www.sahims.net/mdgsa](http://www.sahims.net/mdgsa)

## 3.2 Identifying challenges and opportunities for knowledge sharing and management

### *Panel Discussion*

*Chair: Ousmane Badiane, Africa Coordinator, IFPRI*

*Bob Day of Non Zero Sum Development* indicated that the issues around data that had come up were crucial to ReSAKSS-SA. Many organisations and players would be involved and we had to get it right. The interaction of analytical processes, the beneficiaries of processes and the visualisation of processes would make them accessible. The measure of success would be how many people were using ReSAKSS-SA for creating high quality dialogue. Data and strategic analysis was important but it was not enough on its own.

*Bentry Chaura, Senior Agricultural Information Management Officer, AIMS, SADC* pointed out that the SADC Council of Ministers had given the Secretariat a mandate to come up with a system for data management on agriculture. The main problem was to find the technical and human resources to do this. AIMS was relying on partners and ReSAKSS-SA should be a party to setting up the system. The RVAC showed the importance of cooperation between SADC and its partners. Although we talked about a system at regional level it needed data from member countries to work. AIMS did not have the resources to help member states to set up systems at present, neither in the form of IT equipment nor training. Another question was how to sustain the system. We could not expect corporate partners to provide long-term support. SADC could provide personnel to sustain it. At the moment there was not much data to publish. Publishing it on the web was easy and this would give stakeholders access to it.

*Joachim Otte, Coordinator, PPLPF/AGAL, FAO* outlined that on the supply side the challenge was to define the boundaries of the knowledge we need. Agriculture links to non-agricultural issues and what happened in one country impacted on others. The way forward would have to be through networks, all the information could not be accessible at one point. There were many information collection points; FIVIMS, WFP, projects and there was a big opportunity to bring the networks together. This required dedicated management and the raised the issue of network sustainability.

Organisations that collected data were reluctant to share primary information and were only willing to give out reports. This was understandable given the cost of data collection. Maybe we should look at the World Bank model of charging for access. There was also the question of whether people had an agenda around the kind of information they put out.

There were dissemination issues on the supply side. Putting information on the Internet was not enough. We needed to make it available in different forms to meet different needs.

On the demand side the ability to use analysis, critique information and then transform it into policy advice or strategy and plans was critical. This involved more of a group effort to negotiate what could come out of it. The final point was whether there was a culture of evidence-based decision-making. Here we were looking at behavioural change.

The way information management had developed making new ways of relaying data feasible presented opportunities. There were also many initiatives that were collecting information and a wider demand for information.

*Charles Jumbe, Research Fellow, Center for Agricultural Research and Development, Bunda College of Agriculture, Malawi* indicated that a major challenge in getting access to high quality data in Malawi was the limited financial and human resources in data collecting institutions. In addition each organisation collected the data it needed and there was no procedure to harmonise data collection although there was now a system to do this. Property rights limit access to data and we needed to ensure access for those who needed it. Perhaps we could sell data to those outside the region to generate some income.

The financial constraint was critical. We needed sustainable financing to analyse and document data in order to feed it into the policy process. Perhaps we should assign 1% of the agricultural budget to data collection and analysis. ReSAKSS-SA, FANRPAN and the SADC Secretariat were all structures that could be used to strengthen data management.

Advances in information and communication technology (ICT) presented the opportunity for a database on the web. We needed a standardised format so that we could do cross country analysis. Perhaps ReSAKSS-SA could provide a framework for this. ReSAKSS-SA could also keep a database of people with skills so that we could see where the weaknesses were and access the skills we needed.

### ***General discussion***

Identifying available expertise could be the basis of a third working programme for ReSAKSS-SA. We need to monitor the effectiveness of ReSAKSS-SA as a tool for high quality dialogue. The challenge is resources and manpower for SADC. We can help to address the challenge through partnerships. We need to identify the focus and boundaries of our work. Other issues are how to use networks, data quality, access and standards. ReSAKSS-SA is focusing on the supply side but it also needs to look at the demand side, the capacity to use the kind of information that it is generating. There is an issue of changing mindsets and people seeing the importance of knowledge and there is also an issue of advances in technology.

- We are hearing about the need for expertise. ReSAKSS-SA is there to support existing regional bodies and its success must be measured in terms of their success and when it can step away. Information has to be brought together under the umbrella of regional organisations. How can ReSAKSS-SA provide technical assistance to SADC's AIMS? What services will ReSAKSS-SA provide?

ReSAKSS is not an institutional development instrument. There are other organisations involved in strengthening organisational capacity. ReSAKSS role is bringing strategic analysis to the process. Fundamental to doing this effectively is identifying the processes working towards joint policies that ReSAKSS can contribute to.

There is a collective effort in Southern Africa around research processes and ReSAKSS-SA can add value to their strategic impact. There is also a collective effort around regional food



security initiatives. However, it is unclear whether there are any collective efforts around pillars one and two.

Regional institutions need information to track the progress of CAADP at regional level. There is also a demand for information on country level processes. Does ReSAKSS-SA have links with these processes?

Is there a mechanism to gather information and feed it into policy making? We need to clarify this when we look at the ReSAKSS-SA work plan.

- The UN system has a weakness in advising governments on improving agricultural development and other strategies. For example Botswana is well equipped for data collection but despite this it is still very weak in tackling the MDG targets. As the UN we are realising how far we are from this. There is a big opportunity here for ReSAKSS-SA.

### Joachim Otte

Many of these initiatives are supply driven. Often countries do not want to be told where to go. You need time to build trust and understand what different stakeholders want. Then people start to listen if you have good arguments and data.

