

Advisory services in agricultural policies of Benin, Burkina Faso, Guinea and Niger: summary and perspectives of producer organizations

Inter-réseaux, Fert, Afdi/Corade, October 2012

Work carried out with the financial support of AFD

On the occasion of an international conference on management advice for family farms (MAFF) in Francophone Africa (Bohicon, 13-15 November 2012), Inter-réseaux Développement rural, FERT and AFDI (in partnership with Corade) examined the vision of, and approaches towards, agricultural advisory services within the frameworks of national agricultural policies in four West African countries: Benin, Burkina Faso, Guinea and Niger.

Short studies were undertaken in these countries by Fert and Afdi/Corade leading to the drafting of four factsheets¹. Going beyond merely describing the policies and existing or planned mechanisms, these documents address the recurring question: **What is the role of agricultural producers and their organizations (POs) in these agricultural advisory policies?**

These factsheets do not aim to provide an exhaustive analysis but serve rather as guides to the reader, allowing him to match official documents to the perception of **some producer representatives**. They rely mainly on two types of sources:

- A documentary review of principal texts of agricultural policies in force in the four countries²
- Interviews with representatives of agricultural-producer organizations in these countries³

This summary is based on these analyses. We will, in particular, examine the following points:

- Broad changes in policies since independence (1960s)
- Current policies in force in the four countries (in 2012)
- Governance of agricultural advisory services in these policies
- Funding of agricultural advisory services in these policies
- Skills and methods favoured by these policies
- Agricultural advice coverage and targeting

¹ <http://www.inter-reseaux.org/groupe-de-travail/gt-conseil-agricole-et-rural-car/article/fiches-de-synthese-politiques-de> (in French).

² Documentary resources (in French) on policies for agricultural and rural advice in the four countries (Burkina Faso, Niger, Benin, Guinea) can be found on Inter-réseaux's website: <http://www.inter-reseaux.org/groupe-de-travail/gt-conseil-agricole-et-rural-car/article/ressources-documentaires-sur-les-7703>

³ Bénin: Lionel Guezodje, President of FUPRO; Burkina Faso: Marc Gansoré, Secretary General of FEPAB and Assistant Secretary of CPF; Guinea: Moussa Para Diallo, President of CNOP-G and FPF; Niger: use of RECA notes.

1. Evolution of agricultural advisory policies since independence: a similar pattern in the various countries

Considered in broad terms, agricultural advisory policies since independence in the four countries studied are remarkable in their similarities. A wider gaze at the whole of West and Central Africa confirms this finding⁴. Broadly speaking, we find the following sequence:

The 1960s: Under State supervision

Immediately after independence, the States involved themselves directly in the ‘management’ of farmers, especially those who had turned to cash crops (cotton, groundnuts, etc.). This form of advice was based on the transfer of standardized Western agricultural technology, a pyramidal extension system and a prescriptive control over sectors (supply of inputs, advice, marketing). This approach was strongly opposed because of its cost, its modes of governance and its results. During the same period, development projects became the vehicles of experimentation of alternative advisory systems (such as rural education).

The 1970s and -80s: ‘Training and Visit’

The prescriptive approach was gradually replaced in the 1980s by the ‘Training and Visit’ model promoted by the World Bank, which relied on the Ministries of Agriculture for applying it. This was a more participatory approach to providing agricultural advice. It involved more research, relied on village leaders, pilot farmers and guided tours. However, this approach was not unanimously welcomed: *“The ‘Training and Visit’ (T&V) approach, rigid and standardized, is ill-suited to small farmers and the highly diverse agro-economic contexts that characterize rural African populations. The T&V assigns the producer the role of receiver and intermediary (contact farmer) but it does not involve him in the construction of the ‘knowledge’ being transferred.”*⁵

The 1980s and -90s: Withdrawal of the State

In the late 1980s, countries in Africa undertook plans of structural adjustments. For budgetary reasons, these plans resulted in the slashing of State expenditures and reductions in numbers of State employees (including those involved in the agricultural advisory services). The administered economic sectors, in particular the agricultural sector, experienced serious disruptions. Withdrawing quickly from agricultural advisory activities, the State in some cases left this space to the private sector, NGOs or POs and in other cases to a literal void: a complete lack of agricultural advisory services. It is in this space that new approaches such as MAFF (Management Advice for Family Farms), seeking to go beyond the extension services for production techniques to provide more comprehensive advice by taking the farming system as a whole and its economic environment into account, were tried out in some West African countries.

