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The POVNET task team on agriculture held a meeting on 21-22 September 2005 at the OECD in Paris. The list of participants to this meeting is attached in the annex.

The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Take stock of the Task Team’s work to date and its contribution/status in the wider POVNET work;
- Discuss the draft publication, “Enabling Pro-Poor Growth Through Agriculture” and comments section by section with a view to finalising a draft for POVNET endorsement at its next meeting on 16-17 October;
- Prepare for the Steering Group discussions on the Overarching paper, “Promoting Pro-Poor Growth” and ensure that its messages as regards the work on agriculture are reflected accurately and sufficiently; and
- Identify next steps for the Task Team, particularly with regard to dissemination of the key messages and work programme for 2006.

I. Introduction by Chair

Tim Mahoney provided an overview of the context in which the Task Team’s work had proceeded and the process underway. This has entailed pulling together the contributions of experts with the help of an editorial board, holding several consultations with the task team and developing country experts, and working with a professional editor, Bruce Ross Larson. The Editorial Board consists of the two Co-Chairs, Tim Mahoney and Susan Thompson, Ebba Dohlman from the Secretariat, Daniel Asplund from Sida, Lynn Brown from the World Food Programme, Jim Kinsella from Ireland and Neil Macpherson, World Bank. An editor has been engaged to ensure consistency and coherence of the draft. The intention is now to complete the draft this year, forward it to the POVNET and subsequently to the DAC for approval.

The background to this work was the recognition that rural areas are lagging behind, donors have overlooked the importance of agriculture for growth and there are major gaps in knowledge of rural livelihoods. At the same time, PRSs are not doing a good job of analysing the causes of rural poverty, focusing instead on the social sectors.

Against this background, the group set out to better understand the challenges and opportunities facing rural households by getting a clearer picture of the changes taking place. These contextual changes include the withdrawal of the public sector from agriculture on the assumption that the private sector would step in, a continuous depletion of the natural resource base, declining productivity, the spreading of HIV/AIDS which is undermining the human capital necessary for a robust agriculture sector. In some instances, the private sector stepped in to create new opportunities for small holders, providing a pathway out of poverty, but in other cases marginalized poor farmers even further. At the same time, the OECD
countries’ agricultural subsidies continue to impact on developing country producers and exporters through a combination of forces.

6. With a better understanding of this context, the Task Team set out to analyse the potential and limits of reaching poor agricultural households and enabling them to improve their livelihoods in sustainable ways. This means first and foremost to improve agricultural productivity and access to new markets. It means addressing the risk and vulnerability which undermines the ability of poor households to engage in the new expanding markets and in higher productivity/higher risk activities. And it means promoting diversified livelihoods within the rural sector and beyond. The final task was then to identify the wide set of policies, institutional improvements and clearer set of investments necessary for addressing these three challenges. In summary the objective of this document is provide a framework for PRS stakeholders to reverse the decline in agricultural investments recognizing the important potential of agriculture in stimulating growth and reducing poverty.

II. Outcomes of the meeting

Enabling Pro-Poor Growth Through Agriculture

7. The Task Team expressed strong support for the current draft with its focus on a livelihoods approach and set in the framework of five Rural Worlds. They welcomed the treatment of new agenda themes and endorsed the key messages that were emerging from this work. The draft nevertheless needed to be further improved and edited. There was agreement on the following key points:

- Shorten the document and ensure greater clarity and consistency of key messages;

- Prepare a second document of 5-6 pages aimed at senior policy makers and practitioners to be drafted by Tim Mahoney and presented at the next POVNET meeting mid November. Such a policy statement could also serve as input to the Overarching Paper and as executive summary for the longer technical document;

- Ensure that gender and sustainability are better mainstreamed in the text; emphasise the importance of social capital and capacity building in enabling market access and increasing productivity; strengthen coverage of the role of producer associations, OECD subsidies and HIV/AIDS; recognise important regional differences and include an intermezzo specifically on Africa. The current intermezzo on land will be revised.

