



ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTION DE LA COOPERATION POUR LE DEVELOPPEMENT
DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE

Examen et Evaluation
Review & Evaluation

Institutional Approaches to Policy Coherence for Development OECD Policy Workshop

18-19 May 2004

Room Document 4:

KEY POLICY COHERENCE ISSUES IN AGRICULTURE AND MIGRATION

Contact: Sara Dahlsten
OECD, DCD/PEER
E-mail: Sara.Dahlsten@oecd.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| AGRICULTURE | 4 |
| I. Agriculture and the Millennium Development Goals | 4 |
| II. Links between OECD agricultural policies and developing countries | 5 |
| III. Differential Impacts..... | 6 |
| MIGRATION | 8 |
| I. Introduction..... | 8 |
| II. Selected issues | 9 |
| III. Impact of immigration on OECD countries | 12 |
| IV. Policy Recommendations | 12 |
| QUESTIONS FOR DAC PEER REVIEWS..... | 13 |

Boxes

| | |
|--|----|
| Box 1. Migration of the Highly Skilled: Extracts from Two Case Studies | 10 |
|--|----|

INTRODUCTION

It is increasingly recognised that successful poverty reduction requires mutually supportive policies across a wide range of economic and social issues. At the same time OECD members realise that their current government policies are sometimes incoherent with their development objectives. Calls to address these incoherencies are increasingly being made. In 2002, OECD ministers agreed to the *Action for a Shared Development Agenda*, which requested the OECD to “*enhance understanding of the development dimensions of member country policies and their impacts on developing countries*”. Most OECD members have also committed to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). MDG number eight, “Develop a Global Partnership for Development,” specifically sets out actions for industrialised countries. For example, it is stated that countries should strive to “*further develop an open trading and financial system that includes a commitment to good governance, development and poverty reduction – nationally and internationally; deal comprehensively with developing countries’ debt problems; and make available the benefits of new technologies to developing countries.*”

This paper deals with three key areas for policy coherence for development – Agriculture, Migration and Environment. Agriculture is an important sector for most developing countries in that it provides food, income to rural areas and in some cases export earnings. Currently, however, several OECD countries’ policies work against the sustainable development of agriculture in developing countries. In particular, tariffs and tariff escalation, domestic subsidies and limitation of access to related research harm developing countries. Migration has been important for OECD countries’ own development and is an integral part of the on-going globalisation. Recently, some areas of incoherencies in migration have received more attention; notably the limiting of access for refugees, policies to encourage immigration of the highly skilled from developing countries (which risk draining these countries of essential resources), and policies which make remittances become extremely costly.

The main purpose of the paper is to inform DAC Peer Reviews. The Peer Reviews deal more and more with issues related to policy coherence for development and for some years each review has contained a chapter dedicated to policy coherence. At the end of the paper there are specific questions for Peer Reviews. The findings of the paper might also be used in the context of the Mutual Reviews, initiated by the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD).

AGRICULTURE

I. Agriculture and the Millennium Development Goals

According to recent estimations around 75% of the world's poor live in rural areas and most are dependent on agriculture¹ and/or related activities in the rural economy. Agriculture can be important for developing countries in several ways; where food security is weak it can be a vital source of nutrition, it provides income for farmers and farm workers and thus revenues for rural areas, job opportunities in related areas such as processing and in some cases export revenue and thus foreign exchange for governments. Moreover, many developing countries have a comparative advantage in agriculture, because of low labour costs, natural endowments and in some cases advantage in the quality/price ratio. However, the benefits from agriculture for developing countries could be increased substantially if many OECD member countries reformed their agricultural policies. Currently, agriculture is the area on which OECD countries are creating most trade distortions, by subsidising production and exports and by imposing tariffs and non-tariff barriers on trade. It is, nevertheless, important to keep in mind that agricultural policy reform in OECD countries is only one ingredient in a necessary policy mix to facilitate growth, development and poverty reduction in developing countries; domestic policy reform in developing countries is arguably as important.

