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## List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATC-P</td>
<td>Agri-Business for Trade Competitiveness Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARI</td>
<td>Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFRI</td>
<td>Bangladesh Fish Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPC</td>
<td>Business Promotion Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSSF</td>
<td>Bangladesh Shrimp &amp; Fisheries Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAE</td>
<td>Department of Agricultural Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoF</td>
<td>Department of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>University of Dhaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRS</td>
<td>Fertiliser Recommendation Software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>Good agricultural practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoB</td>
<td>Government of Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPM</td>
<td>Integrated Pest Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAN</td>
<td>Local agri-business network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4P</td>
<td>Making Markets Work for the Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoC</td>
<td>Ministry of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSD</td>
<td>Market Systems Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGAF</td>
<td>National Governance Assessment Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSS</td>
<td>One-Stop Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Perspective Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI</td>
<td>Public Private initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public-Private Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSP</td>
<td>Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD</td>
<td>Private Sector Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWBM</td>
<td>Public Water Body Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCC</td>
<td>Rajshahi City Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRDI</td>
<td>Soil Research and Development Institute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Katalyst or Agri-business for Trade Competitiveness Project (ATC-P) is a market development project in Bangladesh which aims to contribute to increase the income of poor men and women in rural areas. It applies the Making Markets Work for the Poor (M4P) or Market Systems Development (MSD) approach, which facilitates the private sector to develop business models for the benefit of the poor – as producers, consumers or workers. The project has gone through three phases of project implementation since 2002, and has a wealth of practical experiences and lessons on developing market systems for a range of agricultural as well as non-agricultural sectors in Bangladesh. It is currently in its final year of project implementation and through this paper intends to capture the learnings of its interventions in terms of engagement with public agencies.

Private sector development (PSD) has been on the agenda of the Bangladesh government for many years. As a result of past PSD initiatives, two specific changes are currently occurring: i) the Government of Bangladesh (GoB) is focusing increasingly on including private sector actors in the overall development efforts of the country and is inviting the private sector to contribute to a number of sectors, including infrastructural development, power generation, agricultural market, fisheries and livestock and even social protection. In effect, a real opportunity has been created for the private sector to participate in development efforts through public-private partnership; and ii) the need for collaboration has effectively opened up the policy space. Historically, policies in Bangladesh were usually developed within a closed domain strictly guarded by bureaucracy; however, in this changed scenario, private sector actors are getting an opportunity not only to influence policies through sharing their opinions but also are playing a pivotal role in introducing new policy initiatives through shaping the problem statement and policy agenda.

The role of public agencies – for example, government ministries, agencies and departments – in the development of the country is multi-faceted. Some agencies act as enablers of sustainable development by installing policies and regulations designed to create strategies for poverty reduction, while other agencies are well placed to provide services such as extension and information, inputs and access to finance, to the poor in the economy. Over the lifetime of the project, Katalyst has engaged with various public sector stakeholders at different levels depending on the need of the sector (particularly in cases where underlying issues can only be addressed by the public sector). This paper assesses eight such interventions in depth to determine the lessons – what worked and what did not – evident in the engagement process. Interviews with respective government officials of the partner agencies as well as current and ex-Katalyst staff were conducted. The authors of the paper then developed a detailed framework on engagement with public agencies based on the lessons learnt from Katalyst interventions. The framework provides step-by-step guidance for an MSD project to initiate, act, implement and monitor collaboration with public agencies.

Assessment of Katalyst interventions reconfirms the fact that market systems development is not only based on how the private sector functions but also on the role of the public sector, which means that working with the public sector to achieve sustainable change in the market systems is important. The practical tips this paper provides are expected to prove useful for MSD practitioners interacting and implementing interventions with public agencies.
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1. Introduction

1.1 About Katalyst

Agri-business for Trade Competitiveness Project (ATC-P), branded as Katalyst, is a market development project which aims to contribute to increasing the income of poor men and women in rural areas. It does this by facilitating changes in services, inputs and product markets (with a focus on the maize, vegetable and fisheries sectors, and ICT, media and agro-journalism cross-sectors), which in turn increases the competitiveness of farmers and small enterprises. Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the project together lasted from 2002-2013. The current phase, Phase 3, ran from March 2014 until the end of March 2017, with a year-long extension of project activities beginning on 1 April 2017, continuing to 31 March 2018. Katalyst is co-funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Department Of International Development of the UK government and the Danish International Development Agency (Danida). It is implemented by Swisscontact under the umbrella of the Ministry of Commerce, Government of Bangladesh.

