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1. Challenges and issues

**Increasing data requirements and decreasing data availability**

1. Worldwide: need for evidence-based decision making on food security, agricultural growth and productivity, food security, poverty reduction and resilience, sustainable growth,

2. Africa: need for indicators to monitor progress in reducing extreme hunger and poverty, increasing government expenditures on agriculture, increasing productivity growth: MDG 1, *Maputo Declaration, Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP)*

3. Challenge: falling data quality/response & increased imputation to compute regional/international indicators
2. Data availability and quality in the region (2005-2011)

- FAO dispatches 7 annual questionnaires, collects Trade data through electronic trade data files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Pesticides</th>
<th>Machinery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Producer Prices</td>
<td>- Fertilizers</td>
<td>- Government Expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Response rates of 60% for Trade and 40% for Production
- About 1 country in 3 reports on Government Expenditure (35%) and Producers Prices (30%), less than 1 in 4 in other domains
- For all but pesticides, response rate less than half the average world
- No sub-region performs systematically better than the world average, Southern Africa outperforms in Government Expenditures; Northern Africa in production, producer prices, and land.
- Middle Africa has the lowest response rates in all domains, except fertilizers, which nevertheless is below 15%.
2. AFCAS vs World response rates by questionnaire, 2005-2011 average

![Bar chart showing response rates for different categories: Prod, Trad, PP, Land, Fert, Pest, Mach, GEA. The chart compares AFCAS and World responses with labels for each category indicating the percentage response rate.](chart_image)
2. Data availability and quality in the region (2005-2011)

Countries divided in 3 groups:

1. **FREQUENTLY REPORTING**: reported 5+ times (3+ for machinery, pesticides)
   - No country regularly responded to all FAO questionnaires in the period
   - Mauritius a regular respondent in 7 out of 8 periods (with the exception of pesticides in which no country is a regular respondent);
   - Egypt in 6 out of 8 (not in pesticides and machineries). **Morocco** and **Madagascar** responded 5 out of 8 periods.

2. **NEVER REPORTING**: never provided data to FAO.
   - **Djibouti** and **Libya**;

Situation/groups vary for each data domain.
3. IRREGULAR REPORTING: reported 1 to 4 times (1 or 2 for machinery, pesticides)

- All other AFCAS members irregularly report data, which makes it difficult for FAO to build consistent times series in each data domain.

- Largest challenges in this group faced by Comoros, Equatorial Guinea, and Liberia, who responded only once, for pesticides (2011), producer prices (2005), and government expenditures (2011).

• Irregular or incomplete reporting makes it difficult to build consistent time series for each data domain.

• Uses of data series increasing, to build System of Economic and Environmental Accounts for Agriculture, Economic Accounts for Agriculture, and Capital Stock

Production questionnaire workshops in Tunisia, Mali and Kenya in 2010
3. Patterns & trends in declining response/quality

1. Possible explanations, for discussion:
   • Increased burden: from FAO questionnaires (length, complexity, number, etc.); from all sources (regional/international organizations, NGOs, etc.)
   • Resource issues: budget/HR constraints at country level
   • Lack of country-level data: less than annual frequency, or no data collection, in some domains
   • Training needs, confidentiality issues, other?
3. Patterns & trends in declining response/quality

Possible solutions, for discussion:

- Establish single country-level focal point (Annex 2, paper)
- Adopt international classification systems at country-level in lieu of national classification systems
- Provide on-line/virtual training and workshops
- Develop alternative data reporting/collection means: on-line/internet, CountrySTAT, APIs
- Improve metadata reporting at country-level (classifications, content, format, frequency, coverage, etc)
- Establish regional data peer-review process
4. Recommendations for Discussion

**Short-Term:**
1. Country level: single up-to-date contact registry; improved metadata reporting, higher priority to questionnaire completion
2. FAO: strengthen statistical capacity via questionnaire workshops on rationale, measures, classifications, imputation method, other topics required
3. Both: address confidentiality through MoU’s on data provision and dissemination; establish AFCAS-FAO group to peer-review country data

**Medium to Long-Term:**
4. Country-level: adoption of international classification systems, development of platforms to support APIs, SDMX (statistical data and metadata exchange),
5. FAO: on-line/mobile data collection, APIs, CountrySTAT as Food Security hub
6. Both: formal mechanism of country consultation; Global Committee on Agricultural Statistics to: (a) better coordinate/standardize recommendations/activities from regional bodies; (b) provide global forum for countries to review/endorse methodological and other normative work
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