OECD countries, by making agricultural policy reforms, can contribute to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). In signing the Millennium Declaration in 2000, most OECD countries committed themselves, among other things, to opening up the trade system in favour of the poor, to deal comprehensively with developing countries' debt problems, and to provide more aid. These commitments are set out in "Develop a Global Partnership for Development", MDG number eight. In relation to **agriculture, trade and poverty**, that developed countries should strive towards "*further developing an open trading and financial system that includes a commitment to good governance, development and poverty reduction – nationally and internationally*". In their statement -Action for a Shared Development Agenda - OECD ministers confirmed their commitment to enhancing policy coherence for development. This section outlines some potential links between OECD member countries' policies on agriculture and their objectives for development assistance. It also highlights areas of actual policy incoherence, which differ according to region and commodity.

¹ Agriculture includes farming, herding, livestock production, and fishing/aquaculture. Cultivating and harvesting of food resources from waters and cultivating trees and shrubs and harvesting non-timber forest products are also included. It also concerns processors, (small-scale) traders, managers, extension specialists, researchers, policymakers, and others engaged in the food, feed and fibre system and its relationships with natural resources.

II. Links between OECD agricultural policies and developing countries

Subsidies

Many OECD countries provide substantial subsidies to farmers, for production and exports. These subsidies promote increased production, and distort markets. Especially different kinds of export subsidies lower world market prices, in some cases by 10% or more. For developing countries this means increased competition which can result in a lower market share in certain commodities, reduced income from agricultural exports and thus less incentive for investments and lower economic growth than would be the case without these subsidies. With the Uruguay Round Agreement on Agriculture 1986-94 the WTO started to address the problem. For the first time agricultural policies were subject to multilateral rules and agreements, in terms of three pillars: market access, export competition and domestic support. It later led to the currently on-going Doha round, which aims to liberalise agricultural trade in favour of developing countries. However, net food importing countries, including developing countries, may lose from a reduction of subsidies, in particular in the short term.

Trade barriers including tariffs

Tariffs on agricultural products are among the highest in the world in comparison with other sectors, averaging 60% across the OECD area and with most OECD countries having peak tariffs of at least 200% for certain commodities. For OECD countries, tariffs are a way to protect OECD production from competitive imports. However, this practice limits developing countries' access to OECD markets, which has negative repercussions both for developing countries' government revenues and rural economies. The issue concerns both current and potential agricultural production (according to comparative advantage) in developing countries. The last twenty years has also seen an increasing use of non-tariff measures. Non-trade barriers include environmental and social demands on products. While these may be justified, they can also be used as a hidden mean to reduce imports. Tariffs are often prompted by politically influential producer lobbying groups. In many OECD countries there is a manipulation of public opinion to defend certain sub-sectors that are not economically competitive or to defend a minority of larger farmers. Consumer groups in developed countries are increasingly getting involved in the debate and demand, for example, higher environmental standards, improved food safety and quality while at the same time demanding low prices. These demands can lead to both interventions and support that can further distort markets. In addition to agricultural support and non-tariff measures, the increasing use of regional and bilateral trade agreements constitutes another significant aspect of OECD policies that need to be examined further.

Food surpluses

It has been a practice of several OECD countries to transfer food surpluses to developing countries. Depending on the modalities, this can have positive and negative impacts on developing countries.

(i) *Food aid* can provide direct help to hungry people, enhance market availability of food by lowering prices during food scarcity, and improve the balance of payments for countries with foreign exchange constraints. Food aid could also be an additional ODA source, since exportable commodity surpluses are available, and the public has a willingness to provide food to feed the hungry. However, serious concerns have been expressed about the effectiveness of food aid as an input for sustainable development. Food for development is cumbersome and carries risks of creating distortions on recipient and regional markets, enhancing food aid dependence and changing local food habits. Development food aid is also more expensive than commercial food imports. Hence, providing funds to purchase food on commercial terms is more effective than food aid. At the Rome meeting on February 2003, Heads of multilateral and bilateral

development institutions recognised that these issues require urgent coordinated and sustained action to improve aid effectiveness.