The 2000s: Pluralism in agricultural advice

In the 2000s, States developed policies and strategies, at the national, sub-regional⁶ and international⁷ levels which were focused on agricultural growth and poverty alleviation. But their implementation remained problematic. In parallel, the agricultural advice landscape became increasingly marked by pluralism and fragmentation: a wide range of actors dispensing advice in very different ways, reaching varied areas or target populations. These actors included the private sector, projects, NGOs, POs involving themselves progressively in agricultural advisory activities, and even

⁴ See article *Grain de sel* (in French): <http://www.inter-reseaux.org/revue-grain-de-sel/41-42-l-agriculture-en-quete-de/article/50-ans-d-histoire-du-conseil>

⁵ *Grain de Sel* (in French), *ibid.*

⁶ Strategic framework for sustainable food security of CILSS; UEMOA Agricultural Policy; discussions initiated by CEDEAO on a common agricultural policy.

⁷ Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP); the agricultural component of NEPAD; African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services (AFAAS).

the State, trying to reconnect with producers directly. The main concerns related to the quality, consistency and fairness in the coverage of advisory services and systems.

2008: An ‘agricultural surge’

After the food crisis in 2008 and following the publication in the same year of the World Bank report entitled ‘World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development’⁸, a consensus built up on the importance of reinvesting in agriculture, a sector which all admitted had been left behind. This consensus was not without its ambiguities, most notably on the orientation of public and private investment as well as the relative emphasis to be accorded to smallholdings and to large farms. The fact is that this ‘agricultural surge’ seemed to coincide with a renewal of advisory policies across these four countries. These national policies were often derived from the direction provided at the African level by the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), which includes a pillar of research and advisory systems. Even in the context of an international crisis, this revitalization continues to struggle to be translated into concrete actions.

2. Current policies in the four countries (in 2012)

In recent years, we find that several West African countries have initiated a general reflection on agricultural advisory systems: agreeing that the status quo was not satisfactory, that the advice offered to farmers – both by the concerned ministries and non-State actors – needed to be assessed, and that there was a need for new and better coordinated orientations to be proposed. The choice of the four countries analyzed (Benin, Burkina Faso, Niger and Guinea) is justified by the presence of new and clearly identifiable dynamics.

Benin: the White Paper on Agricultural Advisory Services followed by the National Strategy for Implementation of Agricultural Advisory Services (SNCA) (2007/2008)

In 2004, the Government of Benin launched an in-depth reflection on agricultural advisory services, leading to the White Paper on Agricultural Advisory Services, a real change in the approach to support producers and a guide for all concerned actors. This White Paper was followed, in 2008, by the National Strategy for Implementation of Agricultural Advisory Services (SNCA in French). The SNCA established a more comprehensive agricultural advisory approach than before, one that is focused on the farm. Four types of advisory services were selected for the first phase: the specialized technical advice (broken down by activities), management advice for farms, advice for accessing markets, and advice for local organization and planning. For each type, the roles of every stakeholder were identified. Over the past two years, there has been a growing involvement of POs in this process, reflecting the dynamism of these organizations and the close collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MALP).

Burkina Faso: the National System for Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services (SNVACA) (2010)

After a few years of reflection based on a diagnosis of the previous advisory system, Burkina Faso adopted a National System for Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services (SNVACA in French) in 2010. This new mechanism is based on promising principles. It tries to rationalize the support provided to farmers, whether from private advisers or public ones. To avoid a dilution of initiatives, the almost total dependence on donors for advisory services and the lack of advice customized for different farmer categories, a common approach is proposed as well as a programme of continuing training of all types of advisers. This new approach does not break completely with the notion of extension but attempts to empower actors more and better take into account local knowledge

8

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTDEC/EXTRESEARCH/EXTWDRS/0,,contentMDK:23062293~pagePK:478093~piPK:477627~theSitePK:477624,00.html>

(particularly through the identification of contact farmers). However, the POs, especially those that promote MAFF, fear that their proposals have not been taken into account and describe vague implementation modalities that cast doubt on the State's real intentions (fiscalization, agribusinesses)⁹.

