

ANNEX I: METHODOLOGY AND DATA NOTES

Methodology

The AGRI Index was designed to provide an objective and comprehensive basis for understanding and improving the regulatory environment for agribusinesses. Through the use of standardized indicators, the AGRI index captures the regulations and administrative procedures that occur throughout the lifecycle of an agribusiness. In order to measure this impact, the AGRI Index uses (1) indicators that capture the time, cost, and procedures for fulfilling regulatory requirements involved in operating an agribusiness, and (2) indicators on legal rights, which assess objective characteristics of a country's legal, regulatory, and administrative framework pertaining to agribusiness operations.

The AGRI scope and methodology were inspired by the World Bank's global *Doing Business* reports and were specifically adapted to the agricultural sector. Initial indicators were drawn from the core topics covered in USAID's Agribusiness Commercial Legal and Institutional Reform (AgCLIR) diagnostics.¹ Indicator development included extensive input from international agricultural and legal experts and feedback from hundreds of contributors during pilot testing in 2012.

Indicator Selection and Design Principles

In order to develop a standardized and replicable tool that can improve the business environment for agribusinesses, AGRI indicators were designed around the following six principles:

- 1) The logic of each indicator should be **simple** and the implications transparent to policymakers and other stakeholders.
- 2) Utilizing **discrete** and well-defined indicators is vital to enable policymakers to identify areas of concern.
- 3) Indicators that are **comparable** across countries highlight best practices and allow policymakers and development partners to track the impact of a reform over time. Additionally, pressure for reform is often generated by comparisons between neighboring countries.
- 4) Indicators must be highly **relevant**, focusing on regulatory issues that have the greatest effect on agribusinesses.
- 5) AGRI indicators are **actionable** and point to policy or administrative steps that can be completed in a short timeframe.
- 6) Finally, the indicator should be directly changed by policy reform, to measure **impact**.

Types of Indicators

Time and Motion: Captures the time, cost, and procedures for fulfilling regulatory requirements involved in operating an agribusiness.

Legal Framework: Assesses objective characteristics of a country's legal and regulatory framework.

¹ USAID's AgCLIR diagnostic assesses the root causes of systemic constraints to agribusiness operations using an analytical framework that focuses on the legal framework, implementing institutions, supporting institutions and social and market dynamics.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EAT | Enabling
Agricultural Trade

By focusing on concrete legal rights, regulatory barriers, and inefficiencies in implementation, AGRI indicators highlight variations across countries in the agribusiness enabling environment, pointing to areas of improvement for reform-minded policymakers.

Table 1: List of AGRI Topics and Indicators

| Topic | Indicator |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Trading Agricultural Goods | (1) Process to export a widely-traded agricultural commodity (2) Process to import hybrid seed (3) Index on phytosanitary system (4) Index on trade facilitation |
| Obtaining Seed | (1) Process to register a new staple grain seed variety (2) Process to obtain licenses and permits for a seed supplier |
| Obtaining Fertilizer | (1) Process to obtain licenses and permits for a fertilizer supplier (2) Index on legal framework for fertilizer industry |
| Accessing Rural Land | (1) Process to transfer rights to rural land (2) Index on access to property registration information (3) Index on legal rights to obtain, register, and utilize a long-term leasehold interest in land |
| Accessing Finance | (1) Index on types of agricultural collateral permitted by law (2) Index on access to and functioning of registries for movable collateral (3) Index on legal framework for warehouse receipts systems |
| Starting and Operating a Farm | (1) Process to register a mid-sized staple grain farm and obtain all necessary licenses and permits required for farm operations (2) Index on access to business registration information |
| Enabling Contract Farming | (1) Index on legal framework for contract farming (2) Index on grades and standards for agricultural goods (3) Index on alternative and expedited dispute resolution mechanisms |

Survey Design

The AGRI team constructed short written surveys of less than 10 pages for each AGRI topic based on consultation with a range of agricultural and legal experts. Survey questions were designed to inform government and development partner reform efforts by highlighting legal, regulatory, and institutional constraints faced by agribusinesses.