(ii) Food surplus "*dumping*" on developing countries at lower price than the cost of production and distribution is a particularly damaging practice of OECD countries. This has dramatic effects on local food producers and sub-sectors that are no longer competitive on the domestic market, squeezing them out of certain types of production for local regional markets (see the examples of cotton, dairy and sugar below).

Research

OECD countries have come far in agricultural research and many new technologies are being used. Because of patents and other legislation or just lack of communication links, this research and advanced know-how is not being shared extensively with developing countries. One factor concerns the certification of local seed varieties by multinationals. Increased efforts are necessary to promote access of developing countries to such technological innovations, in particular where clear development benefits can be identified. However, one should keep in mind that much of the technology in OECD countries may not be suitable for agriculture in developing countries due to different climatic and environmental conditions and that it might be beneficial for developing countries first to exploit fully the existing/conventional agricultural technologies before moving to the next stage.

III. Differential Impacts

The effect of OECD countries' agricultural policies on poverty differs among regions, commodities and mode of production. Therefore there could be reasons for having different trade policies for different regions and commodities. Cotton, sugar, dairy and rice are four examples of commodities that are of vital interest to some developing countries but where OECD countries' agricultural policies create considerable distortions.²

Cotton

Agricultural subsidies in the US are the main cause of a significant drop in world cotton prices, which have fallen by half since the mid-1990s, with particularly devastating impacts on West and Central Africa, where more than 10 million farm households depend on cotton production. It is estimated that such subsidies have led to losses of more than \$300 million for the region as a whole. Costs of production in the US are three times those of Burkina Faso, yet the US has expanded production in the midst of a price slump. Total subsidies equal \$3.9 billion. Research estimates that removal of US subsidies would raise cotton prices by 26%. As with dairy and sugar payments in the EU discussed below, a large share of these subsidies goes to a small proportion of farmers and processors, with the ten largest cotton farmers in the US reaping three-quarters of all payments.

Dairy

The EU dairy policy currently costs 16 billion euros each year and representing 40% of the value of EU dairy production. The policy provides for a mix of price support, production quotas, import restrictions and export subsidies. Despite the imposition of quotas, production exceeds consumption, and the surplus must be disposed of in both domestic and foreign markets. The EU remains one of the largest exporters of milk and milk products globally, accounting for 40% of whole milk powder exports, a position which can only

² The text on cotton, dairy and sugar is drawn from an Oxfam report quoted in the Club Sahel report "Transformations in West African Agriculture and the Role of Family Farms" by Camilla Toulmin and Bara Guèye, June 2003. The information on Japan was collected during the DAC Peer Review of Japan 2003.

be maintained by continued subsidies. Export subsidies are used to enable dairy produce to be sold at prices well below cost, in many cases undercutting local producers. Thus, for example in Kenya, India and Jamaica, while development aid has been spent encouraging more effective local dairy production, export subsidies are destroying markets for local producers.

Sugar

The EU is one of the highest cost sugar producers in the world, yet is also the second largest exporter, due to the export subsidy system. Current world market sugar prices are low and unstable, given chronic over-supply. In 2000–01 the EU exported almost 7 million tons of sugar at prices far below the costs of production. Export refund systems and cross-subsidies allowed this sugar to be sold at prices far below production costs, depressing world market prices and pushing low cost developing country producers out of third markets. Taking Mozambique as an example, production costs are amongst the lowest in the world, and the sector provides incomes and employment to 23,000 people, with great additional potential if export markets could be further developed. A World Bank study estimates that EU subsidies have brought a fall of 17% in world market prices and made it impossible for Mozambique to compete in third markets. For example, in 2001, Europe exported 770,000 tons of sugar to Algeria and 150,000 tons to Nigeria – both natural markets for competitive producers like Mozambique. While the EU has a system of preferential access for African-Caribbean-Pacific (ACP) countries, this constitutes a small fraction (8%) of the EU consumer market and is counter-balanced by an equivalent volume of sugar re-exported with export refunds. The “Everything but Arms” (EBA) initiative is providing additional access to sugar-producing least developed countries, but this is being achieved by cutting back on other ACP countries, rather than by curbing domestic production within the EU.