Niger: Mechanism for Support and Advice (DIAC) (2011) replaced by the '3N' initiative

In 2011, after several decades of prescriptive control over producers, Niger launched an integrated Mechanism for Support and Advice for rural development (DIAC in French) that is more in tune with producers (better consideration of their needs, involving them in project management) and is market-oriented. The POs were, however, not satisfied with this reform because it does not draw lessons from their experiences, which are not capitalized. They have no real say in project management and disagree with the proposed segmentation of advisory services on the basis of municipalities. Indeed, the mechanism proposes to offer, on the one hand, a public support and advice service to municipalities considered poor (150 municipalities) and, on the other, a specialized support and advice service (on payment basis) to sectors and profitable economic activities in 105 municipalities. The lack of funding and the emergence in parallel of the '3N' initiative (Nigeriens Nourishing Nigeriens) has prevented DIAC's implementation.

Guinea: absence of any specific advisory services strategy or mechanism

No specific advisory mechanism exists in Guinea but intentions take the form of the National Policy on Agricultural Development (PNDA in French, 2007–2015) and are included in the National Programme for Investments in Agriculture and Food Security (PNIASA in French, 2012–2016). The main areas they cover are: improving the quality of public agricultural advisory services (and the training of advisers), enhancing the role of POs in advisory services, a new division of roles between public and private advisory mechanisms, a reform of the training curricula for advisers (private and public), and the establishment of a sustainable financing mechanism for advisory systems. In addition, the National Agency for Rural Promotion and Agricultural Advisory Services (ANPROCA in French) was established in 2011 and accorded the status of independent administrative institution. Its main mission is to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate Guinean agricultural advisory policies and rural promotion policies. This agency includes four cells: training, agricultural advisory services, research and development, and support to farmer organizations.

This brief overview shows that reforms of the agricultural advisory services try to address some major problems recurring in each country:

- the dilution of initiatives and efforts between multiple actors uncoordinated with each other,
- inadequate and unpredictable funding of advisory services,
- the variable quality of advice provided to farmers, depending on the skills of advisers and advisory methods used, and
- finally, the inequality in access to advisory services for farmers.

⁹ <http://www.inter-reseaux.org/groupe-de-travail/gt-conseil-agricole-et-rural-car/article/ressources-documentaires-sur-les-7703> (in French)

3. Governance of agricultural advisory services in these mechanisms

By governance of agricultural advisory services, we refer to the modalities of how the planning, evaluation and coordination of advisory services are determined. It refers to the decision-making processes regarding the delivery of advice, especially the identification of requirements, selection of advisers, contractualization and monitoring of services.

Countries amenable to working in consultation with POs

On the whole, the official texts say that producers and their representatives (POs) should participate in taking decisions on the organization and orientation of advisory services. In reality, however, it seems that the quality of this consultation varies from country to country.

In Benin and Guinea, the ministries in charge of agriculture and the POs collaborate and progress together. Thus, in Benin, the POs were consulted during the diagnosis phase and the drafting of the White Paper and then of the SNCA. And during the implementation of the advisory services, some POs were placed at the heart of projects such as PADYP or PROCOTON¹⁰. But when the State recruits new advisers, it is to strengthen its own advisory structures, and not those of the POs.

In Guinea, the POs are recognized and supported by the State. Thus, State officials are seconded to producer organizations to strengthen their mechanisms. The Federation of Producers of Fouta Djallon currently has some ten officials from the Ministry of Agriculture in its team. In addition, POs were involved in the development of different aspects of agricultural development policy. Officers within the ministries demonstrate openness to dialogue: POs are listened to and their views taken into account. Nevertheless, reality shows that State presents tendencies of interference and prescriptiveness.

In Burkina Faso and Niger, collaboration between the State and the POs remains difficult. In both countries, the POs queried complained about being invited to consultation workshops at the very last minute, without enough time to prepare. The POs have not been sufficiently consulted during the diagnosis phases and argue that their ideas were not taken into account in the strategies adopted. Experience and know-how acquired by the POs is being underestimated. In Burkina Faso, SNVACA favours, above all, the structures of the Ministry of Agriculture.

There is also a question as to the resources allotted for the consultation. Indeed, in addition to the announcements, the consultation also has a cost, which does not seem to be sufficiently taken into account by the mechanisms involved. Finally, the POs point out that there already exist consultation frameworks in some of these countries which should be strengthened (Niger, Burkina Faso) before considering the creation of new ones.

