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Background to the Review

• Importance of public expenditures in agriculture in Africa (and beyond), including by catalysing private ag. investments

• This in turn points to importance of properly measuring quantity (e.g. the CAADP 10%) and quality of such public spending—including in standardised ways that allow comparison across countries and over time

• Various organisations have recognised need for compiling disaggregated and cross-country public expenditure datasets: FAO, IDB, IFPRI, IMF, OECD, UN, WB, etc.

• Lots of tremendous efforts undertaken in this regard, but: Until this review, unclear how these efforts related to each other, what the complementarities and remaining gaps are, how the methodologies compare
Motivation for and Objective of the Review

- What are the key features of each effort? Do they produce different AgPE data/statistics because of different methods? Same data, in that case is there duplication? Which dataset/study is useful for what purposes and for which users?
- Discussion in June 2013 at an IFPRI-OECD organised workshop on agricultural policy metrics brought these concerns to the surface

Objective of this review:
- produce a structured, systematic overview of the different initiatives that capture Ag. PE data across countries, to begin to answer above questions
- identify the key complementarities, challenges, and value-additions of each data initiative, so that initiative managers can collectively chart out a way for a ‘community of practice’, for efficient collaboration and cross-fertilisation of the different initiatives
State of the Review

• IFPRI / PIM (CRP2) commissioned a study to produce such a review
• Study carried out by Dr. Richard Anson (external consultant, deep earlier experience with AgPE issues)
• Very valuable input by managers of each data initiative
• Currently in draft form (copy shared with you), plans to use it as a tool for improved and increased coordination and information flow regarding cross-country AgPE data compilation \( \rightarrow \) feedback from you very welcome!
• Criteria for inclusion:
  • For Data initiatives: Ongoing; AgPE data for at least 10 countries
  • For Analytical initiatives: Ongoing; large-scale, closely tied to data
### Overview of the Initiatives:
#### Name & Managing Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>ACRONYM</th>
<th>FULL NAME</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>APE-LAC</td>
<td>Agricultural Public Expenditures for Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>UN-ECLAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ASTI</td>
<td>Agricultural Science and Technology Indicators</td>
<td>IFPRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BOOST</td>
<td>Making Expenditure Data Available for Analysis</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>Creditor Reporting System [Aid Activity Database]</td>
<td>OECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FAOSTAT</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organisation Statistics [Government Expenditures on Agriculture; Overseas Development Assistance on Ag.]</td>
<td>FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GFS</td>
<td>Government Financial Statistics</td>
<td>IMF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MAFAP</td>
<td>Monitoring African Food and Agricultural Policies</td>
<td>FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PSE-OEE</td>
<td>Producer Support Estimates for OECD &amp; Emerging Economies</td>
<td>OECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PSE-LAC</td>
<td>Producer Support Estimates for LAC</td>
<td>IDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>RePEAA</td>
<td>Resources for Public Expenditure Analysis in Agriculture</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ReSAKSS</td>
<td>Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System</td>
<td>IFPRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SPEED</td>
<td>Statistics on Public Expenditures for Economic Development</td>
<td>IFPRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SNAPE</td>
<td>Strengthening National Agricultural Public Expenditures</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>WDI</td>
<td>World Development Indicators</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Overview of the Initiatives: Geographic, Temporal, and Sectoral Scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>ACRONYM</th>
<th>AgPE DATA FOR:</th>
<th>ADMIN. UNIT</th>
<th>TIME*</th>
<th>GEOGRAPHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>APE-LAC</td>
<td>Total Ag.</td>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>1980-2010</td>
<td>10 countries: Central Am. &amp; Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ASTI</td>
<td>Ag R&amp;D</td>
<td>R&amp;D Institutes</td>
<td>1971-</td>
<td>66 dev'g countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BOOST</td>
<td>Highly disaggregated</td>
<td>Highly disaggregated</td>
<td>2005-</td>
<td>20 dev'g countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>Highly disaggregated</td>
<td>Projects / Programmes</td>
<td>1967-</td>
<td>&gt; 150 countries globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FAOSTAT</td>
<td>COFOG Level 3</td>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>2001-</td>
<td>&gt; 150 countries globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GFS</td>
<td>COFOG Level 2</td>
<td>Central, provincial, local govt</td>
<td>1972-2012</td>
<td>130 countries globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MAFAP</td>
<td>Ag &amp; rural dev’t, disaggregated</td>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
<td>10 countries in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PSE-OEE</td>
<td>Public spending on private &amp; public goods</td>
<td>Countries</td>
<td></td>
<td>OECD countries + emerging economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PSE-LAC</td>
<td>Public spending on private &amp; public goods</td>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>2006-2010</td>
<td>13 Latin America &amp; Caribbean countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>RePEAAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ReSAKSS</td>
<td>COFOG Level 3 and in some cases 4</td>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>1980-2010</td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SPEED</td>
<td>Total Ag.</td>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>1980-</td>
<td>147 countries globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SNAPE</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1980-</td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>WDI</td>
<td>No Ag.</td>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>several decades</td>
<td>214 countries globally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Selected years for different countries
The Initiatives within a Typology