- Clarify in chapter 4 issues of diversification within and away from agriculture so this is not misconstrued as encouraging hasty exits out of agriculture. Highlight better the need to improve opportunities for small-scale farming operating in less than conducive conditions. Reorganise Ch 5 to give greater emphasis to country contexts and processes of engagement.

- Edit all chapters according to the detailed comments attached in the annex as well as in the written comments and contributions by Austria, Canada, IFAD, IIED, Sweden, Switzerland and the U.K. Specific contributions will be forthcoming from IFAP and Italy (on producer associations and decentralisation), IFAD (productivity), Spain (OECD subsidies), Sweden and Lynn Brown (gender), UK (supermarket procurement), Sweden (intermezzo on Africa), Tim Mahoney (revising the land intermezzo), and IFAD (PRS section of ch. 5).

- Finalise the longer technical draft by end October with a view to requesting written comments by the end of the year. A final draft could then be presented at the next POVNET meeting in early 2006 with a view to approval by the DAC in March.
The discussion on the overarching paper “Promoting Pro-Poor Growth” highlighted the following points:

- The section on agriculture does not reflect clearly the important messages emerging from the work of the task team. It is inconsistent in places (para 76), oversimplifies the arguments (para 80) and undersells the contribution of agriculture to pro-poor growth. (para 49) Agriculture should be presented more positively. (para 7). The Agriculture Task Team will have to finalise its shorter policy piece so that it can feed into further revisions of the overarching paper.

- The draft approaches agriculture as a sector requiring in situ responses rather than holistically and from a livelihood perspective (para 74) where there is diversification within the rural sector as well as away from it (page 11). It should be made clear that agriculture never stops making a contribution even if its importance declines over time in relation to other sectors. The section on “lagging regions” is contradictory in this respect.

- The paper needs to look at the important links between private sector, infrastructure and agriculture. It currently treats the three issues in isolation. It should note also that investments in infrastructure and private sector development have been biased against rural areas.

- The paper is weak on capacity building and on recommendations on how to foster a strong partnership. It should take better account of regional differences and have a more nuanced presentation of the concept of security (page 14). The text highlights “food for work” as an example of a good instrument for R & V but not sure task team would agree.

- The issue of empowerment comes into the text in para 57 but should also be highlighted later in text on paras 94-95. The treatment of gender is a bit paternalistic. If you give women equal access to resources, food production will go up.

- The treatment of markets and market failures should be strengthened; it currently features in two paras only. Agriculture also needs to be considered as part of the private sector rather than outside it.

- Ch 3 is good. The Agriculture Task Team might draw from it in revising its ch 5. Otherwise the paper should make firmer conclusions.

Next steps for the Task Team might include the following:

8. Dissemination of messages was considered an important priority. It was suggested that a purpose made PowerPoint presentation could be developed for use at various workshops and seminars. The shorter policy statement could also be circulated.

9. Dissemination could be done at the international level such as through:
   - Global Donor Platform on Rural Development (GDPRD) where there are already numerous synergies emerging.
   - CGIAR as regards agriculture research
   - NEPAD;
   - World Bank’s Rural Week
• FAO events


• Field level with a view to test/validate the messages of the Task Team on PRS stakeholders.

10. Some possible areas for further work include:

• Pro-poor budgeting (fiscal policy)

• Synergies with Enironed on pro-poor growth

• Take further the work we have done and apply to Africa (or other region) such as by pulling together work from NEPAD, OECD AGR, SWAC and INICA, G8, etc to consider how to implement a country owned strategy.
ANNEX 1 – SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT: ENABLING PRO-POOR GROWTH THROUGH AGRICULTURE