Who should control agricultural advisory services?

The four countries express, via their declared policies, their desire to share control over advisory services with POs, either through joint agencies (relatively autonomous and collegial structures, representing both the State and non-State actors) as in Niger or Guinea, or through a scheme of progressive delegation by the State to the POs as in Benin and Burkina Faso. Recognizing the need to further adapt advisory services to producer needs, framers of official policy often emphasize that control should be demand-driven. Thus, DIAC in Niger lays strong emphasis on the expression of the demand and envisages a capacity building of POs to enable them to be able to express this demand. Contractualization of services by producers is also a watchword which recurs in all current policies. POs must express their needs, contract with service providers and monitor the quality of services. This emphasis on contractualization does lead to some questions: At what level should it take place? Who contracts with whom? Contract between advisory service providers and farmers and/or the

¹⁰ PADYP: Project to Support Farming Dynamics (AFD); PROCOTON: Programme for Capacity Building of Cotton Producers' Organizations (SNV)

POs? Contract between advisory service providers and organizations that are funding the advisory mechanism?

The control of advisory services also raises the issue of the accreditation of service providers and quality control of services. What types of service providers (NGOs, POs, individual service provider) should be authorized to provide management advice for family farms? Are specifications planned that a service provider will have to meet before being approved? Will service providers be monitored and by whom? These questions require answers in order to put a mechanism in place for the shared governance of agricultural advisory services at the national level.

Who should provide agricultural advice?

Current policies identify the State and the private sectors as the main advisory providers. Indeed, despite its announced withdrawal, the State continues to be seen as a provider¹¹ of agricultural advisory services. This role of the State leads the POs to ask: What specific role do the States assign to themselves? Aren't States seeking to 'return' to the agricultural sector by providing advice directly to farmers? At the same time, the private sector is clearly identified in policy documents as a way forward. However, the POs are rarely included in the definition of 'private sector' and express concern about advisory services being entirely entrusted to other non-State providers: advisers employed by them, service companies, companies connected upstream or downstream with certain sectors (suppliers of inputs, buyers, processors, etc.). And finally, the POs seem to be marginalized in the operational aspects: they are seen more as applicants, beneficiaries of advisory services and organizations to be consulted when designing the offer. In practice, however, some POs have already become providers of advisory services and would like to continue positioning themselves as such. In Guinea, the PNDA envisages the gradual delegation of responsibilities of providing agricultural and rural advice to POs in addition to involving them as interlocutors in the political and social dialogue on the rural sector. In Burkina Faso, the POs feel that an inherent competition exists with the private sector in offering advisory services.

As far as the governance of advisory systems is concerned, the issue has been correctly framed by the State: it is a matter of i) giving more weightage to the producers themselves in decisions relating to advisory services so that the advice is more suited to their needs and ii) streamlining the advisory services offered to farmers, which currently remain few in number and uncoordinated. The proposed solutions, however, do not satisfy the POs; they want to play a more important role and be part of the implementation of advisory systems in the same way as private service providers.

4. Funding of agricultural advice in these mechanisms

With the exception of certain sectors which are especially well-organized and supported by the States, agricultural advice in West Africa has until now been funded mainly by international aid, with States employing a number of field staff, often without adequate resources. Advisory systems suffer – as do other services destined for farmers – as a result of the inadequate and unpredictable funding allocated to them. New policies seek to overcome this situation, mainly through two principles: participation of producers in paying for advisory services and the centralization of funds (existing or to be recovered eventually from sectors) in special instruments with autonomous management: the 'development funds'.

Planned mechanisms and funding instruments: the development funds

In their policy documents, all the countries envisage the establishment of agricultural development funds financed jointly by the State, donors, sectors, and POs. In these four countries, the national agricultural development funds are wholly or partially devoted to agricultural advisory systems. Beyond just the centralization of national or international resources, these funds are also planned to

¹¹ The Beninese government recruited 850 advisers in 2007, mainly for supporting the cotton sector.

rely on parafiscal taxes¹² on certain sectors and duties on imported goods (Benin, Niger). Even though estimates of funding needs exist, the documents studied during this present work do not provide any clarity on the resources that will be made available by the States and their partners. In theory, producers or their organizations may apply to these funds for funding of services including advisory services. However, to date, no fund has been created, so the issue of funding advisory services remains still unresolved¹³.