Specific indicator: Data on producer support estimates

Studies using Ag PE data

Specific funding source: Data on dev’t aid

Analytical tools

Data on Ag. Publ. Exp.
Potential Feasibility-Tradeoff between Depths Along Different Dimensions

- Number of countries
- GFS: countries
- APE-LAC: 10 countries
- MAFAP: Ag. & rural dev't
- ASTI: Ag. & R&D
- SPEED: Total ag.
- PSE-OEE: Type of transfer; commodity group; etc.

Scope of ag-related exp.
Where to Go from Here?

- Difficult (perhaps even unrealistic and undesirable) to try to achieve all types of depth in one single data initiative
- Each type of depth has its distinct value for different types of policy analysis
- But there is scope for improving each DAI—given its purpose and ambitions
- Some DAIs are also relatively similar to each other—here, benefits from going beyond individual improvement of each DAI, to joint collaboration
- Sustainability of cross-country Ag PE database compilation: 6 of 14 initiatives are dependent on funds for time-bound projects
- Finally, some “depths” are clearly more underprovided than others—need for more work to enable tracking ag. PE along these depths
Strategic Options: Strengthening DAIs, and Coordination among Them

- Intra- and inter-agency co-ordination and collaboration
  - First step—Co-ordination:
    - making methodologies transparent
    - making datasets publicly available
    - information flow
    - seeking external feedback from experts and users
    - mutual feedback / peer review
    - through creation of Ag PE community-of-practice
  - Possible second step—Collaboration:
    - developing shared standards
    - pooling expertise, resources and data for efficient creation of joint databases and analytical studies
    - generate new funds together for joint efforts
    - to be considered: an Africa-focused subgroup?
Strategic Options: Strengthening “Backward and Forward Linkages”

- Strengthening country-level expenditure reporting systems—What ongoing support is already being provided? How can it be improved? Strengthening agriculture-specific versus general reporting systems?
- Analytical capacity support for ‘frontline’ users of country-level data
- Building demand for cross-country databases on the part of country-level policy analysts and decisionmakers
Some Next Steps Planned

- Finalise the review report (including based on your feedback!)
- Follow-up meeting to the June workshop will take place this December, to discuss putting in place the ‘community-of-practice’ based on the recommendations of this review report and the outcomes of the December meeting
- Possible first-step outputs from the coordination of the group:
  - Better and clearer data documentation across DAIs
  - More easily accessible data (perhaps through joint website linking to datasets and studies in respective organisations)
  - Easily digestible comparison of commonalities and differences in the methodologies of the DAIs
- Would an Africa sub-group be useful / add value? We will take your views to the December meeting

Thank you!