### Bentry Chaura

One of the problems SADC faces is the quality of data. Sometimes the data is politically correct rather than technically correct. This is very difficult to deal with. If you come with FAO data some countries will refuse to use it. How do you go forward if you are using data that the government does not accept?

### Bob Day

It is not ReSAKSS-SA's job to build the capacity of regional bodies but its success does depend on their effectiveness and we can help them to show what they can do.

The UN needs to do more to give a good example. Very few of the UN bodies have a research information system that makes information accessible. Implementing accessible research information systems would be a major advance.

### Charles Jumbo

National governments should invest in getting good data. ReSAKSS-SA role is to collect and use data in ways that contribute to its analysis.

- Heads of state have committed to CAADP so there is willingness to share information but is the information available? Have we defined the information needs clearly? Can we assist to meet those needs? We need to look at statistical data and administrative data on expenditure.
- Existing data is very expensive and difficult to get. Is there any way of making data easier to use? If we are all working for development how can it be that information is not available? Can panellists comment on using both qualitative and quantitative analysis? We must also bear

in mind that existing networks have limitations. We need to involve others. ReSAKSS-SA can play a role in ensuring that there are resources to implement policies.

#### Chair: Ousmane Badiane

We have some points to take forward to this afternoon. We need to go back to the idea behind ReSAKSS-SA – a desire to plan and implement better – this is also behind the CAADP agenda. How can ReSAKSS-SA help countries to move more towards evidence and outcomes based policies? SADC will be an important player. ReSAKSS-SA will be supporting SADC and member countries to improve policies.

How to move from data to knowledge and from knowledge to better policies? ReSAKSS-SA may help to relieve some of the pressure for politically correct data by providing a more neutral networking arrangement. The quality of some of the data is another issue. Here ReSAKSS-SA can help to validate and improve data. The fact that much of this is supply driven may not be negative. But stakeholders need to be able to assimilate the products. The bottom line is do we have better policies that lead to better outcomes?

#### Pius Chilonda

We will be trying to build on what exists in the region by working closely with the ongoing work of partners in the region. We need to develop an optimal network.



# Chapter 4

## 4.1 ReSAKSS-SA work plans

*Chair: David Rohrbach, Principal Scientist (Economist), ICRISAT*

*Pius Chilonda, Sub-Regional Coordinator, ReSAKSS-SA* said that this is the draft work plan for the next three years.

### Key questions

Why does agricultural growth lag in Southern Africa?

Why does poverty persist in Southern Africa?

What sorts of investments can achieve pro-poor growth?

In looking at the work plan we should bear in mind the commitments to supporting the goals of CAADP and RISDP, in particular:

- contributing to achieving MDG 1;
- reaching 6% annual agricultural growth by 2015 and
- countries committing 10% of their budgets to expenditure on agriculture.

ReSAKSS-SA would align its work plans with the four CAADP pillars:

- extending the area under sustainable land management and reliable water control systems;
- improving rural infrastructure and trade related capacities for market access;
- increasing food supply, reducing hunger and improving responses to food emergency crises and
- improving agricultural research, technology dissemination and adoption.

It should also take into account the RISDP indicators, which address the four pillars such as:

- double cropland under irrigation from 3.5% to 7% of total arable land by 2015;
- increase fertiliser consumption from 44.6 to 65 kilograms per hectare of arable land by 2015 (world average is 98.8 kg/ha);
- increase cereal yield from 1,392 to 2,000 kilograms per hectare (world average) by 2015 and
- double the adoption rate of proven technologies such as improved seed varieties, management of water and land by 2015.

This would help to realise ReSAKSS-SA aim of supporting both CAADP and SADC's RISDP.

ReSAKSS-SA has identified four work plan activities:

- baseline assessments of agricultural and poverty trends;
- assessment of options for increasing agricultural growth and poverty reduction;
- strengthening impact of agricultural investments and policy and
- knowledge management.

## Activity 1: baseline assessments of agricultural and poverty trends

### Activities:

- review and critical analysis of national agricultural growth and poverty trends and
- monitoring agricultural spending and allocation, including levels of spending.

### Suggested deliverables:

- annual summaries of the status and trends of agriculture in Southern Africa;
- data on allocation of spending in agriculture and incomes;
- spatial analysis of agricultural spending and
- selected indicators for monitoring and evaluating CAADP pillars and RISDP.

## Activity 2: assessment of options for increasing agricultural growth and poverty reduction

### Activities will answer the following questions:

- what types of investments and policy options have the potential to contribute the most to growth and poverty reduction?
- how do different sub-sectors contribute to that growth? Are there important national differences in these sub-sectoral priorities?
- how can we improve the targeting of investments? (development domain work)
- what are the potential added returns to regional cooperation on agricultural development priorities, for example agricultural research and infrastructure investments?

### Suggested deliverables:

- investment and policy options for accelerating agricultural growth and poverty reduction and
- development domains to identify disaggregated livelihood strategies.

## Activity 3: strengthening impact of agricultural investments and policy

### Activities:

- diagnostic assessments of constraints undermining the payoffs to agricultural expenditures (ex-ante analysis of investment priorities);
- evaluating best bets in agricultural programme investment (ex-post assessments of investment priorities and
- assessing how policy analysis influences policy.

### Suggested deliverables:

- compilation of factors constraining higher returns to different agricultural investments and
- recommendations to enhance policy impact of ReSAKSS-SA results.

## Activity 4: knowledge management

### Activities:

- establish ReSAKSS-SA knowledge sharing platform;
- analytical framework for SADC AIMS and
- policy dialogue.

