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Food Policy Research Schematic
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Key Feedback Linkages
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Building capacity to generate reliable data
Building capacity to generate relevant analysis
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STATA 11 - SAMPLE SESSION

Cross-Sectional Analysis
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Designing Policy Relevant Research and Data Processing and Analysis with STATA 11
1st Edition
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Building capacity for policy outreach

POLICY SYNTHESIS
FOOD SECURITY RESEARCH PROJECT – ZAMBIA
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Agricultural Consultative Forum, Lusaka, Zambia
No. 45 (Downloadable at: http://www.ag.gov.zm/archives/2/zambiafoodsec.htm ), July 2011

WHY ARE ZAMBIAN FARMERS NOT HARVESTING ALL THEIR MAIZE?

Arthur M. Shipekese and T.S. Jayne

Key Points

1. According to nationally representative Crop Forecast Survey data, over the past 10 years farmers have harvested between 55 and 90 percent of the area that they planted to maize.
2. In the 2009/10 and 2010/11 crop years, over 80 percent of the maize area planted by small- and medium-scale farmers was harvested, mainly due to favorable weather.
3. In 2010/11, the ratio of harvested to planted maize area was highest in Luapula, Northern and Eastern (all over 90%), and lowest in Western (56%) and Southern Province (70%).
4. The main reasons provided by Zambian farmers for not harvesting all their area planted to maize are: (i) wilting due to drought (50.6%); (ii) crop failure due to lack of fertilizer (25.6%); and (iii) floods, heavy rains, and water logging (12.2%).
5. More effective extension of moisture conserving and flood protecting agronomic practices to farmers may substantially promote maize production and yields in Zambia.

INTRODUCTION: The recent expansion of fertilizer subsidies, marketing board price supports, and favorable weather conditions in the 2009/10 and 2010/11 crop seasons have resulted in an impressive 65% rise in national maize production in Zambia compared to the first 8 years of the decade. Expansion in maize area planted and yield growth account for 72% of this growth. However, it is not well recognized that numerous reasons arise as to why this ratio may be less than 1 for a number of farmers. However, there is very little information on why this may be the case in Zambia and the extent to which it is possible to help farmers harvest more of what they plant.

OBJECTIVES: The objectives of this policy synthesis are (i) to examine trends over time in the extent to which Zambian farmers harvest all the maize they plant; (ii) to understand why this ratio is below 1; (iii) to identify factors that might help farmers harvest more of what they plant; and (iv) to develop an investment strategy to improve maize production and food security in Zambia.
Facilitating dialog among decision makers
Mali-Guinea border conference on livestock trade

• Partnership between Ag Chambers of Commerce and traders’ associations in Mali and Guinea
• Exchange of information between traders and officials from both sides of the border
• Discussion of problems and solutions/monitoring
• Results:
  - Opening of a new livestock market
  - 80-90% reduction in non-official charges
  - border conference model replicated by USAID for Senegal/Mali trade
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Mozambique Phase 1 (1992 – 97)

- Context: post civil war recovery and transition to market economy
- Project housed in Ministry of Agriculture
- Main clients USAID, donor and NGO community
- Primary focus establishment of market information system (SIMA)
- Applied research activities analyze emerging cereal markets and smallholder recovery
- In-service and MS training of project-employed local analysts

- Context: donors adopt SWAP to encourage government to take public sector leadership
- Project fully integrated into Min of Ag Economics Directorate
- Policy Analysis Unit established with locally recruited university graduates
- Strong demand from senior officials on wide range of policy issues
- National ag production survey improved and expanded to rural household income
- SIMA / PAU fully under national leadership
Mozambique Phase 3 (2005 – 2009)

• Context: stagnant agricultural productivity established as main constraint to rural income growth
• National request to establish a socio-economic studies unit (CESE) in the new agricultural research institute
• Tailored in-service and MS training of ag research system employees
• Ag research priority setting analysis, investment plan, adoption studies
• CESE under national leadership
Mozambique Phase 4 (2010 – present)

• Context: transition from SWAP to CAADP
• increased local and international analytical capacity (Re-SAKSS)
• Coordinated approach to facilitate CAADP preparations (e.g., ag public exp. review)
• Increased involvement of Mozambican university analysts
• Next step: university-led policy analysis unit to undertake research/in-service training
University-based policy analysis unit linkages
Cross-country and regional food policy research

Data → Analysis → Outreach → Public Private Sector → Action → Reduced Hunger and Poverty
Concluding Points

• Policymaker ownership matters enormously
  – trust (credible, transparent, responsive)
  – national leadership
• Frequent changes in local leadership require continuous dialog with decision makers
• MSU’s FS I-III Cooperative Agreements have been an effective tool for achieving:
  – ownership through collaborative design and implementation
  – continuity and innovation
Concluding Points

- Policy analysis has to be relevant and timely
  - Collaborative design of the policy research agenda
  - Frequent interaction on intermediate results
- Finding right balance between short-run advisory work and longer-term research agenda a challenge
- Avoiding poor decisions has a high payoff because difficult to change/reverse once made
Concluding Points

• Investment in data systems and human and organizational resources to manage them is foundational for analysis
• Providing adequate incentives for retention of qualified analysts is crucial for sustainability
• Upgrading national university and technical school capacity the next frontier
  – Food system modernization leading to rapid changes in private and public sector human capital needs
Thank You