Katalyst applies the Making Markets Work for the Poor (M4P) or Market Systems Development (MSD) approach, based on the premise that enhanced private and public sector business services coupled with an improved enabling environment leads to more competitive enterprises, sustainable economic growth and poverty reduction. It is important to note that, the MSD approach is also referred to as Inclusive Business (IB) approach by some development agencies. The project works indirectly, focusing on making sustainable changes to how the markets work. It partners with a wide range of private and public sector intermediaries who have long-term business interests and a mandate to work in a particular sector. In partnership with market players, Katalyst designs and implements interventions to address underlying market constraints which harness market incentives to reach out to a large number of beneficiaries. It follows a rigorous monitoring and impact assessment system, producing information which is used to feed into and improve the design of future interventions. In other words, key steps followed by Katalyst are sector selection, sector assessment, intervention design, intervention implementation (with private and public sector agencies), intervention monitoring, and the redesign and follow-up of interventions.

1.2 Objectives of this paper

Besides the private sector, public agencies are an important part of the market system and have a role to play in ensuring equitable economic growth which benefits the lower-income population. This paper captures Katalyst’s long experience of working with different public agencies in Bangladesh and highlights the lessons learnt in the process. It presents a framework along with a list of practical tips, which has been developed based on analysis of eight Katalyst interventions (case studies), covering the three project phases. Its objective is to guide other MSD projects in engagement with public agencies. The paper was commissioned by Katalyst in 2017 as part of its ‘capitalisation’ outcome.

1.3 Methodology

The paper has adopted an exploratory approach and makes an effort to understand the process through which Katalyst has interacted and worked with public sector actors. The methodology is therefore qualitative in nature, and in consideration of the fact that the paper covers Katalyst’s experiences over three phases, information has been collected from the project’s archives, and (largely) through interviewing ex-Katalyst staff, current senior Katalyst staff, and individuals from the project’s partner public agencies. The interviews were conducted using open-ended checklists designed to explore what worked and what did not in the collaboration process between Katalyst and the respective public agency. With support from the Katalyst team, the authors of this paper assessed 17 of Katalyst’s interventions and short-listed eight (see section 3.2), carrying out a deeper analysis of these to identify the lessons learnt and develop the MSD framework.
1.4 Contents

The paper is presented as follows:

**Chapter 1** provides an introduction of the project and the paper, its objectives and methodology.

**Chapter 2** elaborates the history of the GoB’s drive and initiatives to support the private sector in Bangladesh and provides a brief description of how the interaction between the public and private sectors has evolved over time.

**Chapter 3** explains Katalyst’s engagement with public agencies and presents details of the project’s eight selected interventions, referring to the interviews with the respective public agencies as well as project staff and the document review carried out by the authors of this paper.

**Chapter 4** presents a framework developed by the authors based on the assessed interventions of Katalyst and also provides tools and guidelines on key steps for engagement with public agencies. The framework targets MSD practitioners in order to guide them in their development of partnerships with public agencies.

**Chapter 5** provides concluding remarks to the paper with recommendations for the donor agencies, and public and private sectors, as to their role in developing market systems for sustainable changes.
2. Role of the private sector in the economic development of Bangladesh

As indicated above, the main objective of this paper is to understand and analyse the process through which Katalyst has interacted with the public sector and to develop a framework which similar MSD projects can use to engage with this sector in the given context of market systems development. However, to achieve this it is important to understand how the focus of the public sector vis-à-vis working with the private sector has evolved over time and how that has created not only the opportunity for the private sector to work with the public sector but also has allowed these different sectors (i.e. public, private and non-profit sector) to contribute to the overall economic development of the country.