### Suggested deliverables:

Knowledge sharing platform – interactive website, CD, and other related products and Strategy for SADC AIMS to analyse and report important agricultural data.

Capacity building is a cross cutting activity

### Activities:

Collaborative training workshops for capacity building (trends analysis, analysis of investment options, and monitoring and evaluation)



## 4.2 Plenary review of work plans

### *Group 1*

Given the purpose of providing information to CAADP for dialogue and monitoring by RECs it is important to establish some principles. ReSAKSS-SA activities should:

- add value;
- address policy makers needs in content and presentation, and
- should not repeat things that have already been done.

The first activity would be to develop a system to identify and track data needed for CAADP and RISDP and why certain things are not happening. ReSAKSS-SA should build on what has already been done in the first four countries. It should identify gaps and priorities for filling them in a sustainable way.

Topics should be related to the 4 pillars and the targets of CAADP and RISDP.

Agricultural trends need to be tracked on an annual basis.

Poverty trends are more difficult. They require a large research project and cannot be done annually but the annual system needs to relate to them.

The work plan also needs to consider environmental pressures, food and cash crops. There is some need for information at sub-national level and information on government or other spending on agriculture.

It is important to take account of the need for standardisation.

ReSAKSS-SA should look at donor spending in addition to government spending.

Changes and trends should be related in a qualitative way taking into account things like climate and political events. This sort of analysis would provide information and background for prioritising other activities and is an important early output feeding into implementation of the system in different countries. It needs to be aligned with events in countries to provide information in a timely way.

## *Group 2*

Priorities for the work plan.

Assessment of options for increased agricultural growth and poverty reduction.

What are the sources of growth, the constraints and options?

What growth do we need? The aim of this question is to identify potential sources of national and regional growth.

How can we achieve growth? Look at marketing and production constraints, technology, trade, infrastructure and institutions.

What options are there for removing constraints?

Review investment, policy, and policy formulation process.

## *Outputs for the three activities*

Identify the key sub-sector for each country.

Define development domains with similar constraints and opportunities.

Do an analysis of regional trade and market constraints.

## *Discussion*

It is important to talk about the policy context for what is being proposed. This will provide a foundation for more detailed analysis. Discussing policy scenarios without looking at the policy context is not practical enough. We need to look at where we are now in order to reflect on what will happen.

The logic the group followed was to start by identifying sources of growth at sector level, then to look at policy and institutional constraints, and then to identify the trade constraints.

The point is well taken that the big constraint is the actual policies. We need to recognise this to establish whether something is feasible.

Activity one looks at trends. Does it also include policy trends? In order to explain the trends you would have to look at policy trends.

Information about the current trends is within the policy context. It is important to take policy into account.

It would be a big job to do an inventory of policies but you could pick up some of them by looking at trends in expenditure.

### *Group 3*

We have to do an inventory of current investment in different countries: things such as infrastructure, irrigation, feeder roads, the marketing system, agricultural research and extension. We can look at successes in different countries and whether they can be duplicated in other countries.

Look at the current agricultural investment policies and their implementation. Are they informed by scientific methodology, and by qualitative and quantitative analysis, or are they politically motivated.

### *Outputs*

Design an interactive training module on assessing investments.

Organise an interactive national dialogue between stakeholders including government and the private sector.

Monitor the quarterly report on investment flows nationally and regionally.

Report on the competitive analysis study.

### *Discussion*

Reports by central banks should provide information on investment flows.

ReSAKSS-SA needs to look at public and private investment in the agricultural sector.

How do we focus ReSAKSS-SA's energies on analyses that will help CAADP to move forward? The framework is already a CAADP framework and there are constituencies around those areas. We have to look at what analysis they need. ReSAKSS-SA really needs to focus on pillar three related efforts and what the priorities are for investment to address chronic vulnerability. It is very important to influence the huge flows of finance into those areas. There is also a significant effort in the region to address productivity issues and we need to look at these things more carefully.

In the case of pillar one it is important to analyse the types of investment that have gone into irrigation because much of this money comes from the budget. We want to track where it went and what impact it had. From there we will know which areas will produce impacts on agricultural productivity.

The group did not look at areas like vulnerability and infrastructure but we agreed that ReSAKSS-SA should look at the 4 pillars. The question is whether to start with pillar one or look at all four?

We need to look at the returns on investments in the region and at issues like countries making big investments in irrigation because a powerful person mobilised funds although investment in other areas like transport may have been more productive. We need to look at how investments are being made and how the process can be improved. It would be interesting to take specific areas, for example, irrigation and look at what constraints have to be removed to get a return on investment in that area.

Can 10% investment achieve 6% growth? We need to assess whether it is enough given the existing level of efficiency?

Then there is the question of the allocative and technical efficiency of investment. Both forms of efficiency are needed. Allocative efficiency is quite easy to assess. To assess technical efficiency you need to go deeper into spending patterns (and look at things like the lack of human resources).

A large proportion of the agriculture budget relates to food security as governments try to increase basic food production and technical efficiency in that area may have the biggest pay off initially.

How do donors allocate their money and resources?

Calculations of efficiency and investment can be quite sterile because you have to factor in the huge costs of dealing with food insecurity. Is it the return on that investment or is it the wider policy that we have to look at? For example, who will benefit from different kinds of investment? Will it be the poor or larger enterprises?

In most cases we do not know how much of the 10% should go to various areas. We need to look at the high dependence on rain fed agriculture. Possibly at least 20% should go to irrigation. We need to look at what is the constraint. We have plenty of water but little irrigation.