Surveys utilized standard cases that cover a range of agribusinesses along the value chain, including agro-input dealers, small- to medium-sized farms, and traders. The case studies specify characteristics about a hypothetical agribusiness, such as size, location, number of employees, and types of activities. **Standardized cases were imperative in order to obtain responses based on consistent assumptions that could be averaged across contributors and compared across countries.** For example, cases for the Trading Agricultural Goods topic were built around a “widely traded agricultural commodity” in each country rather than a pre-specified commodity for all countries in order to establish a classification that applies to each country, while being consistently comparable across countries. For a full list of case study information and sources for this information, see Annex 2.

Data Collection

A multi-step outreach process was repeated in each country (see Figure 1). The sampling method is similar to other index efforts, such as the World Bank’s *Doing Business* and *Women, Business, and the Law*, and is based on a frequently used methodology in the social sciences.² The approach combines data collection from written surveys with in-person interviews. A standard and non-random sample of potential contributors was identified, with a target of obtaining at a minimum three to five contributors per topic per country. Contributor selection emphasized (1) organizations that routinely advise agribusinesses on legal and regulatory issues and (2) individuals with direct experience of the time, cost, and procedures required for compliance by a specific type of agribusiness. As a result, a range of stakeholders were surveyed, including government officials, agribusinesses, associations, and professional service providers (lawyers, bankers, notaries). A broad range of contributors is necessary to reconcile differences between private and public sectors and the varying experiences of individuals who had actual experience with the indicator processes.

Contributors were initially identified remotely through desk research. This process included comprehensive searches for leading firms and experts, relevant news and academic literature, participants of recent agribusiness events and conferences, and networks of individuals encountered in previous work by the EAT project or Fintrac. At the same time, a local consultant or partner institution knowledgeable about policy and business networks was engaged in each country to assist in identifying and contacting contributors.

Surveys for each topic were distributed by email to contributors. Based on desk research and the local consultant’s network and contracts, each contributor was assigned a survey topic based on his or her area of expertise. Contributors with multiple areas of expertise were sent multiple surveys. The AGRI team followed up with contributors by email and phone to collect survey responses. In some situations where phone and email access was limited, local consultants conducted in-person meetings to introduce the AGRI Index and collect data. Once a contributor returned a survey, the AGRI team reviewed the information and followed up with clarifications, questions, and links to relevant laws and regulations for independent verification.

The AGRI team compiled an extensive database of contributors in each country. Between the AGRI team and local partners, roughly 300 experts were contacted in each AGRI country. Outreach efforts yielding 31 completed written questionnaires on average per country, an average response rate of 13

FIGURE 1: AGRI INDEX PROCESS



² See MN Marshall, “The Key Informant Technique” *Fam. Pract.* 13:92-97 (1996).

percent. Response rates ranged from as low as 3 percent in the Netherlands to as high as 22 percent in Nepal. As noted in the 2012 AGRI Pilot Report, initial expectations were for response rates of 33 percent. Lower response rates can be attributed to the inherent challenges of working in agriculture, including limited English language capacity, low formalization, lower use of professional service providers, and restricted email and internet usage, particularly outside the capital city. The very low response rate in the Netherlands was due to a high level of job specialization (making it difficult for one respondent to complete an entire survey) and timing of the survey, which coincided with Dutch summer holidays.

After data was collected from written surveys, the AGRI team conducted one-hour in-person interviews with an average of 40 experts per country during field visits to all ten countries. The team met with at least three to five contributors per topic in each country. The primary purpose of field visits was to clarify conflicting or missing survey data and to gather feedback from stakeholders on the ground.

In-country visits were a vital part of the data collection process by allowing the AGRI team to gain crucial contextual information on overarching issues in the sector, the rationale behind survey responses, and to vet data and regulations against actual implementation on the ground. In-person interviews were conducted with both contributors who had previously submitted a completed written questionnaire, as well as with experts and institutions that had not yet submitted a questionnaire, but were deemed to have particularly important expertise and/or were identified through personal referrals from other interviewees.