Bangladesh started with a closed and protectionist economic strategy, and at independence in 1971 the public sector became the most dominant actor in the government’s plan for economic development. However, this focus on a centralised economy failed to achieve the desired goal, as economic growth stagnated. At the same time, as the government started to focus on private sector development and introduced various policy interventions to allow the private sector to participate effectively in the overall economic development activities of the country, the rate of economic growth started to accelerate. By the beginning of the 1990s, the GDP growth rate started to show improvement; the three-year average annual growth around 1990/91 was 4.77%, compared to a somewhat low GDP growth rate of less than 4% in the 1970s (Hossain, 2017; Khan, 2016). Growth performance has become even more impressive since 2005. As per the GoB’s estimate, the Bangladesh economy achieved an economic growth rate of over 6% from 2005-16 (GoB, 2016), while according to the Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS), in FY2015-16 the country managed to break through the 6% growth trap and attain GDP growth rate of 7.05% (GoB, 2016).

Other studies, however, indicate that Bangladesh’s impressive economic performance has become possible due to “…prudent macroeconomic management, greater openness and integration with the world economy, and deregulation and market orientation” and that these factors have created a favourable enabling government, meaning that the private sector can contribute to a stable, sustained, and broad-based economic growth (Khan, 2016; WB, 2008). In fact, investment by the private sector has played a critical role in building the productive capacity of the economy. For example, between 1980 and 2005, although public investment remained unchanged (at about 6.5% of GDP), private investment “…surged from a little over 10 percent to almost 18 percent of GDP” (WB, 2008). According to a recent GoB estimate, in FY2015-16 private investment was 21.78% of GDP, whereas public investment stood at 7.60% (GoB, 2016).

At the same time, it is important to note that the growth of the private sector has also created exceptional employment opportunities for different groups of people. In the case of manufacturing industries, whereas state-owned enterprises formed the major source of employment during the 1970s, according to a recent study, in this particular sector, “…domestically owned private sector accounts for 90 percent of workers and another 8 percent of them is in private enterprises owned by foreigners and jointly by foreigners and nationals. Only 2 percent of workers are employed in enterprises owned by the government or jointly by the government and private owners” (Khan, 2016).

The discussion so far indicates that Bangladesh’s impressive economic performance would not have been possible without the effective and efficient participation of the private sector. This raises a few important questions: why and how did the focus of the GoB with regards to working with the private sector evolve? To that end, what policy and planning interventions were proposed? How did these
interventions create an opportunity for the private sector to work in collaboration with the public sector? The following parts of this section attempt to answer these questions.

2.2 Evolution of privatisation policies in Bangladesh

The Government of Bangladesh’s focus on privatisation and private sector development has undergone significant changes over the years. At independence in 1971, the Awami League-led government adopted a nationalisation policy, as the industrial ownership vacuum created due to the flight of West Pakistani owners and managers essentially made nationalisation the only viable policy option. Consequently, within two years of independence, the GoB’s control over industrial assets jumped to 92%, compared to only 34% before independence (Humphrey, 1987; Uddin, 2005).

However, nationalisation as a policy proved not very beneficial for Bangladesh’s economy and after the overthrow of the first post-liberation government, the new government decided to shift course (Uddin, 2005; Hossain, 2017). Turning increasingly to market liberalisation and privatisation, it took the decision to dismantle the nationalised sector and in December 1975, a revised investment policy was adopted which focused on privatising the state enterprises. In 1982, the country took a big leap towards privatisation and adopted a New Industrial Policy. That policy was reformulated in 1986, which “…restricted the state’s scope for intervention, and public sector companies were put into a holding company as joint stock companies” (Uddin, 2005: 159).

Bangladesh’s journey towards privatisation and private sector development continued after its transition towards democracy in 1991. A revised Industrial Policy advocated strongly in favour of private sector development by promoting an ‘enabling environment’ which mentioned, “…liberalising foreign trade, relaxing exchange controls, and restructuring import tariffs” (Uddin, 2015). In 1993, the GoB established the Privatisation Board, reflecting the government’s commitment to a speedier and more independent privatisation process.

The discussion so far draws attention towards three issues. Firstly, there has been a clear shift in the policy priorities of successive governments, as the country slowly but steadily moved away from nationalisation towards privatisation. Secondly, it is important to note that despite Bangladesh’s two leading political parties (Bangladesh Nationalist Party and Bangladesh Awami League) being often at odds regarding policy priorities, both of them were equally committed to privatisation. Thirdly and most importantly, up to 2001, policies geared towards privatisation have mostly concentrated on developing an enabling policy environment but rarely highlighted the desirability of specific initiatives or strategies for private sector development. The following sections highlight how GoB priorities about private sector development evolved in the post-2000 era, especially since the introduction of its Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper in 20xx.