Rice

In Japan, agricultural support is provided predominantly through price support that is underscored by supply control through restrictions on imports and the use of administratively determined prices. Rice is Japan’s principal agricultural product, accounting for approximately 35% of the value of all agricultural output. The rice sector remains the most protected agricultural sector through a combination of import controls, subsidies and price support, a PSE of 88% in 1999 compared with the OECD average of 44%. For that reason, the market price in Japan is five times the world market price. Besides having an impact on Japanese consumers, protective measures on rice also affects a number of Japan’s developing partners negatively. Among the five top rice exporters to Japan are Thailand, Vietnam and China. Other developing countries for which rice is an essential part of the economy and that export smaller amounts to Japan, but could potentially increase their export if the market were liberalized include Pakistan, India and Bangladesh.

MIGRATION

I. Introduction

International migration has been increasing steadily since the middle of the nineties, in spite of last years economic down-turns. In particular, there has been a boom in labour related migration to several OECD countries³. In general, however, most migration takes place between non-OECD countries. Another recent trend is the polarisation of the migrant population around very high and very low levels of education. The reason is that these groups can expect the highest rates of return from emigrating.

There are many views on migration. From a trade perspective, labour migration is mostly positive since it optimizes the benefits of comparative advantage. It also increases potential for knowledge transfers. From a political point of view it can create both increased tolerance for other cultures and more interdependence between countries, which reduces the risk for conflicts. On the other hand, it can also be a source of tension, notably in cases of significant illegal immigration. Some social costs frequently arise around problems of integration, especially when domestic unemployment rates are high.

Migration has been an important factor for the development of OECD countries. In particular, the ability to emigrate in difficult times e.g. the massive Irish migration to the US in the late 19th century has been important. Equally important, there has been a possibility to receive immigrants to fill labour shortages in key industries. With this in mind it would seem that migration could be of great importance for developing countries as well. However, migration policies in OECD countries are often not designed in a way that benefits developing countries. For this reason migration has surfaced as a fairly new focus area in the debate around policy coherence for development. A number of incoherencies between OECD countries' migration policies and their stated wish to reduce poverty have been identified. For instance, OECD countries' policies of promoting highly skilled labour immigration from developing countries sometimes risk draining these countries of essential skills. Remittances, which are of increasing importance for developing countries, are presently very costly. Immigration of less skilled labour and refugees are sometimes excessively discouraged.

OECD governments are giving more attention to these issues. For instance, in the WTO the movement of goods, capital and technology has been on the agenda for many years, but recently the movement of people, through the agreements on trade in services and through mode 4, are also being studied. Migration is also part of the Doha Development Agenda, which promotes both a facilitation of trade in services and the movement of people across national borders. Recently, a UN commission on International Migration was created with a mandate to explore the impacts on developing countries of current migration policies in OECD countries. This purpose of this section is to outline some potential links between OECD member countries' policies on migration and their objectives for development assistance. It also highlights areas of actual policy incoherence.

³ OECD *"Main Trends in International Migration"* 2004

II. Selected issues

Remittances and Investment

It is difficult to capture the magnitude of remittances. According to official data, total remittances went up by 38% in 1994-2000, rising from USD 74.6 billion to 103 billion. It is estimated that unofficial flows may add 50% or more to these figures. The biggest recipients of remittances in 2000 were India, Mexico and the Philippines⁴ and the top source countries were USA, Saudi Arabia and Switzerland.