I. Specific comments on Chapter 1:

- We need to reinforce the main messages and explain the rationale for this document: These include in brief: (i) the achievement of MDG 1 requires increased attention to a pattern of economic growth through agriculture that involves poor men and women as participants in and beneficiaries of expanding opportunities; (ii) agriculture is key to pro-poor growth in its ability to provide incomes, livelihoods, employment and food security taking account of diversified livelihoods and heterogeneity of the poor; (iii) rural markets are undergoing rapid change (such as liberalisation and globalisation) providing new opportunities but also threatening the livelihood of many smallholders (natural resource depletion, HIV/AIDS etc); (iv) vulnerable households face many obstacles in attempting to take advantage of these opportunities, not the least of which is their very insecure economic base; (v) fostering diversification of livelihoods is an important element of a strategy to enable pro-poor growth through agriculture.

- The rural worlds framework works well, particularly with five rather than three rural worlds but should been seen as a ladder (the dynamic of moving from one to the other could be underlined). As conflict is about access to natural resources, we need to stress security as one argument for investing more in this sector and address R&V and security aspects. The impact of OECD subsidies should be highlighted more. (Italy)

- The chapter has mixed messages and needs greater coherence. The various objectives set out in box 1.4 contrast for instance with objectives set out elsewhere in the text (para 37). The importance of agriculture is diffuse here and needs to be brought out more. A number of publications exist which underpin this importance of agriculture as a driver of growth. These should be referred to. Para 9 is misleading, repeats lowest figures. (IFAD)

- The chapter tends to look at the present and future, but not enough at lessons from the past. Donors are currently concentrating on poverty reduction but why are so many still poor? Why is it so hard to enhance productivity in some countries and not others? More analysis is needed. (AGR)

- The chapter is important in presenting a situation analysis and defines policy messages but it could be clearer. Analogies could help. The Rural Worlds framework is useful but this section should flow into a section on principles for engagement which now appear only in chapter 5. (IFAD)

- Two questions need to be addressed upfront: Why is agriculture so important? How does agriculture reduce poverty? The introduction to the chapter should be set in italics like in other chapters. This would help guide the reader. We should have a stronger rationale. (UK)
• Agriculture is critical for all of Africa. We should talk about Africa as one region and not differentiate the different sub-regions. Most African farmers fall into the category of Rural World 3. (AfDB)

• We need a stronger rationale why we need a new agenda, and capture why progress has not been made, compared for example to the 1960s. What happened during the Green Revolution? There is a three part challenge to look at the role of agriculture for: (i) producers, (ii) economic growth and (iii) poverty reduction. (IFAP)

• It was agreed in Florence at the first meeting of the Agriculture Task Team to address this subject from a livelihoods perspective and try to understand what is new about the context and what are the key messages from a livelihoods perspective. The outcome should be increased investments in agriculture – we should look at the why and how. The different Rural Worlds framework is key to this understanding.

• The intermezzo on RWs could be cut out which would save space and rationalize but parts of the intermezzo, especially the policy implications should be integrated in the main text.

• There is a need to look at the reasons why not more has been achieved. There has been a fundamental change in paradigm and in roles between the public and private sectors which has to be clarified. OPPG work on agriculture can be drawn on to provide more evidence on how agriculture is unique as a transmission channel for poverty reduction. There is a tension in the document between the general conclusions and prescriptions. (Sweden)

• There is a need to draw a distinction between the main regions (Sub-Saharan Africa, South and South-East Asia, and Latin America and the Caribbean) in this chapter so that the reader is conscious that there are significant differences both between regions and within regions.

II. Specific comments on Chapter 2:

• It is important to set out arguments upfront about productivity. Explain first what we mean by productivity. The notion is weak and is never defined. [ We will accept DFIDs definitions of productivity in our text] Para near 78 needed to clarify point. Idea of supermarkets good, significant. We should emphasise more poorly developed markets and how to get access to them. Confusing order 75 and 76. 1st point should be 1st line of para 76. Guiding principles about access. Subsidies- how they can be reduced or eliminated? Financial Services, needs to be woven throughout. Helps people engage in processes and procurement practices. Flow of environment throughout. (UK)