## *Group 4*

The group agreed that the different organisations are working in complementary areas and they should work with ReSAKSS-SA. Establishing a knowledge system involves many issues and we should have a meeting with all relevant organisations to look at ICT strategies, work plans and alignment. We should also look at ongoing growth, capacity building and resource sharing. There are a number of opportunities around data sharing and sharing funding to achieve more efficiency. The meeting should be held within 6 weeks.

To start the process on policy dialogue we need to bring together regional players such as SADC, ReSAKSS-SA and others.



As our intention is to support CAADP and SADC is supporting CAADP we should support AIMS. Bentry is already getting together a wide range of useful material and looking at how it will be presented to a wide range of stakeholders. As a team we will start looking at ways of making this information available.

Member states have agreed to implement an agricultural plan that would be monitored through the SADC Secretariat. Member states have to monitor and analyse data but they also send it to SADC.

The Botswana country report looks at issues like the provision of inputs, seeds fertiliser, labour (HIV), land issues, livestock, crop production and fisheries, natural resources, trade and market access issues, water resources management, disaster preparedness, food security, food reserves, research and technical development and dissemination. Investment is an area we have been talking about. These are some of the issues we need to analyse in an information system for the region. ReSAKSS-SA could play a role – we are having problems with training and consultations. It could also help governments and other stakeholders to influence agriculture.

We will deal with the components of the knowledge platform when we have a separate meeting. There are a lot of issues and it is not practical to deal with them now.

A key issue is packaging information and disseminating it in ways that can be made useful. People in government do not have time to look at long reports.

We need to look at how we strengthen analysis in reports to give them greater impact.



# Chapter 5

## Closure

### Bentry Chaura, SADC

We are happy with the level of discussion and participation. Thank you all very much; you have given ReSAKSS-SA a way forward on how to help the region. Hopefully these discussions will help to improve strategies so that we can have a better impact in the region and help the poorest of the poor through the development of agriculture.

### Jeff Hill, USAID

We have had very positive and constructive discussions over the last two days. One thing to reflect on is that CAADP is a very big idea and it will be very tough to bring some of the big ideas to reality. ReSAKSS-SA is potentially a really important step in making CAADP a reality and in creating a common Africa vision for development. This is a powerful contribution to the future of Africa and it aligns with donor support. There are big expectations at high level for using this information, information to really inform policy decisions. As the next steps are made we will be looking closely at progress and we are pleased with the very strong participation, the capacity to deal with the issues, and the cooperation at regional level. Congratulations on a job well done.

### David Rohrbach, ICRISAT

Thanks to USAID for providing the initial funding. We now have further funding from DFID and SIDA and the EU is also interested. Thanks to Pius for putting the meeting together.

### Pius Chilonda, ReSAKSS-SA

We thank you for your inputs. We will refine the work plan and produce proceedings of workshop

# Appendixes

## Agenda

### Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System for Southern Africa Regional Stakeholders' Workshop

Birchwood Executive Hotel & Conference Centre  
Johannesburg, South Africa, October 4-5, 2006

#### Wednesday, 4 October, 2006

**08:00**     **Coffee and Registration**

**08:30**     **Introduction and objectives**

Chair: **Hilmy Sally**, Head IWMI Southern Africa Office

Introduction of participants

Welcome remarks

**IWMI**     *Hilmy Sally*, Head IWMI Southern Africa Office

**ICRISAT** *David Rohrbach*, Principal Scientist (Economics)

**SADC**     *Bentry Chaura*, Senior Programme Manager, Agricultural Information Management System (AIMS), SADC FANR

**COMESA** *Chikakula Miti*, Agricultural Development Expert, COMESA

**NEPAD**     *Richard Mkandawire*, Agriculture Advisor, NEPAD

Objectives of the workshop

*Pius Chilonda*, Sub-Regional Coordinator, ReSAKSS-SA

**09.30**     **Bridging knowledge and information gaps to achieve agricultural growth in Africa through the implementation of the Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (ReSAKSS)**

*Michael Johnson*, Research Fellow and ReSAKSS Coordinator, IFPRI

*Ousmane Badiane*, Africa Coordinator, IFPRI

**10:00**     **Refreshments**

## **ReSAKSS strategic analysis issues in the context of CAADP and Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (RISDP) growth objective**

Chair: **Michael Johnson**, Research Fellow and ReSAKSS Coordinator, IFPRI

**10:30**     **What is the current status of agricultural growth, food security and poverty in southern Africa – long term trends?**

*Pius Chilonda*, Sub-Regional Coordinator, ReSAKSS-SA

**11:00**     **Strategic options for achieving agricultural growth, food security and poverty reduction in Southern Africa. What is the role of regional economic integration? What could be the contribution of the agricultural sector in this?**

*Shenggen Fan*, Division Director, DSDG, IFPRI

*Alejandro Nin Patt*, Research Fellow, DSDG, IFPRI

**11:30**     **How much growth in productivity is required to reduce poverty in Southern Africa? What are the opportunities of improving the performance of the agricultural sector and which areas need investment to achieve the CAADP and RISDP objectives?**

*Duncan Boughton*, Professor of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University

**12:00**     **Status of the implementation of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers in Southern Africa? What is the role of agriculture in the PRSPs process? What is the status of defining the PRSPs program on poverty? What has worked and what has not worked? How can we possibly improve the targeting of interventions in order to reduce poverty?**

*Barbara Kalima-Phiri*, Policy Analyst: Poverty Reduction Strategies, Southern Africa Trust

**12:30**     **What are the constraints to pro poor agricultural growth in poor rural areas? What investments are needed in what sequence to address these constraints? What are strategic choices that need to be made? What are the roles of and challenges to governments in this?**