2.3 Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)

In 2003, the GoB developed the Interim PRSP (I-PRSP), in which it identified the private sector as the “main engine of economic growth”, even though the document failed to discuss the difficulties faced by the private sector in detail. The I-PRSP argued strongly in favour of the role played by the private sector, pointing out that “through improved governance and better coordination among the government, the private sector and the civil society, the major development impasses facing the country can be overcome”, while anticipating “a new mix of policy instruments striking a balance between private initiatives, public action, and community mobilisation”. Furthermore, the national policy document called for a partnership between the public and private sectors in priority areas including a sustainable agriculture growth-based approach which would place agriculture within the “wider rural development framework”. In line with the I-PRSP, the PRSP was developed in 2005; this emphasised the need for a long-term vision for private sector development (PSD). The PRSP devoted an entire chapter to PSD. 1

1 Chapter V of PRSP 2005 focused on the following issues:
- The need to provide appropriate financial incentives for more private sector investment was emphasised. It also suggested changes in trade policies and offered adequate measures to avoid bottlenecks to enable domestic producers to have level playing field with the importers.
- The PRSP, like the previous policy documents, also concentrated on creating an enabling environment for private sector development and advocated for improved business services and institutional capacity of the public sector organisations to support private sector. The document emphasised on addressing the concern related with information asymmetry.
- The document strongly recommended reforming the State-Owned Enterprises. Privatisation was expected to release resources from State-Owned Enterprises which at that time constituted about 20 percent of the lending of the total banking sector.
Although the PRSP reflected the GoB’s commitment to PSD, its focus was mainly on suggesting plans that would allow the private sector to flourish. It did not make any significant effort to identify areas where the private sector should play the key role in economic development, and how the public and private sectors can complement each other or work in partnership to obtain economic development.

2.4 Beyond PRSP: the beginning of public-private partnership (PPP)

National plans and policies adopted and implemented in the post-2009 era marked a significant change in Bangladesh’s legislative history. In addition to facilitating an enabling environment, these focused on identifying priority areas where private sector investment was necessary, it started to emphasise the development of a collaborative relationship between the public and private sectors. An example is that before coming to power, the current Awami League-led government designed a Vision 2021, based on which it developed a Perspective Plan (PP) for the period 2010-21. The document pointed out the following key issues related to PSD:

- The PP reiterated GoB’s commitment to developing an enabling environment for the private sector.
- It also identified key areas where the private sector can contribute to national development. These include transportation services, infrastructure building, social protection schemes, agricultural and rural development, power and telecommunication sectors.
- Most importantly, the perspective plan suggested, “the public and private sectors will collaborate effectively and efficiently through public private partnership (PPP) projects and other innovative models to deliver infrastructure, utility and other services in an environment-friendly manner”.

The policy focus of GoB in initiating and institutionalising PPP for promoting the country’s overall economic growth was not new – Bangladesh had been experimenting with PPP since the mid-1990s. Although initial experiments resulted in modest outcomes, since 2009 PPP had become a major policy priority of the government. In 2010, PPP policy was introduced which proposed “…a comprehensive range of reforms, including tax incentives for PPP projects, designed to develop a sustainable PPP program across multiple sectors. These reforms were reinforced by the strong demonstration of government commitment through the allocation of more than US$300 million for PPPs in the 2009/10 Budget to support the development, financing and funding of PPPs” (Uddin, 2015; Ahmed, 2016).

Bangladesh’s Sixth Five-Year Plan (FYP) (2011-2015) increased the importance of the issue of PPP, as it argued that if the country wanted to achieve the Vision 2021 goal of becoming a middle-income country by 2021, the GDP growth rate had to be raised to 8%, which would require a rise in its investment-to-GDP ratio from 24-25% to 35-40%. At the same time, the national planning document, while identifying the key barriers to economic growth, emphasised three issues: infrastructure constraints, an acute power shortage, and the inability of government to implement large infrastructure projects. The Sixth FYP pointed out that to reduce the investment deficit and to ensure massive investment so as to reduce infrastructural constraints, the participation of the private sector (which can be made possible through PPP) would be essential. Although the government had been successful in attracting private sector investment in the power, gas and telecom sectors, the planning document suggested that more investment was required in these areas and other sectors, including ports, roads, railway, water supply, waste management, tourism and e-service delivery.