• Productivity & market opportunity are important, but PSD concepts and dimensions are not addressed enough. Throughout the RWs, research, technology, extension and information services are weak. IFAD written comments are valid on this point. We need to be able to suggest ways forward for farmers. Rural Finance worrisome, CGAP principles should be included. Subsidies, particularly smart subsidies for RWs 3-5 need more attention. The role of producer organisations could be sharper and their advocacy/empowerment role highlighted. There is a need to emphasise the critical role of social capital in enabling market access and increasing productivity. Land issues should be brought up sooner. Para 86 is weak. UN Human Development Report could give ideas. HIV/AIDS had not been mainstreamed in document, same for Gender. Sweden might be able to get help to genderise the document, otherwise Lynn Brown will add some appropriate illustrations. (Sweden)
Messages are mixed in this chapter: 79, 5 key considerations, only 4 are there. Para 86 contradicts. DFIDs wording of Production vs. Productivity. Para 79 mentions tech. driven, WB paper is more extreme. This chapter fades. Something about Page 30 tech. Chapter too long. How to bring back science and tech. back to the rural worlds? Credit for small farmers. Must include CGAP work. Access to markets – in a mess, pages 28-29, flip sections. Para 109, interesting. Intermezzo contradicts Para 84-85, quotes by Simon and Lipton. (IFAD)

Policy messages are not clear in para 77. 91 &92 says it looks good. Paragraphs conflict. Enhancing productivity. Para 88 & 89 and 126, suggest that solutions are just solutions. Subsidies issues need courage to put this to DAC. Conflicting with last chapter. Decision making from power, knowledge and info sharing. (IFAD).

The chapter doesn’t deal with how to improve from a tech. point of a view. In Para 77, strengthen rural world 1. We should focus on how to go up the RW ladder, not down. Producer organisations are a way out [IFAP will provide a few paras on this]. Decentralisation process also needs more emphasis. [Italy will contribute a few paras on this] Ag support policies of the OECD countries needs to be tackled [Spain will contribute a few paras on this]. HIV/AID could be elaborated and would fit better in section on R&V.

Sections on access to markets and access to existing technology should be strengthened. On the issue of subsidies the question is what part of the value chain do you subsidise? On financial services one should consider the full range of services. Producer organisations are important also for the certification and standardisation processes and for supermarket procurement. [UK – will send some info on this]

Intermezzo – in general okay, page 36 box 1.3 wrong number

Chair’s summary: There have been good suggestions for reorganisation of the chapter which we should take on board. The chapter needs a clearer framework seen through the Rural Worlds and rural livelihoods lens. The section on food producers needs to be strengthened, IFAP and Italy will work together to provide inputs on this. Productivity needs to be defined. The messages need to be clearer and more consistent. The introduction needs improvement as the three italicised paragraphs don’t do justice. We need a stronger statement on OECD country agricultural subsidies. The issues of environmental trade-offs and complementarities need highlighting, perhaps with a more positive spin – it is not all negative. HIV/Aids needs to be mainstreamed further – look at Sida’s document.

III. Specific comments on Chapter 3:

HIV/AIDS is not mentioned enough, given magnitude of impacts on rural households and institutions. Para 191 on major food crises doesn’t show the problem, Club du Sahel paper could provide more nuanced analysis on the risks here. (Food and Security in West Africa, July 2005) [Italy].

The chapter is too long and should be cut back. The starting point could be the table on risk and vulnerability. Moving to commercial farming contains risks for small producers. The issue of common property resources needs more attention and nuancing. The chapter should incorporate a para or two on climate change. [Sweden]

The chapter is too wordy and key messages are lost. We should stick to focus on agriculture when looking at R&V. Make distinction between people in a growth trajectory and those in
RW5. Issues of Niger, shocks and stresses reveal complexity of problem. There should be a
distinction between domestic and production risks. HIV points are well made. The chapter should
draw more on current publications such as World Resources Report and Clinton
Commission.[UK]

- The chapter is too long. Table 3.1, leaves superficial statements. 3rd column. Box 3.2, last para is
strange and may not be correct. Consistency - para 158 cuts into other chapters. [IFAD]

- Chair’s summary: The discussion needs to be sharper and chapter cut back. Climate change issue
is dealt with in more detail in other publications such as the Clinton Commission. We should
look at the treatment of HIV/AIDs and consider if and how it should be strengthened particularly
with regard to impacts at household and institutional level. Shocks reveal systemic weaknesses.
Common property, sustainability and commercial agriculture should be integrated here.