FIGURE 2: NUMBER OF SURVEYS COMPLETED

| | Written Surveys | Number of Interviewees | Backfilling Responses ³ | Total ⁴ |
|----------------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Bangladesh | 29 | 36 | 16 | 65 |
| Ghana | 30 | 36 | N/A | 69 |
| Kenya | 21 | 31 | 25 | 60 |
| Mali | 29 | 61 | N/A | 79 |
| Nepal | 16 | 33 | 33 | 42 |
| Netherlands | 47 | 44 | N/A | 81 |
| Senegal | 46 | 43 | N/A | 70 |
| Thailand | 49 | 38 | N/A | 79 |
| Uganda | 22 | 33 | 26 | 59 |
| Zambia | 17 | 41 | 26 | 59 |
| Average | 31 | 40 | 25 | 66 |

After each field visit, data for each AGRI topic was aggregated and sent back to key contributors to review and offer final comments. **This iterative process yielded consistent data that ultimately reflected the input of a diverse group of key contributors.**

Benchmarking

A primary focus of the AGRI Index is to measure key indicators in a set of countries deemed to have particularly dynamic agricultural sectors, against which other countries can compare the performance and the structure of their legal, regulatory and institutional systems. The Netherlands and Thailand were selected as benchmarks from a set of countries deemed to have particularly dynamic agricultural sectors. Thailand was chosen based on the competitiveness of its agricultural sector across a wide range

³ “Backfilling” refers to the collection of additional data points after the original assessment. See Backfilling section below.

⁴ The total number of contributors reflects the absolute number of individuals who participated. Some contributors participated in multiple ways (survey, interview, backfilling) but are only counted once.



of staple and high value agricultural goods, while still facing constraints unique to developing economies.⁵ The Netherlands was selected based on its superior reputation as an agricultural powerhouse with a sophisticated system of regulating the agricultural economy.⁶ The two countries provided the opportunity to assess the applicability of AGRI indicators in countries that are global leaders in agricultural production and exports while also providing valuable legal, regulatory, and institutional models for less developed economies. If the Netherlands and Thailand results on AGRI indicators were found to be superior, the two countries' scores could be used to establish benchmarks against which other countries could be measured.

AGRI indicators are meant to measure what matters. By design, the AGRI Index does not measure all aspects of the enabling environment for agribusiness (AgBEE). Instead, AGRI focuses on seven core topics, using a select group of quantifiable and actionable indicators. This subset of indicators should be understood as meaningful and relevant proxies for the AgBEE in a country and is not intended to be a catch-all index for agricultural development.

Definition of Indicators and Scoring Guidelines

Final data for each AGRI topic was scored according to guidelines developed by the AGRI team in order to maintain consistency across all countries. The AGRI team created scoring guidelines for each indicator to consistently classify responses. All scoring guidelines are provided in Annex 2.

Time and motion indicators

Scoring for time and motion indicators is straightforward. Standard definitions of “time,” “cost,” and “procedures” are included in each blank AGRI survey and are provided in the box below. Indicator results are achieved by summing up the total time, cost, and number of procedures required to complete a process such as transferring rural land, or exporting an agricultural product. When ranking countries, equal weight is given to each of the three components.

Legal rights indicators

Legal rights indicators contain Yes/No questions on the conduciveness of the legal, regulatory, and institutional framework as it relates to agribusiness operations. Most legal rights indicator questions are scored and averaged in a simple, straightforward manner, where a response of “Yes” is positive and “No” is negative. However, due to the structure of the survey questions, where this is not the case, scoring rules were developed.

Backfilling

Backfilling refers to the collection of additional data points after the original country assessment. A number of legal rights indicators were developed or substantially revised after the initial AGRI pilot assessments in Bangladesh, Kenya, Nepal, Uganda, and Zambia in 2012. As a result, the AGRI team followed up with previous contributors to collect data for brief Yes/No questionnaires to fill in missing information and ensure that the data set is as complete and comparable as possible. The number of contributors who participated in backfilling data collection efforts is listed in Figure 2 above.

⁵ Thailand is a major agricultural producer and exporter. In 2011, Thailand was the world's largest rice exporter (> 10 million MT), the second-largest rubber exporter, and 24th in the world in seed exports (third among Asian countries). Sources: FAOStat, International Seed Federation.