Transfers from migrants to their countries of origins are currently greater than total international development assistance. The impact of remittances has been studied at household, community and national levels. Direct impact would primarily be on the household level, by improving the standard of living but, when amounts are significant, foreign exchange reserves and national balance of payments can be affected. In addition, remittances are sometimes intended for community and social purposes. Studies show that remittances are used mainly to buy consumer goods and that little is saved or invested on productive investments. There are some studies in East Asia that suggest some migrants are more likely to engage in productive investment, but the conditions and incentives require further study. Recipients can also become dependent on remittances as a source of income. A positive aspect is that remittances are often targeted on the poor as migrants who come from poorer families have a higher propensity to send money home than migrants from well-off families. Although the development impact of these remittances is not clear most development experts are convinced they have a positive effect. Generally transfers are carried out by commercial intermediaries, which has had the consequence that transaction costs are very high. Since remittances are often looked upon as a form of development assistance, OECD countries could strive to lower these costs and improve transparency through ameliorating the international financial infrastructure.

“Brain drain” or “brain gain”

Many OECD countries have a shortage of skilled labour in specific areas. It has become common for these countries to try to attract people who possess the relevant skills from developing countries. It is estimated that upwards of 1.5 million skilled professionals have left developing countries for Western Europe, the US, Japan and Australia. This phenomenon can have both positive and negative effects on the source country. In the neo-classical literature the rational choice of highly skilled emigrants to seek improved incomes abroad was thought to raise global welfare. Moreover, in some cases enrolment in education in the source country increases because of the increased possibilities of migrating and finding better paid work abroad; this enhances the human capital formation in the source country in the long term. Other advantages include remittances and prospects of a highly skilled return migration. Overseas scientists and scholars can also be a source of international prestige and an investment in the future (China’s strategy since the 1970s). When the migration is temporary it is more likely to generate benefits for the source country, since it allows for more substantial knowledge transfers. A concept has been created in this regard “Earn, learn and return” is becoming increasingly popular. Return migration can also help promote research and development related FDI (e.g. Israel, Chinese Taipei). Together, these positive aspects usually go by the name of “brain gain”.

However, in the current debate the focus is more on the negative effects of highly skilled migration, notably “brain drain”. The loss to the source country of skilled emigration is twofold: Lost education and social investments for sending countries, and the absence of their services to the nation. A permanent emigration of skilled labour can deplete the human capital stock. Emigration might deprive developing countries of their most important talent and radically alter household dynamics and parenting strategies. It

⁴ The figures are IMF data and exclude border workers in Europe.

may also leave leadership gaps in higher education and research training. Moreover, remittances from skilled migrants, students and scientists are usually lower compared to unskilled workers.

The impact, however, can be quite different between developing countries. For instance, India cannot absorb all the scientists and technicians they educate, whereas Ghana lost around 60% of the doctors trained in the early 1980s in spite of a dire need of medical staff. A popular theory in recent years is one of an optimal level of emigration, whereby enough people migrate to generate the positive effects of migration but not so many that the loss in human capital causes the economy to slow down.

International organisations such as the UN frequently also employ experts from developing countries. Individuals benefit from these practices but they can drain developing countries of skilled labour in key areas, such as health and technology. Quality-selective immigration policies, e.g. Canada, Australia and New Zealand also increase the incentives for high skilled migration. For instance, for nurses from the Philippines the difference between staying and migrating to an OECD country is significant, while the average salary for a nurse is USD 146 per month in the Philippines it is USD 2.500 in the US. The situation is different for the flow of professionals between developed countries. It is often temporary, creating a sort of brain circulation within the OECD countries rather than brain drain.

OECD countries often provide research scholarships to scholars from developing countries in their aid programmes to develop capacity. Again there are many positive aspects of this practice but when scholarships are taken up in the OECD country these researchers often do not return to their countries of origin and end up being a resource in the developed country. A survey of Ph.D. students showed that 79% of students from India and 88% from China who arrived in the US in 1990-91 were still there in 1995. The same figure for Japanese doctorate students was 15%.