Participation by beneficiaries in paying for advisory services

This general principle appears in all the documents studied. However, the modalities of this participation are not spelt out: What type of producers will have to bear these costs? Which agricultural products will be targeted in particular? Which organizations will have to contribute and on what basis? Will producers and their POs be able to afford co-financing? POs have varying positions on this principle. Some POs, particularly in Guinea, consider advisory services to be inherently public and therefore to be funded by public resources. Others, such as those in Benin, accept the idea of contributions by producer organizations (either via sectors or directly by the POs), but not by individuals.

5. Skills of agricultural advisers and methods promoted in these policies

The job of an agricultural adviser is not easy; it requires him to have many specialist skills. Rural development agents in the countries studied are insufficiently trained in these skills due to a lack of suitable training courses. Discussions are underway in each of these countries on adviser training strategies, including modules for initial training as well as for building up existing capacities. In the official documents, the issue of recognition, training and accreditation of human resources, in particular of those belonging to the private sector, seems to lack clarity. In Niger and Burkina Faso, in particular, no thought has been given to the status of private-sector advisers as opposed to that of government advisers.

These four countries clearly do not think the same way about agricultural advisory services. Agricultural adviser, interface-adviser, officer providing support and advice, extension worker, farmer extension worker: visions of all these human resources to mobilize and the methods to use vary from one country to another. These differences have a direct impact on the advisory approach and methods used in the implementation.

In Niger and Burkina Faso, the change in the vision of what advisory services should be or can be is not yet clearly discernible in the policy documents of their Ministries of Agriculture. Advisers are called 'extension or training agents' in Burkina Faso and 'officers providing support and advice' in Niger. In Burkina Faso, the documents mention farmer extension workers as advisory stand-ins in areas where State agents are absent, but are silent on their specific roles and possible remuneration. 'Extension' in the traditional sense of the term is still present in the policies of these two countries, even though they also emphasize the demand-driven approach. In Burkina Faso, the new system is expected to be based on several methods: participatory technology development (PTD), centres of experimentation and technological innovations (CETI), farmer field schools (FFS) and model-farm units, and management advice for the farm (MAF).

In contrast, in Benin and Guinea, a real change in approach is reflected in the policy documents. Field agents are called 'agricultural advisers' in these two countries. In Benin, the documents propose that there be a single point of contact for the farmer. This contact person is responsible for

¹² Parafiscal tax is tax levied for a specific purpose, i.e., a tax or a mandatory fee on a specific product or service by which a government raises money for a specific purpose (here the agricultural profession). The money raised is usually paid to a body other than the national tax authority (here the development funds). It is an exceptional tax in this regard.

¹³ In Burkina Faso, there is a lack of clarity on the functioning of these funds and how disbursements will take place. This is resulting in an ever increasing concern on the part of POs on the actual accessibility of these funds.

organizing the advice and summoning the expertise required (e.g., technicians) as and when required by the farmer. Having a generalist profile, with social science knowledge and a good understanding of management tools, he can be from the private or the public sector. The Beninese White Paper discusses different types of advisory services and one of them is clearly in tune with the fundamentals of the Management Advice for Family Farms (MAFF) defined in 2001 at Bohicon. This type of advisory service is defined as ‘a process of methodological support for farmers in taking and implementing decisions. It takes into account a farm’s overall situation and seeks, in consultation with the farmer, a path of improvement that often extends over several years.’ For Benin, extension is only one tool of agricultural advice.

The thinking on advisory methods in these countries is certainly linked to the quality of consultation with the POs on the topic. We note, for example, that the latter work closely with the Ministries of Agriculture in Benin and Guinea. In both countries, these ministries are kept well-informed of advisory experiments being conducted outside their ambit. In Burkina Faso and Niger, on the other hand, similar PO endeavours are poorly known and little valorised by the State.

6. Geographic coverage and targeting of farms by agricultural advisory services

What farmer categories do these four countries seek to reach through advisory services? This is a crucial question and it can serve as an indicator of policy orientations that are sometimes not clearly spelt out in the policy documents. In all policy documents, all farmers are envisaged to be provided advice, without any discrimination.