⁶ The Netherlands is the second-largest agricultural exporter in the world (by value), second only to the United States.



Uses, Limitations, and Inherent Tradeoffs

The AGRI Index final report details the multiple uses of AGRI results by a variety of key audiences including USAID, other donors, policymakers, academics, investors, and the general public. The Final Report discusses several fundamental tradeoffs and limitations to cross-country comparative indexes that should be taken into consideration by a reader of this report. These include the choice of indicators, the limited ability to measure informal operators in the agricultural economy, and the role that benchmarking can play as a precursor to deeper analysis and technical assistance.

It is important to also note the limitations of the AGRI methodology. Data for benchmark products like the AGRI Index are not derived from statistically significant samples of contributors from every country; to do so would be cost and time prohibitive. Additionally, indicators on the amount of time it takes to complete an administrative procedure involve a measure of judgment by contributors. To help address these limitations, a key informant approach was used to select contributors in each country who have substantial, concrete knowledge of the agricultural sector that is reflective of many actors in the sector. Responses were also cross-referenced against each other and against available research and legal texts to identify conflicting data. Extensive follow-up efforts were made to clarify and verify all data points. Other constraints common to similar index efforts include the potential for sampling bias towards more sophisticated and larger agribusinesses that have an Internet presence, as well as potential self-selection effects given the voluntary nature of responses. These considerations are mitigated to the greatest extent possible through intensive research and data collection efforts.

Revisions and Data Notes

A number of revisions and refinements were made to the AGRI indicators during the development and implementation of the AGRI Index pilot. Successive rounds of modifications were made to AGRI indicators between each round of country assessments.⁷ Key lessons learned in survey design are highlighted in the 2012 AGRI Index Pilot report and include:

- **Keep survey questionnaires short:** Surveys should be less than 10 pages. Lengthy and overly-complex surveys discourage contributors from participating in the study. This reduces the number of contributors and survey response rates without increasing the quality of data collected.
- **Structure survey questionnaires to match contributor expertise:** A key lesson learned in 2012 was the need to build surveys that reflect the types of expertise of practitioners and other experts, and to organize questions such that one contributor can answer an entire survey (as opposed to responding to select portions of multiple surveys). For example, questions regarding seed licenses, registration, and import were initially split among three different surveys, which was not conducive to gathering data from seed experts and was off-putting to contributors with limited time. Consolidating these three sections into a single survey resulted in higher response rates and more robust data.
- **Maintain the strict AGRI design principles when considering adding or deleting indicators:** Measuring what matters most entails keeping to a small and highly focused set of indicators. These data for these indicators are easier to collect and are more-easily understood

⁷ Multiple AGRI country assessments were undertaken concurrently. “Round 1” refers to pilot testing in Kenya, Uganda, and Zambia in April 2012. “Round 2” refers to pilot testing in Bangladesh and Nepal in August 2012. “Round 3” refers to country assessments in Ghana, Netherlands, and Thailand in August 2013. “Round 4” refers to country assessments in Mali and Senegal in March and April 2014.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EAT | Enabling
Agricultural Trade

by policymakers, making them more likely to spark reform than a broad laundry list of indicators.

- **Simplify survey questions when possible, and provide additional guidance when needed:** For example, Yes/No questions should not be multi-part questions. Complex questions should be split into two distinct questions so that contributors won't be confused as to whether the correct answer is Yes or No. In other cases, more prompts are necessary. For instance, questions on customs clearance procedures in the Trading Agricultural Goods survey were improved to break down the customs clearance process into each step.

