

IFAD's Engagement with the Private Sector in pro-poor agricultural value chain development

2nd Mekong Knowledge and Learning Fair Bangkok, 11 July 2019





Background and relevant corporate-level strategies and policies

Instruments for supporting pro-poor VC development

Corporate organizational aspects

Specific corporate initiatives

Results and moving forward



Background & corporate strategies & policies



Background: APR investment portfolio as of 31 March 2019



Background: IFAD investments by thematic area



Since 1977, IFAD has financed US\$18.5 billion in grants and low-interest loans to farm and non-farm projects which benefited 464 million people

IFAD currently is working on **212** projects in **96** countries globally

In APR, **59 projects** in **21 countries**, US\$2.5 billion outstanding, average project size US\$43 million as of March 2019

Background: APR trends in financing by sectors

Markets and Related Infrastructure Natural Resource Management **Rural Finance** Agricultural Production Community Driven Development Management/M&E SMEs Research, Extension and Training Livestock/Rangelands Policy and institutional support Human Development **Fisheries** Irrigation Other



Background: How IFAD is achieving its mandate



Corporate strategies and policies: relevance, vision, gaps

- Corporate strategic documents (IFAD Strategic Framework 2016-2025, IFAD 11 replenishment)
- (new!) Private-Sector Strategy and IFAD 2.0 Vision incl. Private Sector Window to crowd-in financing
- On **15 February 2019**, IFAD Governing Council approved an amendment of IFAD article of agreement to authorize direct funding to the private sector
- Corporate commitments (gender, nutrition, youth, climate change) incorporated into VC development

Current vision

- VCs are seen as <u>one</u> way to increase poor people's benefits from market participation
- Focus on people not only on commodities to minimise dichotomy VC/targeting
- Multiple entry points not only at primary production - & private sector partnerships
- Approach **tailored** to the specific context
- Win-win opportunities to cover corporate commitments

Challenges

- Sovereign lending for public-sector financing
- Diverse views on what is a VC approach
- Need to avoid elite capture in VCD
- IFAD11 emphasis on poorest and most vulnerable people may imply some further adjustments
- Trade-offs between corporate commitments
 and market potential

Instruments for supporting pro-poor VC development



IFAD investments in projects as instrument for supporting pro-poor VC development

Strengths

- Active **participation of the government** in the selection of VCs and the type of interventions
- Potential room to influence policies that can benefit pro-poor VC development
- Financial resources to cover soft investments
- Good set-up to develop PPPs
- Opportunities to leverage public sector capacities and investments (research centres, extension services, and public infrastructure
- Different inclusive VC business models:

- Formal or informal contractual arrangements (outgrower schemes, contract farming, informal supply schemes)

- **Cooperative-led model** of partnerships with the private sector

- joint ventures between private sector and SHs

Weaknesses

- The decision making process can be politically biased
- Limited **implementation capacity** and experience of the gov't in VC development
- Reluctance of governments to borrow money for TA
- Reluctance of governments to engage private sector with borrowed money
- **Sustainability** could be a challenge with government-owned initiatives
- Higher risk of suboptimal use of financial resources (inefficiencies are higher in government vs. private sector projects)
- Less innovation

Financial instruments for supporting pro-poor VC development

The past and the present

Missing financial instruments

- I. Direct lending mechanism for private sector
- II. Equity investment mechanism in private sector SME agribusinesses
- III. Co-financing facility
- IV. Blended finance facility

Consequences

- I. Limited or no financing (few grants only) to key private sector actors
- II. Limited financial resources per country (performance-based allocation system only)
- III. Higher interest rates and transaction costs for funds targeting private sector companies

IFAD has enhanced its business model and financial instruments

- I. Set-up of the YIELD Fund Uganda, Agri-Business Capital (ABC) Fund for equity and debt investments directly into private sector actors, incl. FOs and FSPs
- II. Changed IFAD articles of agreement to allow use of IFAD core resources for private sector funding; principles: relevance, additionality, development impact, risk/sustainability

Technical support for pro-poor VC development

The past and the present

What IFAD currently supports

- Increase in **productivity** & surplus **production**
- Improvements in quality & standards
- Technology adoption
- Aggregation & support to Farmers' Organizations
- Small-scale **infrastructure** (e.g. warehouses, storage facilities, rural roads, markets, etc.)
- Improved financial and non-financial services
- Other public goods e.g. **research, extension**