Box 1. Migration of the Highly Skilled: Extracts from Two Case Studies

Philippines

The greatest export of workers is under temporary programmes to the Middle East, while permanent emigrants tend to go to North America. Four tenths of the permanent outflow is college educated and their numbers exceed the net change of skilled workers in the country. Highly skilled workers face high rates of unemployment and there is evidence that young college educated emigrants are selected from those with experience and high productivity. Domestic educational systems are responsive to global demand; witness a strong increase in graduates with IT degrees. Still, it is estimated that 30 to 50 per cent of information technology workers emigrate and 60% of physicians. Changes in the global economy may help address the brain drain: the IT sector has just started up in the Philippines, financial markets have been liberalised, regional cooperation has improved, and there is hope of reverse migration.

Bulgaria

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union over 200,000 Bulgarians left their country and the numbers today run at about 50,000 per year. Tenured academics were among the first to leave, followed by younger scientists with records of international publication. There are no data on the skills of emigrants, but surveys on intent to emigrate indicate that one third of college students want to leave. Despite recent inclusion in the Schengen agreements there has been no shift in the intent to emigrate, but most Bulgarians cannot afford to move. It appears that only about 20 per cent of the emigrants return. New initiatives promote short term employment abroad through bilateral agreements with some OECD countries. Skilled workers comprise some of these flows, for example, medical technicians are supplied to Libya.

Source : International Labour Office in Geneva 2002

Labour market in the source countries

One main argument in favour of emigration is that it could be beneficial to a labour rich developing country as it releases the pressure on the workforce, reduces unemployment and increases wages in the source country. However, there is not much support for the hypothesis that emigration influences employment and wage rates in developing countries (only in cases of mass migration e.g. in 1870-1913 when European wages caught up with those of Americas largely due to emigration). Another reason is that the coexistence of unemployment and high rates of migration has been a characteristic of many developing countries. Moreover, migrants do not generally belong to the unemployed in the source country. Nevertheless, there have been cases of labour shortage such as in the construction industry.

Limiting immigration

OECD countries limit immigration in many ways, by closing borders and imposing visa requirements. At the same time, there is a need of low skilled labour in most OECD countries and employers are interested in hiring people from other countries. The result is often illegal immigration from developing countries. Illegal immigrants are declined many rights, whereas rich migrants to poor countries are privileged. Movements of people and services are recognised in OECD countries as central in creating economic growth and such movements from developed to developing countries are usually free, and unrestricted.

Humanitarian admissions – burden sharing

All OECD countries take part in bearing the costs of humanitarian disasters and the responsibility of protecting and receiving those in need. However the burden is not equally shared among countries since humanitarian admissions vary greatly between countries. Humanitarian admissions are mostly positive for developing countries since they help the individuals concerned who then can also send remittances to those which are left behind. However, there are also cases where external communities fund conflicts in their home countries. Despite that risk OECD countries could consider increasing humanitarian admissions, for humanitarian reasons, and achieve a more equitable burden-sharing.

Immigration or outsourcing?

There is a strong link between migration of labour and the movement of capital and technology. As companies seek to lower costs of production they examine possibilities of moving to low cost countries. Therefore OECD countries are increasingly facing the choice between their companies moving abroad or allowing more immigrants into the country and thus enable the industry and in particular the service sector to lower their costs. At the same time the public and the media debate the concerns about immigration and job losses; and propose more restrictions.

Other barriers

Often migrants who come to OECD countries gain jobs that are below their level of education and experience. Not being able to speak the language and lacking knowledge of the local context are frequent constraints. Another reason is that educational certificates and diplomas from developing countries (and frequently also from other OECD countries) are sometimes not recognised in OECD countries. Migrants who want to exercise their profession are therefore occasionally forced to redo their education and examinations to get the locally recognised diplomas. The greatest impact of this is on the individuals concerned but it also reduces the amount of remittances that can be sent to developing countries.