The following table outlines significant revisions to AGRI indicators since 2012. (Revisions made between Round 1 and Round 2 pilot testing of the AGRI Index are detailed in the 2012 Pilot Report). There are three main types of revisions:

- **Survey format changes:** Significant changes to AGRI topics included the addition/removal of indicators, changes to indicator structure, and length/formatting of survey questionnaires. Most survey format changes were made during initial tool development in 2012, but were further refined during the more recent process.
- **Changes to case study assumptions:** Case study assumptions were refined to provide greater clarity and specificity for contributors. Case studies are only relevant to the time and motion indicators (which measure the time, cost, and procedures to complete an administrative process).
- **Addition or revision of survey questions:** In some cases, legal index indicators were improved by modifying the Yes/No questions that make up the index.
- **Removal of indicators:** The Obtaining Crop Protection Chemicals, Employing Agricultural Workers, and Complying with Taxes topics were discontinued after the 2012 pilot report. The decision to remove these indicators was made in part to focus more resources on the remaining AGRI topics. Additionally, the Obtaining Crop Protection Chemicals topic yielded similar results to the Obtaining Fertilizer topic, because in some countries agrochemicals and fertilizers are regulated under the same law and set of implementing institutions. The Employing Agricultural Workers was removed because the time and motion indicator measuring the process to obtain a work permit for a skilled expatriate was difficult to measure precisely – few instances of agribusinesses applying for work permits were identified, and each instance was different enough so as not to be easily averaged across contributors. Finally, the Complying with Taxes survey was discontinued because it was highly technical (17 pages long) and could only be filled out by a tax accountant, and few large accounting firms in AGRI pilot countries had agribusiness clients.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EAT | Enabling
Agricultural Trade

Revisions to AGRI Indicators

| Topic and Indicators | Revisions and Rationale |
|---|--|
| Starting and Operating a Farm | |
| Obtaining Licenses and Permits to Start a Farm (Time, Cost, Procedures) ⁸ | <p>Case study assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The farm in the case scenario was described as a Sole Proprietor (SP) in Round 1 and Round 2 surveys. This was changed to a Limited Liability Company (LLC) with a single owner in Rounds 3 and 4. This revision was made to better reflect the company form most-frequently observed among small and medium commercial farms in the first five AGRI assessment countries – namely, a single owner (or commonly, family farm) that had been incorporated as an LLC.⁹ It is important to note that business registration procedures differ by company form. Additionally, the LLC and SP company forms confer different rights and responsibilities on the entrepreneur. For instance, a LLC protects the owners’ assets in the case of bankruptcy. The farm size listed in the case scenario was 50 hectares (ha) in Round 1 and 2 countries. This assumption was revised to be the “weighted-median” farm size in Round 3 and 4 country assessments. The weighted-median farm size is the point at which half of all land in a country is on small farms and half is on large farms, and is a threshold used to distinguish smallholders from large farms; a particularly useful distinction for the AGRI Index’s target small/medium-sized commercial farm. Thus the size of the farm in the case study varies by country, from 5 hectares (ha) in Thailand to 35 ha in the Netherlands. http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/216698/err51_1_.pdf Beginning in Round 3, the number of farm employees in the case study was reduced from 1 manager, 10 full time employees, and 25 seasonal workers (during planting and harvesting seasons) to 1 manager, 5 full time employees, and 10 seasonal workers. The revision was meant to reflect the change in the case study farm size, which in all AGRI countries reduced the farm’s size from 50ha to 5-35ha depending on the median farm size in each country. The case study assumption for the farm’s annual revenue was changed in Round 3 from ‘650 times the gross domestic product (GDP) per capita’ to ‘US\$1,000 times farm size (# hectares)’ to better reflect actual farm turnover, which is typically a function of the size of the farm, types of crops produced, and level of mechanization. <p>1) For Round 4, a few modifications were made to the case study assumptions, (1) to note that the farm land has already been zoned for agriculture, and (2) to specify that no new building/construction is necessary at the time of purchase. These changes were made to focus survey responses on farm start-up procedures specifically related to business registration and operational licenses and permits related to farming activities.</p> |
| Access to Business Registration Information | <i>No changes</i> |
| Obtaining Seed | |
| Registering a Seed Variety (Time, Cost, Procedures) | <p>Survey format</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure of the Registering a Seed Variety indicator was revised from an |

⁸ There are two types of indicators: Time and motion indicators that measure the time, cost, and procedures to complete an administrative process; and “Indexes” that are comprised of Yes/No questions on the strength of the legal, regulatory, and institutional framework with regard to agribusiness operations.