Since then, the GoB has taken a number of initiatives to promote PPP, including enacting the PPP Act of 2015 and setting up a PPP office at the Prime Minister’s Office. As of 2016, 42 projects have been implemented under PPP, with a capital value of around USD13 billion. The country’s latest planning document, the Seventh FYP (2016-2020), acknowledged the significance of private sector development and PPP initiatives which argued that to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, further scaling up of public-private collaboration is necessary. In addition to the aforesaid areas (e.g. infrastructure, power generation), another significant aspect of the Seventh FYP was the identification of specific areas where private sector investment will be required. Of these, in the agriculture, fishery and livestock sectors, the planning document proposed the following activities:

- Given that the country is now focusing on transforming the semi-commercial agriculture sector into commercial agriculture, improved market and credit accessibility backed by appropriate policy support would be necessary,
which requires more private sector investment in this particular area. In effect, to facilitate the transition to commercial agriculture, small farmers need to be integrated in the markets to contribute effectively to the production of high value crops; for this, they would need better access to credit and other agricultural services – such as extension, information and local market infrastructures and services. This can be possible with more private sector engagement and investment in agriculture value chain development.

The planning document argues that if quality control can be ensured, food processing (e.g. canned fruit, fruit drinks, processing of vegetables/mushrooms and dried food production) can become major economic activities. To this end, the government needs to continue investing in manufacturing and infrastructure, while facilitating the participation of private sector in different aspects of these value chains. The document also emphasised the need to pursue a collaborative relationship between the public and private sectors in the area of technology development and its diffusion.

Further reference to the importance of private sector investment was made in areas of veterinary services/animal health, poultry and fisheries sector development, and feed/fodder management. Furthermore, with the introduction of the revised seed policy, it highlighted that effort should be taken to involve the private sector in the research and development of hybrid and high-yielding variety seeds.

2.5 Government of Bangladesh: synopsis of its PSD focus

The concluding remarks on the evolution of GoB policies for PSD, based on the above sections, are as follows:

At independence in 1971, Bangladesh started with a nationalised economy, gradually shifting over the years towards privatisation and PSD. Whereas in the initial years the emphasis was on the de-nationalisation and privatisation of state-owned enterprises, the country’s policymakers eventually shifted the focus towards developing an enabling environment designed to promote PSD through the introduction of new policies, rules, regulations and acts.

Although Bangladesh’s centralised bureaucratic machinery nevertheless promoted open market policies (albeit reluctantly), collaborative relationships and partnerships between public and private sectors did not materialize until at least the first decade of 2000. The Perspective Plan of 2012, and the Sixth and Seventh Five Year Plans, marked a significant change from this perspective, as these planning documents placed significant emphasis on the promotion of a joint collaboration between the public and private sector actors to promote economic growth. The focus of these plans and strong political commitment succeeded in breaking through bureaucratic barriers, and subsequent policy/legal measures have been introduced which allow these two different sectors to co-produce public goods in an effective and efficient manner.

As a result, two specific changes are currently being observed. Firstly, GoB is now focusing increasingly on including private sector actors in the overall development effort of the country and is inviting the private sector to contribute in a number of sectors, including infrastructural development, power generation, agricultural market, fisheries and livestock, and even social protection. In effect, a real opportunity has been created for the private sector to participate in the development efforts through public-private partnership. Secondly, the need for collaboration has effectively opened up the policy space. Historically, policies in Bangladesh were usually developed within a closed domain strictly guarded by bureaucracy; however, in this changed scenario private sector actors are getting an opportunity not only to influence policies through sharing their opinions but are also playing a pivotal role in introducing new policy initiatives through shaping the problem statement and policy agenda.
3. Katalyst’s Experience of Engagement with Public Agencies