IV. Specific comments on Chapter 4:

- This chapter highlights risk and vulnerability, particularly in RWs 3-5, which emerges in the
absence of any hedging to deal with fragile nature of their livelihoods and results in increasing
interdependency between rural and urban settings.[Tim]

- The chapter is somewhat misleading – appears to encourage all to go into urban areas. People will
move out for good reasons but there can also be stress related exits from agriculture, sometimes
related to fragile land. How do you present this without being contradictory? Don’t try to
promote premature exits. Higher return/distress diversification from lower producers. We should
make a distinction between productive diversification within agriculture and what is a natural
economic transformation going out of agriculture. We also need to bring back some of land
issues, as these are not reflected well.[UK]

- The reference to PRS in the chapter is wrong. Land issues and access to resources should be
moved up. Investing in and strengthening capacities should be highlighted more. [Sweden]

- Compare para 228 & 223. The role of farm activities is missing. 2 track process - diversify within
rural sector and urban sector. Sounds critical. [Italy]

- The chapter is unrealistic and misleading. Encourages belief that all can easily move out of
agriculture. Diversification within farming system in chap 2. Agriculture is business small
compared to labour industry. Farm indirectly related to Agriculture. Page 54 & 55 para 215 &
221 reiterates. Lipton and Maxwell debate in the document (236) is out of place. [IFAD]

- Chapter 4 needs to make a strong connection with chapter 2 as market and productivity issues are
core to the messages related to diversification of the rural economy. Upstream and downstream
linkages should be looked at. The value of the chapter is to say this process is happening and how
do we best support that process and enable people to do best and make good choices rather than
constrain them artificially? Agriculture does not provide the only route out of rural areas. (ch 2)
Agriculture can still provide a productive route out of poverty. [Ireland]

- More should be said about employment creation, governance and institutions. The intermezzo
may be one place to do it. The Ethiopia example can be used to locate the land discussion but is
probably better placed earlier on in the document – to place greater emphasis on productivity.
Land consolidation policy, not sure if we can say so many concrete things but it is already on the
table in many countries – Klaus’ paper tried to say that so will take another look.
• PSD arguments have been faithfully integrated—there are obstacles to people doing something else—have to look at market mechanisms and see if they work.

V. Specific comments on chapter 5

• Get more quickly to key messages on new aid architecture. Policy implications of enhancing productivity, addressing R&V, diversifying out of agriculture. Sharpen the message, clarify audience—1) field—get a grasp of what is going on but then you also need to get to (2) capitals, very different audience—they are the ones we have to go through to get things onto the agenda. What makes aid managers interested in what we’re doing? What are the implementation challenges? What are the implications for how we work together? [Secretariat]

• Chap 5 is critical. Final section should be consistent with rest. 80% of concerns are addressed. Strengthening market opportunities. Guidelines on prioritisation. Para 265 & 266 undermine story about pro-poor growth that is told through-out paper. Don’t suggest that providing Agriculture safety nets are the way to go. These paras dilute impact. Social transfer. Sense of realism as to what can be achieved. Paras 262 & 261 implies that Asia is okay. Para 261, language change about matching Africa to Asia. There should be a strong recommendation to donors to put agriculture back on the agenda. [UK]

• What are we saying? New agenda is not just focusing on agricultural output, but relationship between the sector and a livelihoods perspective. Do we need section 1 at all? “Addressing multiple objectives” could go. Uncomfortable with paras 267 & 268 & 269 not clear. [Ireland/IFAD]