⁹ Discussed in greater detail in the 2012 AGRI pilot report.



| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>open-ended response to a more-structured format. The questionnaire now displays each stage in the seed variety registration process (application; field testing; technical review; approval; gazettement) and the contributor provides information on the time, cost, and criteria associated with that step.¹⁰ Questions were added to collect data on the number of seasons of field testing and the types of tests required (DUS, VCU).</p> <p>Additions/revisions to survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several Yes/No questions were included in the Registering a Seed Variety indicator. These questions are intended to elicit information on seed variety registration but are not scored. A Yes/No question was added in Round 3: “Is the country party to a regional agreement with respect to common procedures for variety testing, registration, and/or release? If yes, is this agreement effectively implemented in practice?” |
| Obtaining Licenses and Permits for a Seed Supplier <i>(Time, Cost, Procedures)</i> | <i>No changes</i> |
| Obtaining Fertilizer | |
| Obtaining Licenses and Permits for a Fertilizer Supplier <i>(Time, Cost, Procedures)</i> | <p>Case study assumptions</p> <p>Beginning in Round 2, several case study assumptions were listed for the case scenario fertilizer supply business. The purpose of the assumptions is to improve the consistency of data collected by outlining key characteristics of the hypothetical business.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specifying the activities of the fertilizer firm to include import, wholesale distribution, and retail sales, and to exclude fertilizer manufacture, blending, and repackaging. Many countries lack domestic fertilizer production and blending processes and requirements related to these activities would be difficult to compare across countries. Setting the location of the business to the commercial capital. Specifying the ownership of the fertilizer supply businesses as a domestic, non-state-owned enterprise. |
| Registering a Proprietary New Fertilizer Product <i>(Time, Cost, Procedures)</i> | <p>Survey format changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This indicator was removed after Round 1 and Round 2 pilot testing. |
| Fertilizer Distribution Index | <p>Additions/revisions to survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A legal rights index was added to capture key elements of the legal framework for fertilizer, as well as on the implementation of regulatory controls related to fertilizer distribution. Several questions in the Fertilizer Distribution Index were revised for Round 4 to allow for greater specificity of responses. Data for this indicator was backfilled for Round 1 and Round 2 countries in January, 2014. |
| Accessing Rural Land | |
| Transferring Rural Land <i>(Time, Cost, Procedures)</i> | <p>Case study assumption revisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To match revisions to the Starting and Operating a Farm topic, in Round 3 several changes were made to the Transferring Rural Land case study: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ownership of the Seller and Buyer (both are firms) was changed from Sole Proprietorships to Limited Liability Companies. The size of the farm being transferred was changed from 50ha to the |

¹⁰ Previously, as in all other Time and Motion indicators, contributors filled out blank boxes on each procedure involved in the seed variety registration process.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EAT | Enabling
Agricultural Trade

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>“median” farm size in the country (as listed in the Starting and Operating a Farm survey).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The number of employees working on the farm being transferred was reduced from 1 manager, 10 full time employees, and 25 seasonal workers (during planting and harvesting seasons) to 1 manager, 5 full time employees, and 10 seasonal workers. • Specification was added that the Seller has owned the land for the past 10 years or has held a long-term lease that acts as the closest equivalent to ownership. This change was made to reflect the fact that private ownership of farm land is not possible in some countries, and instead farmers hold long term leases. |
| Access to Property Registration Information Index | <i>No changes</i> |
| Leasing Land Index | <p>Additions/revisions to survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Utilizing Customary Land Index indicator (developed in Round 2) was expanded and changed to “Leasing Rural Land” in recognition that not all countries have customary land. Several questions that were specific to customary land were removed, to make the Index more general to agribusinesses’ abilities to enter into a long-term lease for farmland. • Data for this indicator was backfilled for Round 1 and Round 2 countries in January 2014. |
| Accessing Finance | |
| Agricultural Collateral Index | <p>Additions/revisions to survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Round 3, the Agricultural Collateral Index was revised to capture whether financial institutions accept each type of agricultural asset as collateral in practice, as well as the type of charge (fixed, floating, etc.) used and if the security interest is publicly registered. |
| Movable Collateral Registry Index | <i>No changes.</i> This indicator was initially added in Round 2. Therefore, data for this indicator was backfilled in Round 1 countries in January 2014. |
| Warehouse Receipts System (WRS) Index | <i>No changes.</i> This indicator was initially added in Round 2. Therefore, data for this indicator was backfilled in Round 1 countries in January 2014. |
| Trading Agricultural Goods | |
| Exporting an Agricultural Commodity (Time, cost, and documents), and Importing Hybrid Seed (Time, cost, and documents) | <p>Survey format changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After the 2012 pilot report, the Trading Agricultural Goods survey was modified. Sections on inland transport and on port and terminal handling were removed from the <i>time and motion</i> indicators measuring the import and export of agricultural goods. These elements were found to be difficult to measure consistently across countries, since 4 of 10 AGRI countries are landlocked and can only access a seaport through a neighboring country. Given the large number of data points in the trade survey, these sections were removed for expediency to allow the AGRI team to focus on elements of the trade process that most-frequently constrain agribusinesses – namely, obtaining trade documents and clearing customs. As a result, the AGRI survey does not capture all elements of the trade process. Common inland transport issues include delays due to roadblocks, checkpoints, and container repositioning (on backhaul routes); high transportation costs and fuel prices; and limited competition in the truck transport sector. Frequent constraints at the port include congestion, delays, and infrequent carrier service to major overseas markets. <p>Case study assumption revisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case study changes to reflect most widely traded agricultural commodity • Beginning in Round 3, the case study trade route was changed in the import and |