The gaps in technical support

- Limited ability to do **brokerage** and PPPs
- Limited ability to influence pro-poor market policies
- Limited ability to train other VC partners
- Limited stand-alone TA to support VC
 actors

IFAD – future for technical assistance and expertise

- I. Set-up of the ABC **Technical Assistance Facility** to provide direct support to ABC investees
- II. Establish a more general TA facility to support IFAD VC project stakeholders
- III. Digital Global Platform For Improved Access to Markets and Services

Corporate organizational aspects



Advisory role and thematic guidance

From centralized to decentralized regional operations

6 Lead/Senior Technical Specialists in HQ

- ✓ supporting whole project cycle (COSOP, design, supervision, implementation support, MTRs, etc.)
- ✓ generating knowledge products (toolkits, guidelines, lessons learned, thematic publications)
- ✓ developing IFAD strategies, VC financing mechanisms (4P), contribution to design new instruments
- designing and managing grants and partnerships
- ✓ collecting & analyzing database of VC projects
- 7 Lead/Senior Technical Specialists in Hubs (plus anchor at HQ)

Strengths

- Regional out reach covering all projects with VC in the region
- Knowledge-based on real regional and country experiences
- More team input, interaction and cross-learning in inter-disciplinary hub teams
- More frequent exposure

Weaknesses

- Never enough demand > supply
- Knowledge generation time squeezed by operational support and travel
- Limited global / corporate perspective

Adaptability during project implementation

The present

- Depends on project design and capacity of project implementing institution
- Multi-stakeholder platforms allow actors to interact and make decisions according to VC dynamics
- Direct supervision and implementation support mostly adequate
- Mid-term reviews are key to adjust project design
- Additional corporate commitments reduce flexibility

Possible improvements

- Make project designs more flexible e.g. choice of VCs based on rigor VC diagnostic
- Decentralized technical staff to spend more time on supervision/implementation support
- Build capacity and use **local knowledge** and centres of excellence in VCs
- Understand better the trade-offs between flexibility and corporate requirements
- Tracking of Business Plan indicators and private sector co-financing and leveraging
- Provide more evidence on link between VC development and poverty reduction
- Direct support enabling policy environment through national policy engagement

Knowledge tools



Specific corporate initiatives

MG



Corporate partnerships on VC Development

A few partnerships at corporate-level:

- UN VCD network (RBAs, ILO, ITC, UNIDO)
- MoUs with multinationals (e.g. Unilever, Mars)
- Through grants: IDS, SNV, TechnoServe, Oxfam
- At regional level, also through grants (Helvetas, Hivos)
- Ad-hoc learning events (WB, IFC, GIZ, BMZ, etc.)

Some results:

- Knowledge exchange and learning
- Joint research work and publications
- Piloting new approaches (e.g. brokering 4P, blended finance)



KM and SSTC on pro-poor VCD

The present

- Global Knowledge Management events on 4P in agricultural VCs together with technical partners (IDS-Sussex, SNV, NL)
- South-South and Triangular Cooperation events on
 - ✓ 4Ps organised jointly with Government of Sri Lanka and APR
 - ✓ environment and climate change in VCs in Pakistan
 - ✓ Mekong Knowledge and Learning Fairs

Gaps and possible improvements

Empirical evidence re impact of private-sector led agricultural VC approaches on smallholder producer inclusiveness, climate resilience and sustainability



Results and moving forward





Results – what has worked and where are the gaps?

Results

- VC development a major and relevant focus area for IFAD-supported projects
- No in-depth results or impact analysis done so far

What has worked?

- Approaches that are context specific
- VC diagnostics at design are helpful
- Flexible projects (e.g. choice of VCs)
- Strong PMUs & local service providers
- Involving private sector is key for sustainability
- Working with existing FOs
- Multi-stakeholder platforms good but room for greater effectiveness

Where are the gaps?

- Limited VC finance tools & instruments
- Innovative ICT for development
 applications in private sector VCs
- IFAD's influence on market policies, rules and regulations
- IFAD's capacity to gather and disseminate knowledge from project and private sector partnership M&Es
- Impact analysis and diagnostics

Thank you for your attention



Michael Hamp, Lead Regional Technical Specialist, Rural Finance, Markets and Enterprises, Asia and Pacific, IFAD