• Title is misleading, kind of like box 1.4 in chap 1. Doesn’t like “diversifying out of Agriculture” as subtitle for 3rd objective. Country driven approaches section important—have to go to country reality before you can address the global level, what are the processes for setting the agenda? Refer to the principles. Support for empowerment and accountability as guiding principles and the rest can flow from there. Guiding principles for engagement should be limited. Need to emphasise the importance of countries’ individuality. Para 264 need to rephrase multiple objectives. Para 332 [IFAD]

• Objectives need to be prioritised. Para 280 talks about removing subsidies, huge problem but hasn’t been mentioned before. This should either be mentioned before in greater length or not at all. Para 285 uncomfortable / inconsistent? 3 objectives = policies, institutions and investments, but section on R&V heading combined starting at para 191. [Italy]

• OECD/AGR has done some case studies, but difficult to draw conclusions. Advice against getting into international trade debates since the impacts on individual countries are all very different. AGRICULTURE welcomes para 332 1st bullet as they believe it’s true, it summarizes their new focus on work. [AGR]

• Empowerment and country led process should move up front. Short para stating commitment and then lay out principles, work through aid effectiveness etc. Get productivity message upfront, add sustainability to message. Add Market Opportunities in title. Productivity section needs more R&V intro section could be reduced. Diversification section needs to be clearer. Be careful about where one talks about agriculture and where economic diversification and premature exits are discussed. Issue of ODA important to put in chap 1, then not necessary to revisit in chap 5. careful about spending target. Country led vs. purpose of doc. Careful wording at beginning of chap 5.
• Figures need to be verified on the importance of agriculture in GDP. Sweden’s para 6 should be sharper. More about Agriculture and less about multiple objectives. Page 73, para 320. Para 262 recent work. Page 23, para 99 in particular from the overarching paper could be used here. Should add a para explaining the structure of chap/paper. One should also recognize the problem of low absorptive capacity when public institutions are very weak. The country context is an important starting point and policy responses are different according to each RW. [IFAD will provide text for PRS section of chap 5.] [IFAD]

• If subsidies decline the question is how each country should respond? And how do you put in place institutions and policies which will help countries respond to opportunities? Donors, at least World Bank, have been risk averse to investing in agriculture. There are risks, high costs and time factors that discourage country directors to engage in these projects. Include in the section of R&V something about on how to get donors like WB engaged. [Lynn]

• The document should explain why investments decreased in the past. How to make the messages (innovative and old) more attractive to senior policy makers? There is now more aid in the system and more growth? We have to show how we can make best use of these opportunities. Make the case and let policy makers make conclusions. [Secretariat]

• There should be a clearer relationship between lessons learned and basic principle /country perspective. The section on the Paris agenda could be shortened. Little use of MDGs. Should use more, fits well. Would like to see the UN Human Development Report included. PRS – undertake policy analysis and review at country level. Africa vs. others.[Sweden]

• There is a need to reduce and simplify like chap 1. 1st part- key principles. 2nd part - 3 objective, 3rd part -conclusions and next steps. [Italy]

• There are important challenges facing institutions and sometimes limited capacity in donor countries and developing countries to address these challenges. The “positioning” issue is missing in the dialogue. We have to make the case there are new opportunities and we have solutions to problems. We are losing sight of the importance of having two documents. The short document is essential to put forward the case for the potential of agriculture to reduce poverty. The longer document is the back-up. We can’t handle the wider debate on regional differences in chapter 5 but can refer to the fundamental differences in ch 2-4. [Ireland]

• We now need to know how the agenda can be operationalized. Focus on Africa as a whole. Short comings of PRSPs not much mention of Agriculture. Donors should be complementary and not competing. Strengthening national statistics unit to measure aid effectiveness. Cross-cutting issues: Gender issues are very important as well as environment and governance.
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