And yet, in Burkina Faso, the POs claim to have observed that, on the ground, the advice provided by the Ministry advisers is directed more towards agro-entrepreneurs and the best-equipped farmers. These Burkinabe POs also state that the objective of certain forms of advice is to make agriculture taxable: the State seeks to obtain farm data through the promotion of training in filling in statistical-data notebooks.

In Niger, the POs complain about the differentiation between the ‘rich’ municipalities (well-integrated into agricultural supply chains or with irrigation facilities) and ‘poor’ municipalities (underdeveloped). The State considers that the producers in municipalities which are part of supply chains and undertake profitable economic activities can enter into contracts directly with service providers and contribute financially to the service, while the producers from poor municipalities, forced into subsistence, deserve the benefit of State support. According to these POs, municipality-based targeting does not reflect farmer realities and State support should rather be based on criteria related to production systems.

Finally, the issue of geographical coverage and targeting of farms for receiving advisory services comes back again to the question of funding. Indeed, the unanimously agreed upon principle of participation by farmers in paying for advisory services, i.e., the principle of ‘payment-based’ advisory services, however legitimate it may be, results in the concentration of advisory services for solvent producers, which is a drastic political choice .

Conclusion: observations and questions

The West African countries are facing considerable challenges as far as agricultural advice is concerned. During the survey part of this study, an official of a Burkinabe PO summarized his perception thus: *‘At one time in my village, there were four State supervisors who supported and accompanied the farmers without any compensation. Today, there is only one (for 25,000 residents!) and one has to pay for his travel based on the distance he has to travel.’* What can we conclude at the end of this overview of agricultural advisory policies in force in four countries?

The debate on agricultural advice is not limited to the national level

Differing approaches can be perceived in the countries on advisory methods and their vision on the issue. In Benin and Guinea, negotiations between actors take place more easily than in the other two countries and the POs can build on this. In Burkina Faso and Niger, it is necessary to overcome the difficulties of holding a dialogue between actors. Exploring the roots of these difficulties could also throw some light on the topic. However, the debate is not limited to the national level. Indeed, the major phases in the history of agricultural advice are similar in all countries of West Africa: Is this a symptom of dependence of African policies on external ideas, those of the development partners? Or do the recent developments indicate an improvement in policies at the African level thanks to NEPAD and CAADP? In any event, this observation increases the relevance of a debate at a sub-regional (West African) level on agricultural advice and encourages the POs to engage in this type of consultation, in particular with ROPPA's support.

The POs must demonstrate their ability to provide suitable advice

According to the documents studied, the landscape of the existing advisory systems in West Africa is marked, on the one hand, by the emergence of private actors (even a partial privatization of advisory services) and, on the other, by the temptation the State feels to re-involve itself in the operational aspects. The policies envisage that the advisers of tomorrow will be mainly State agents or belong to private service providers. How can the POs position themselves with regards to these two categories of actors? We note in particular that States remain to be convinced of the POs' ability to themselves offer advisory services to producers.

Published policies and actual policies

These countries are currently going through a period of reform. Their strategy documents on agricultural advisory services have only recently been drafted and there is as yet only limited perspective on implementation. We wonder whether this period of reform can be used as a window of opportunity to advocate on these issues. Are we at time when decision makers are aware of the need to rethink agricultural advice? Is it not the moment for the POs and the actors involved in advisory services to step forward and be recognized?

But it is also important to remember that there is often a mismatch between what is declared in the strategy documents and the realities observed on the field. Are these policies on advisory services 'realistic'? Do they take into account the real capacities of the African States, knowing that the implementation of a policy requires effective and significant mobilization of human, material and financial resources? Finally, how are the POs preparing themselves to monitor the implementation of the policies?

A key issue: funding of advisory services

To conclude, we should note that, given that the future of agricultural advice revolves around the question of funding, the policies studied propose two specific paths to follow.

First, producers are explicitly asked to help fund agricultural advice. An argument in favour of this principle is that such participation can be a good indicator of producer participation in controlling advisory services. But will all producers be able to contribute towards the costs and to what extent? What contributions are envisaged from the POs?

The other path is based on a structural reform: all these countries are planning to set up development funds, instruments that can sustain and channel funding from various sources allocated to advisory services. Yet, as of date, no fund is in place and there is lack of clarity on budgetary data. Funding thus remains today the Achilles' heel of these policies.