*Andrew Dorward*, Professor of Development Economics, Imperial College London

**13:00**     **Lunch**

## **ReSAKSS-SA/FANRPAN country level analysis**

Chair: **Barbara Kalima-Phiri**, Policy Analyst: Poverty Reduction Strategies, Southern Africa Trust

- 14:00**     **The case of Malawi: What are the trends of agricultural growth, food security and poverty**  
*Charles Jumbe*, Research Fellow, Center for Agricultural Research and Development, Bunda College of Agriculture, Malawi
- 14:20**     **The case of Zambia: Public investment in Zambia's agriculture? Is it quality or quantity? How can Zambia improve the quality of investments?**  
*Emma Malawo*, Deputy Director, Department of Planning, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Zambia
- 14:40**     **The case of Mozambique: What is the impact of investments at household level? Evidence from the analysis of income and poverty dynamics in rural Mozambique**  
*Gilead Mlay*, Professor of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University  
*Bruno Araujo*, Associate Professor, Eduardo Mondlane University
- 15:00**     **The case of South Africa: What are the agricultural trends in the rural sector? What lessons can be learnt from public spending in agriculture and poverty reduction**  
*Charles Machethe*, Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of Pretoria
- 15:20**     **Refreshments**
- 15: 50**     **Discussion of country papers**

Chair: **James Thurlow**, Post doctoral Fellow, IFPRI

How can we improve this type of analyses at country level? What are the data gaps? How can this analysis be more useful to policy makers?

**19:00-21:00**     **Dinner**

## **Thursday, 5 October, 2006**

**08:00**     **PANEL DISCUSSION - Identifying regional priorities for strategic analysis in Southern Africa**

The purpose of this session is to identify regional priorities for strategic analysis in Southern Africa based on current knowledge, the needs, and expectations of SADC, COMESA, NEPAD, donors, countries, and other stakeholders.

Chair: **Isaac Minde**, Senior Scientist (Economics), ICRISAT

*Chikakula Miti*, Agricultural Development Expert, COMESA  
*Jeff Hill*, Senior Agriculture Advisor, USAID  
*Shenggen Fan*, Division Director, DSDG, IFPRI  
*Emma Malawo*, Deputy Director, Department of Planning, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Zambia

## **09:30 Refreshments**

## **Knowledge management issues in the context of Southern Africa**

Chair: **Phumzile Mdladla**, FEWSNET Regional Representative

**10:00 What are the critical data issues in Southern Africa? How can we improve the quality of data? How can we improve data access? What are the critical issues related information and knowledge sharing in Southern Africa**

*Georges Tadonki*, Programme Manager, SAHIMS

**10:25 What types of data are important in informing policy and investment decisions? What are the experiences in sharing information and knowledge at an international level?**

*Joachim Otte*, Coordinator, PPLPF/AGAL, FAO

**10:50 What is the status of vulnerability in southern Africa? How can we reduce the vulnerability of agricultural dependent households to such shocks? How are we monitoring the vulnerability and food security situation? What policy options are available?**

*Elliot Vhurumuku*, Food Security Officer, World Food Programme/FAO/SADC Regional Vulnerability Assessment Committee (RVAC)

**11:15 SADC's Agricultural Information Management System (AIMS) – how is SADC addressing gaps in data quality and accessibility?**

*Bentry Chaura*, Senior Agricultural Management Information Officer, AIMS, SADC

**11:40 What are the challenges of policy research, analysis and dialogue in Southern Africa? What is the potential contribution of FANRPAN's to Southern African agricultural development?**

*Douglas Merrey*, Director of Research, Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN)

**12:05 PANEL DISCUSSION - Identifying challenges and opportunities for knowledge sharing and management**

The purpose of this session is to review the challenges and opportunities for knowledge sharing and improving access to and use of higher quality data in policy analysis

Chair: **Ousmane Badiane**, Africa Coordinator, IFPRI

*Bob Day*, Non Zero Sum Development

*Bentry Chaura*, Senior Agricultural Management Information Officer, AIMS, SADC

*Richard Mkandawire*, Agriculture Advisor, NEPAD Secretariat

*Charles Jumba*, Research Fellow, Center for Agricultural Research and Development, Bunda College of Agriculture, Malawi

**13:00 Lunch**

**14:00 ReSAKSS-SA work plans**

Chair: **David Rohrbach**, Principal Scientist (Economics), ICRISAT.

Presentation of ReSAKSS-SA work plan - comments/discussion

*Pius Chilonda*, Sub-Regional Coordinator, ReSAKSS-SA

**14:30 Group discussions on work plans**

**15:00 Refreshments**

**16:00 Plenary review of work plans**

**17:00 Closing remarks**

*Bentry Chaura*, Senior Programme Manager, Agricultural Information Management System (AIMS), SADC FANR