III. Impact of immigration on OECD countries

Successful policy reform requires public support. Therefore it is important for OECD governments to design policies which are mutually reinforcing for themselves and developing countries. Immigration often elicits strong reactions in recipient countries, which are often emotional rather than based on actual facts. A common fallacy is to forget about the impact of immigration on the demand side of the economy. Studies that have been done show no conclusive evidence on there being a link between immigration and unemployment, wages and social welfare systems. Immigration can be beneficial for employers in some sectors as immigrants generally accept lower wages and below-optimum conditions of work more readily than the local population. This creates cheaper commodities for consumers and increased production, but could also create conditions that are not desirable for either migrants or host countries. Immigration can have an impact on demographics, by decreasing the average age of the recipient population and increasing fertility rates (because immigrants are generally younger). This impact could be positive in many OECD countries where the average population is getting older. An alternative to labour migration, which is has become more frequent in recent years, is the movement of jobs instead of people. The ICT revolution has permitted international employers to minimise costs by moving jobs such as back-office functions and services to developing countries.

IV. Policy Recommendations

A number of policy recommendations for OECD countries can be drawn from the preceding discussion. Notably, OECD governments could consider:

- ✓ Encouraging temporary and return labour migration, so that developing countries can benefit from transfers of knowledge
- ✓ Finding ways to lower transaction costs for remittances through improving the international financial structure.
- ✓ Encouraging the creation of maintenance of diaspora networks
- ✓ Introducing a strategy for not encouraging recruitment of the highly skilled from countries who have a shortage of human capital in that area
- ✓ Encouraging foreign students to become engaged in development projects
- ✓ Encouraging research in areas of concern to development countries – e.g. malaria
- ✓ Increasing the number of humanitarian admissions

QUESTIONS FOR DAC PEER REVIEWS

DAC Peer Reviews have been looking at policy coherence for development in some form since the beginning of the nineties and for a few years the reviews have contained a chapter dedicated to policy coherence. These chapters differ between reviews and are constructed mostly on an ad hoc basis. The general focus is on institutional aspects i.e. legal frameworks, institutional arrangements, organizational settings and capacities, political commitment, formal and informal processes within a national system (including governments, parliaments and interaction with civil society). To illustrate the problems, concrete examples of incoherencies are also used (e.g. tariffs, agricultural subsidies, untying of aid, arms trade, migration issues etc.). In view of the issues outlined in this briefing note DAC Peer Reviews could consider asking the following questions for individual Peer Reviews.

Agriculture:

1. To what extent do these incoherencies of agriculture policy and development policy **exist** in the reviewed country i.e. distorting subsidies, tariffs, non-tariff barriers, unnecessarily limited movement of knowledge, such as agricultural research, to developing countries?
2. What is done to increase **awareness** of the problems in the Ministry of Agriculture and the public?
3. To what extent does a **policy framework** indicate the government's political commitment to tackle specific incoherencies in agricultural policy?
4. Has there been any **analysis** of these incoherencies by the government or by research institutes?
5. What **institutional arrangements** bring together the Ministry of Agriculture with the agencies dealing with ODA to discuss these issues?
6. Provide an example where policy coherence has been systematically taken into account in **decision-making processes** within the government?

Migration:

7. To what extent do incoherencies of migration policy and development policy **exist** in the reviewed country i.e. brain drain, high costs of transferring remittances, limited possibilities of immigrating and explicit and implicit constraints for immigrants to exercise their professions?
8. What is done to increase **awareness** of the problems in the government and the public?
9. To what extent does a **policy framework** indicate the government's political commitment to tackle specific incoherencies in migration policy?
10. Has there been any **analysis** of these incoherencies by the government or by research institutes?
11. What **institutional arrangements** bring together the Ministry responsible for immigration with the agencies dealing with ODA in order to discuss these issues?
12. Provide an example where policy coherence has been systematically taken into account in **decision-making processes** within the government?