

The Political Economy of Agricultural Policy Processes in Africa with a focus on CAADP

Colin Poulton and Blessings Chinsinga

cp31@soas.ac.uk

www.future-agricultures.org/peapa

FAC PEAPA Workstream

(The Political Economy of Agricultural Policy in Africa)

- Phase 1: Comparative analysis of political incentives for agricultural policy making in Africa
- Phase 2: CAADP - Political Incentives, Value Added and Ways Forward
- AUC – Firetail Study: Drivers of Success in African Agriculture (www.firetail.co.uk/caadp)
- PEAPA Conference (March 2013) (<http://future-agricultures.org/events/policy-processes-conference>)

The June 2014 Malabo Declaration (p1) acknowledges ...

“... the *challenges* faced in the implementation of many [prior] Decisions and Declarations, in particular on progress made in attaining the minimum targets of public investment in agriculture that *should demonstrate Africa’s ownership and leadership* to the achievement of goals as enshrined in the 2003 Maputo commitments.”

www.tralac.org/news/article/5874-malabo-declaration-on-accelerated-agricultural-growth-and-transformation-for-shared-prosperity-and-improved-livelihoods.html [emphasis added]

CAADP Hypotheses

1. Countries where there are strong political incentives for pro-poor agricultural policy will
 - Embrace CAADP (evidenced, for example, by early implementation, strong domestic leadership of the CAADP process)
 - Seek the technical “value added” available through CAADP
 - But not necessarily score highly on participation of non-state actors or accountability in the CAADP process

CAADP Hypotheses (cont)

2. Countries where there are weak political incentives for pro-poor agricultural policy will
 - Make slow or halting progress with CAADP implementation, lacking strong domestic leadership of the CAADP process
 - Implement CAADP primarily to keep donors happy (“box ticking”) or to maintain face with other states/leaders
 - Not witness any real shift in political incentives as a result of the CAADP process (for example, through enhanced participation of non-state actors in policy formulation)

Country Examples: Rwanda

“In Rwanda the increase in budget allocation to the agricultural sector was more dramatic and coincided with the signing of the CAADP compact. However, the driving force behind these changes was the realisation by senior politicians, following publication of new national poverty figures in 2006, that the government had to give greater priority to agriculture if it was to realise its objective of broad-based growth and poverty reduction ... At this point, President Kagame, a strong supporter of NEPAD, looked to CAADP as a vehicle for making his case to others within government and the donor community. The modelling support provided by IFPRI was very helpful in this. ”

Source: Poulton et al (2014)

Malawi and Tanzania Examples

Malawi

- Donors hoped that the CAADP process would create new space for dialogue on the composition of agricultural expenditure in the country – frustrated.

Tanzania

- CAADP added new acronyms to the long list of policy documents and plans without resolving any of the underlying tensions within these.
- Expenditure share has shown no trend (5%) over past decade.
- CAADP compliance entailed expanding list of investment commitments – exacerbating lack of prioritisation within existing ASDP

Why Continue with CAADP?

CAADP is

- uniquely placed to encourage governments to respond to important opportunities for African agriculture
 - Rising domestic demand
 - Higher world food prices (political threat, economic opportunity)
 - Limited potential for area or yield expansion in other regions
- established on the African agricultural policy scene with the ability, through the African Union, to access Heads of State, Ministers of Agriculture and Finance

Potential for Leverage and Value Addition

- Heads of State
 - Personal commitment (importance of leadership)
- Information brokering:
 - Formal analysis of what works (e.g. balance of expenditure, public goods, benefits of supporting smallholder growth)
 - High-level networking
- Accountability
 - Expenditure
 - Joint sector reviews (implementation!)
- Civil society participation?
 - Maintain policy spaces (though these are insufficient on their own)
 - Support networks
 - Also role for donors?

FAC Policy Engagement

- AUC-Firetail study: political analysis valued by AUC.
 - Importance of political leadership: can't just sign up, then sit back and blame the technocrats if targets are missed!
- Invited to contribute to further discussions
 - E.g. what should constitute agricultural expenditure?

Where Next?

- The political economy of state capacity building for agricultural policy making
- The political economy of state – private sector relationships in African agriculture
- ???