*Jeff Hill*, Senior Agriculture Advisor, USAID

*Richard Mkandawire*, NEPAD Agriculture Advisor

## List of participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Country	Address	Email	Telephone	Fax
Chaura Bentry	Sr. Programme Manager	SADC	Botswana	FANR Directorate SADC Secretariat P/B 0095 Gaborone, Botswana	Bchaura@sadc.int	267 395 1863 Cell: 71 52 3754	267 397 2848 267 392 4099
Nyirenda Margaret	Director, FANR, SADC	SADC	Botswana	Plott116, Millennium Office Park, Kgale View P/B 0095 Gaborone, Botswana	Mnyirenda@sadc.int	267 395 1863 267 395 7109 Cell: 71 240 459	267 397 2848 267 392 4099
Vhurumuku Elliot	Food Security Officer	WFP-FAO/RVAC	Botswana	WFP-FAO UN Place Box 54 Gaborone, Botswana	elliott.vhurumuku@undp.org	267 3952121 ext506 Cell: 267 71258997	267 3956093
Miti Chikakula	Agricultural Development Expert	COMESA	Zambia	COMESA Secretariat Ben Bella Road P.O. Box 30051 Lusaka, Zambia	cmuyunda@comesa.int	260 1 229 725/52 Ext. 314	260 1 225 107
Mkandawaire Richard	Agriculture Advisor, Nepal Secretariat	NEPAD/African Union	South Africa	P.O. Box 1234 Halfway House Midrand, 1685	Mkandawaire@nepad.org pats@nepad.org	27 11 313 3338	27 11 313 3450
Chimatiro Sloans	Senior Fisheries Advisor	NEPAD/Africa Union	South Africa	P.O. Box 1234 Halfway House Midrand, 1685	sloansc@nepad.org	27 11 313 3824 Cell: 27 82 583 0810	27 11 206 3824
Jeff Hill	Senior Agricultural Advisor	USAID	USA	1325 G Street, NW Suite 400 Washington, DC 20005	jhill@usaid.gov	202 712 5256	202 216 3373
Khupe Cecilia	Programme Manager	USAID	Botswana	P.O. Box 2427 Gaborone, Botswana	ekhupe@usaid.gov	267 363 1231 Cell: 267 71313751	267 392 4404
Lucas Kim	Agricultural Officer	USAID	South Africa	P.O. Box 43 Groenkloof X 5 Pretoria, 0021	klucas@usaid.gov	27 12 452 2208	



Name	Title	Organisation	Country	Address	Email	Telephone	Fax
Chisenga Justin	Information Management Specialist	FAO	Accra	FAO Building Gamel Abdul Nasser Road, P.O. Box GP 1628 Accra Ghana	Justin.Chisenga@fao.org	233 21 675 000/4535 233 21 701 0930	23321668427
Otte Joachim	Coordinator, PPLPI/AGAL	FAO	Italy	Room: C-510 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Rome	Joachim.Otte@fao.org	39 06 5705 634	39 06 5705 749
Breen James	FAO Regional Emergency Agronomist	FAO/RIACSO	South Africa	Private Bag X44 Sunninghill 2157 Johannesburg	Breenjames@yahoo.com	27 11 5151507 Cell: 27 76 892 9600	27 11 517 1549
Tadonki Georges	Programme Manager	SAHIMS/United Nations OCHA	South Africa	Private Bag X44 Sunninghill 2157 Johannesburg	Tadonki@sahims.net grtadonki@yahoo.com	27 11 517 1568 Cell: 27 83 463 5211	
Andrew Dorward	Professor of Development Economics	Imperial College London	UK	Imperial College London, Wye Campus High Street, Wye, Ashford Kent TN25 5AH, UK	A.Dorward@imperial.ac.uk	44 20 75942679	44 1233 812138
Machethe Charles	Professor of Agri- cultural Economics	University of Pretoria	South Africa	Post Graduate School of Agriculture and Rural Development University of Pretoria Pretoria 0002	Charles.machethe@up.ac.za	27 12 420 3280	27 12 420 3206
Boughton Duncan	Associate Professor, Interna- tional Development	MSU - Michigan State University	USA	Dept of Agricultural Economics Michigan State University East Lansing MI 48824-1039	boughton@msu.edu	517 432-6659	517-432-1800

Name	Title	Organisation	Country	Address	Email	Telephone	Fax
Mlay Gilead	Professor	Michigan State University	USA	Dept of Agricultural Economics 213 Agriculture Hall Michigan State University East Lansing MI 48824-1039	mlaygile@msu.edu	517 432-6659 27 12 460 2499 Cell: 27 82 894 6085	517-432-1800
de Villiers Roelof	Director Manstrat	Manstrat Development Strategists	South Africa	P.O. Box 2752 Brooklyn Square Pretoria	roelof@manstrat.co.za	27 12 845 9100 27 12 427 2323 Cell: 27 82 668 4144	27 12 845 9110
Merrey Douglas	Research Director	FANRPAN	South Africa	141 Creswell Street Weavind Park Private Bag X813 Silverton, Pretoria	d.merrey@cgiar.org	27 12 427 2323 Cell: 27 82 668 4144	27 12 427 2172
Mdladla Phumzile	Fewsnets Regional Representative	FEWSNET	South Africa	1040 Burnett Street HATFIELD	Pmdladla@fewsn.net		
Hamadziripi Alfred	SARPAN - Social Dimensions Programme	SARPAN	South Africa	1250 Pretorius Street, Office W2, ProEquity Court Hatfield 0083 PO Box 11615 Hatfield 0028	Ahamadziripi@sarpn.org.za	27 12 423 0232	27 12 342 5636
Ncume Lebohang		SARPAN	South Africa	1250 Pretorius Street, Office W2, ProEquity Court Hatfield 0083 PO Box 11615 Hatfield 0028	Lncume@sarpn.org.za	27 12 302 2707 Cell: 27 82 560 6555	27 12 302 2701
Humphries Richard	Chief Research Specialist	HSRC	South Africa	Private Bag X41 Pretoria, 0001	Rhumphries@hsrc.ac.za humphriesrg@gmail.com	27 12 302 2707 Cell: 27 82 904 0955	27 12 302 2525
Schwabe Craig	Director: GIS Centre	HSRC	South Africa	Private Bag X41 Pretoria, 0001	CASchwabe@hsrc.ac.za		