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EAT | Enabling
Agricultural Trade

| | |
|--|---|
| | export case studies from maritime trade only (via the main sea port) to measuring the import/export process to trade with the country's major trading partner for the case study good along the most commonly used trade route (land or sea) via sea port or inland border post. |
| Phytosanitary Certificates for Export Index | <p>Additions/revisions to survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Round 3, the AGRI team added a seven question Phytosanitary Index to assess legal and operational elements of the system for obtaining a phytosanitary certificate for an export consignment of agricultural goods. Minor revisions were made to this indicator before Round 4. Data for this indicator were backfilled in Round 1 and Round 2 countries in January 2014. |
| Trade Facilitation Index | <p>Additions/revisions to survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Round 3, the AGRI team added a five-question Trade Facilitation Index to the Import indicator to gather data on use of general good trade facilitation practices, such as implementation of risk management and post-clearance audit systems. Minor revisions were made to this indicator before Round 4. Data for this indicator was backfilled in Round 1 and Round 2 countries in January 2014. |
| Enabling Contract Farming | |
| Process to resolve a claim of side-selling by farmer cooperative in an alternative forum (<i>Time, Cost, Procedures</i>) | <p>Survey Format</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This indicator was removed after Round 2, because the process was not comparable across countries. By measuring the process to resolve a claim in an alternative forum to civil court, the alternative forum utilized by the parties varies depending on the country in question. Village court proceedings in Bangladesh differ significantly from court-referred mediation in Nepal. |
| Contracts Index | <p>Additions/revisions to survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Round 3, the AGRI team added a contracts law index with seven questions on the use of standard contractual legal protections that are important prerequisites to the use of contracts in agriculture. Data for this indicator was backfilled in Round 1 and Round 2 countries in January 2014. |
| Grades and Standards Index | <p>Additions/revisions to survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Round 3, the AGRI team added an index on the existence and performance of grades and standards for key agricultural products. Substantial revision of the Grades and Standards Index occurred before Round 4 to focus on the appropriate role of government in supporting the process and ensuring that there are adequate laboratories and weights and measures rules to encourage the adoption and use of grades and standards. Data for this indicator were backfilled in Round 1 and Round 2 countries in January 2014. |
| Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Mechanisms Index | <p>Additions/revisions to survey questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ADR Index was initially added in Round 2. The Index underwent slight modifications between Round 2 and Round 3, allowing for the addition of two questions regarding (1) if ADR mechanisms apply standard contract law principles; and (2) if expedited mechanisms exist to resolve the dispute within the formal court system (i.e. small claims court, commercial court). No changes were made between Round 3 and Round 4. Data for this indicator was backfilled in Round 1 countries in January 2014. |