Name	Title	Organisation	Country	Address	Email	Telephone	Fax
Bob Day	Consultant	Non Zero Sum	South Africa	P.O. Box 33007 Glenstantia Pretoria, 0010	Bday@scientia.co.za	27 12 998 8456 Cell: 27 82 458 9119	27 12 362 5928
Greenwood Peter	Consultant	Non Zero Sum	South Africa	P.O. Box 33007 Glenstantia Pretoria, 0010	PeterhgreenWood@gmail.com		
Ridout Malcolm	Senior Livelihood Advisor	DFID	South Africa	UK Department for International Development 2nd Floor Sanlam Building 353 Festival Street Hatfield	Malcolm-Ridout@dfid.gov.uk	27 12 431 2100 Direct : 27 12 431 2167	27 12 342 3429
Barbara Kalima-Phiri	Policy Analyst: Poverty Reduction Strategies	Southern Africa Trust	South Africa	Southern Africa Trust PO Box 1234 Halfway House, 1685	Bkalima@yahoo.com bkalima-phiri@southernafricatrust.org	27 11 313 3065 265 1 755 352 Cell: 265 8 894 284	27 11 313 3853
Mulenga Nyami Jaff	Director of Land Resources Conser- vation	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security	Malawi	P.O. Box 30 291 Lilongwe3 Malawi	Landcons@malawi.net	265 1 755 352 Cell: 265 8 894 284	
Mhango Brebner		Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security	Malawi	P.O. Box 30 291 Lilongwe3 Malawi	Landcons@malawi.net	265 1 755 352 Cell: 265 8 894 284	
Jumbe Charles	Research Fellow	Bunda College of Agriculture	Malawi	University of Malawi Centre for Agricul- tural Research and Development Bunda College of Agriculture P.O. Box 219 Lilongwe	Charlesjumbe@bunda.unima.mw charlesjumbe@yahoo.com	265 1 277 433 Cell: 265 9 646 387	265 127 7364

Name	Title	Organisation	Country	Address	Email	Telephone	Fax
Mwale Idrissa	Principal Economist	Min of Agriculture and Food Security	Malawi	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security P. O. Box 30134 Lilongwe 3, Malawi	Idrissa@africa-online.net	265 9 955 500	
Arlindo Pedro	Policy and Agricultural Market Analyst	Ministry of Agriculture (Directorate of Economics)	Mozambique	Ministerio da Agricultura Direccao de Economia Praca dos Herois C.P. 1406 Maputo, Mozambique	Parlindo@map.gov.mz	258 21 460 131 /21 460 145 Cell: 258 82 3073870	258 21 460 145/ 21460296
Mahoque Gustavo	Researcher Advocacy Advisor	SETSAN	Mozambique	Av.das FPLM, 2698 P.O. Box 915 Mavalane, Maputo	gustavomahoque@mail.pt comunicacao@setsan.org.mz	258 21 461874 Cell: 258 82 4835680	
Valdemiro Munguambe	Policy Designer/ Agronomist	SETSAN	Mozambique	Av.das FPLM, 2698 P.O. Box 915 Mavalane, Maputo	valdemiro.munguambe@map.gov.mz	258 1 461 850	258 1 461 873
Bruno Araiujo	Probational Assistant Professor	Eduardo Mondlane University	Mozambique	Eduardo Mondlane University P.O.Box 257 Maputo, Mozambique	baraiujo@uem.mz	258 8 232 5528	258 2 149 2176
Morakile Gontse	Senior Research Analyst	National Department of Agriculture	South Africa	Directorate: Research and Technology Development National Department of Agriculture Rm 329: Harvest House 30 Hamilton Road Arcadia, Pretoria	GontseM@hnda.agric.za	27 012 319 056	27 012 319 056

Name	Title	Organisation	Country	Address	Email	Telephone	Fax
Jugmohan Maneshree	Research Analyst Officer (Governance)	National Department of Agriculture	South Africa	Directorate: Research and Technology Development National Department of Agriculture Rm 329: Harvest House 30 Hamilton Road Arcadia, Pretoria	Maneshree@nda.agric.za	27 012 319 056	27 012 319 056
Ndlala Marcia	Intern	National Department of Agriculture	South Africa	Directorate: Research and Technology Development National Department of Agriculture Rm 329: Harvest House 30 Hamilton Road Arcadia, Pretoria	Marciand@nda.agric.za	27 012 319 056	27 012 319 056
Sebola Joseph	Director	National Department of Agriculture	South Africa	Agricultural Department Pretoria, South Africa	DRTD@nda.agric.za	27 12 319 7291/ 6801 27 12 319 7290/ 6699	
Mankazana Mkhululi	Chief Director	National Department of Agriculture	South Africa	Agricultural Department Pretoria, South Africa			
Vutula Noncedo	Chief Director	National Department of Agriculture	South Africa	Agricultural Department Pretoria, South Africa	Cdiistr@nda.agric.za	27 12 319 7291/ 6801 27 12 319 7290/ 6699	

Name	Title	Organisation	Country	Address	Email	Telephone	Fax
Ndokweni Mimi	PhD (Development Studies) candidate	University of KwaZulu-Natal	South Africa	University of Kwa-Zulu-Natal School of Development Studies, RM 256, Memorial Tower Building Congella, 4041	Ndokweni@ukzn.ac.za	27 31 260 2114 Cell: 27 82 294 5878	31 260 2359
Malawo Emma	Deputy Director in charge of Policy and Statistics	Ministry of Agriculture	Zambia	P.O. Box 50197 Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operative Policy and Planning Department Lusaka, Zambia	emalawo65@yahoo.com	260 1 250 504	260 1 253 520
Sikwibebe Sitwala Hargreaves	Chief Agricultural Economist	Ministry of Agriculture	Zambia	IFPR 2033 K Street, NW Washington DC 20006-1002	Hsikwibebe@maff.gov.zm	260 1 250 504	260 1 253 520
Badiane Ousmane	Africa Coordinator, IFPRI	IFPRI/NEPAD	USA	IFPRI 2033 K Street, NW Washington DC 20006-1002	o.Badiane@cgiar.org	1 202 862 5600	1 202 467 4439
Johnson Michael	ReSAKSS Coordinator, Africa	IFPRI	USA	IFPRI 2033 K Street, NW Washington DC 20006-1002	M.Johnson@cgiar.org	1 202 862 5600	1 202 467 4439
Fan Shenggen	Director, DSDG	IFPRI	USA	IFPRI 2033 K Street, NW Washington DC 20006-1002	S.Fan@cgiar.org	1 202 862 5600	202 467 4439
James Thurlow	Post doctoral Fellow	IFPRI	USA	IFPRI 2033 K Street, NW Washington DC 20006-1002	j.thurlow@cgiar.org	1 202 862 5600	12024674439
Nin Pratt Alejandro	Research Fellow	IFPRI	USA	IFPRI 2033 K Street, NW Washington DC 20006-1002	a.ninpratt@cgiar.org	1 202 862 5689	

Name	Title	Organisation	Country	Address	Email	Telephone	Fax
Bahigwa Godfrey	ReSAKSS Coordinator East and Central Africa	ILRI	Kenya	Old Naivasha Road 00100 Nairobi, N/A Country/Region	g.bahigwa@cgiar.org	254 20 422 3000	254 20 422 3001
Chilonda Pius	ReSAKSS-SA Coordinator, Southern Africa	IWMI	South Africa	141 Creswell Street Weavind Park Private Bag X813 Silverton, Pretoria South Africa	p.Chilonda@cgiar.org	27 12 845 9100	27 12 845 9110
Sally Hilmy	Head, IWMI Southern Africa Office	IWMI	South Africa	141 Creswell Street Weavind Park Private Bag X813 Silverton, Pretoria South Africa	h.sally@cgiar.org	27 12 845 9100	27 12 845 9110
Rohrbach David	Principal Scientist (Economics)	ICRISAT	Zimbabwe	Matopos Research Station P.O.Box 776 Bulawayo, Zimbabwe	d.rohrbach@cgiar.org	263 (0) 83 8311to 8315 Cell: 263 (0) 11 631 019	263 (0) 83 8253 or 8307
Isaac Minde	Senior Scientist (Economics)	ICRISAT	Zimbabwe	Matopos Research Station P.O.Box 776 Bulawayo, Zimbabwe	i.minde@cgiar.org	263 (0) 83 311 to 8315	263 (0) 83 8253 or 8307
Kimyondo Godbertha	Consultant	IWMI	South Africa	141 Creswell Street Weavind Park Private Bag X813 Silverton, Pretoria South Africa	Gkimyondo@hotmail.com	27 12 845 9100	27 12 845 9110
Cloete Dick	Consultant	IWMI	South Africa	141 Creswell Street Weavind Park Private Bag X813 Silverton, Pretoria South Africa	dicke@wisenet.co.za	011 442 7572 Cell: 27 (0) 83 250 6066	

Name	Title	Organisation	Country	Address	Email	Telephone	Fax
Njonge Mary	Secretariat	IWMI	South Africa	141 Creswell Street Weavind Park Private Bag X813 Silverton, Pretoria South Africa	m.njonge@cgiar.org	27 12 845 9100	27 12 845 9100 27 12 845 9110
Mashele Rachel	Secretariat	IWMI	South Africa	141 Creswell Street Weavind Park Private Bag X813 Silverton, Pretoria South Africa	r.mashele@cgiar.org	27 12 845 9100	27 12 845 9110
Ngwenya Bafana	Driver	IWMI	South Africa	141 Creswell Street Weavind Park Private Bag X813 Silverton, Pretoria South Africa	b.ngwenya@cgiar.org	27 12 845 9100	27 12 845 9110







*The ReSAKSS-SA aims to identify and assess strategic options for agricultural growth particularly poverty alleviation in southern Africa. ReSAKSS-SA supports review and learning processes in the region to contribute to the successful implementation of agriculture and rural development strategies with particular emphasis on Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) and Southern Africa Development Community Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (SADC RISDP). ReSAKSS-SA is jointly implemented by the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) and the International Water Management Institute (IWMI), in collaboration with the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), regional and national partners.*

*The ReSAKSS-SA is a multi-donor initiative funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the Department for International Development (DFID), and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA).*

**For more information, contact:**

Sub-Regional Coordinator  
Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System  
for Southern Africa (ReSAKSS-SA)

**International Water Management Institute (IWMI)**

Private Bag X813

Silverton 0127

Pretoria, South Africa

Telephone: +27 (0)12 845 9100

Facsimile: +27 (0)12 845 9110

E-mail: [resakss-sa@cgiar.org](mailto:resakss-sa@cgiar.org)

Website: [www.resakss-sa.org](http://www.resakss-sa.org)



**International Water Management Institute**  
Private Bag X813, Silverton 0127, Pretoria, South  
Africa

Telephone: +27 (0)12 845 9100

Facsimile: +27 (0)12 845 9110

E-mail: [resakss-sa@cgiar.org](mailto:resakss-sa@cgiar.org)

Web: [www.resakss-sa.org](http://www.resakss-sa.org)