3.1 Evolution of Katalyst’s engagement with public agencies: Phase 1 to Phase 3

The M4P approach emerged in the early 2000s, with Katalyst being one of the very few projects in the world to test the approach in the field at that time. Bangladesh’s policy evolution towards a more PSD-led enabling environment created the conditions necessary for a project like Katalyst to focus on agricultural sectors, using (primarily) a market development approach. The table below presents some key aspects of Katalyst’s phases. 2

Over the three project phases, with changes in priorities and implementation focus, Katalyst’s collaboration mechanism with both the private and the public sectors evolved. Partnerships were based on field analysis, pursued to bring about innovation and attain higher degrees of scale and sustainability. Engagement with government agencies occurred at two levels: i) with government agencies such as the Ministry of Commerce (MoC), Planning Commission and IMED for overall governance of the project, and ii) with other concerned agencies, such as the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock (MoFL), Business Promotion Council (BPC), for the implementation of interventions in the field. This paper largely focuses on the implementation-level engagement with public agencies. The following paragraphs highlight the evolution of Katalyst’s overall approach towards the public sector across the three phases.

In Katalyst Phase 1, interventions largely concentrated on collaboration with medium and larger private sector actors and thus had very limited interaction with public agencies. Policy advocacy was not much of a focus in this phase, while interventions (with private enterprises or associations) were implemented at the local level (mainly in the form of pilot interventions) in selected regions of the country. The project management team also maintained limited interaction with Katalyst’s mother ministry (the Ministry of Commerce, or MoC). The extent of this limited engagement with public agencies was later critiqued in project reviews. Members of the MoC also expressed discontent with the project’s strategies and results, stating that it felt left out of the design and implementation of the project.

Based on the above lessons learnt, Katalyst Phase 2 actively considered engaging with the public sector to address sector constraints. For example, the project initiated policy advocacy to strengthen guidelines for compost fertiliser licensing. It also implemented strategies to work with the Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE) to promote jute production and good post-harvest practices. These collaborations only evolved in sectors where there was an absence off a vourable private sector policies or a public service delivery model. At the project management level, more frequent interactions and efforts were made to engage with MoC and to involve it in strategy development.

The Project Preparatory Mandate (PPM) lasted for almost a year before the formal beginning of the third phase, due to a delay in obtaining approval for the new project phase. Katalyst was unable to implement interventions during this period and loosened its interactions with partners as a result, leading to a slackening off of engagement and networking with these agencies. However, engagement with other public agencies was strengthened further by involving the Ministry of Commerce – in particular the BPC – in the Phase 3 design process. The BPC was considered an integral part of the project’s strategy to harness export market opportunities of sectors such as vegetables and fisheries. Further engagement with other public agencies, such as Bangladesh Agriculture Research Institute (BARI) and DAE, was consciously planned under the capitalisation objective of Katalyst. This approach increased the sense of ownership of the

2 For further information, refer to http://katalyst.com.bd/background/.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Donors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Donors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for International Development (DFID)</td>
<td>Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)</td>
<td>Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA)</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Implementers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Implementers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swisscontact, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)</td>
<td>Swisscontact, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)</td>
<td>Swisscontact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Duration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Duration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHF 26 million</td>
<td>CHF 51 million</td>
<td>CHF 34.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Line ministry</strong></td>
<td><strong>Line ministry</strong></td>
<td><strong>Line ministry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Commerce</td>
<td>Ministry of Commerce</td>
<td>Ministry of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovating, testing and proving the methodology</td>
<td>Reaching greater scale in sectors</td>
<td>Consolidating and anchoring in the Bangladeshi context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation focus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Implementation focus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Implementation focus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developing markets for transacted and embedded public business development services (BDS) (2002)</td>
<td>• Market development approach</td>
<td>• Consolidation of portfolio, focus on agriculture sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Services, industrial and rural sectors (2003)</td>
<td>• Large scale and sustainable systemic change in targeted industrial and rural sectors</td>
<td>• Deepening and widening of pro-poor impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pro-poor market development (2004-05)</td>
<td>• MRM improves and proves impact</td>
<td>• Capitalising of knowledge and experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitoring and results measurement (MRM)</td>
<td>• Engaging public and private sector partners</td>
<td>• Influencing key stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engaging private sector partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>• MRM improves, proves, and influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 0.8 million micro, small and medium enterprises</td>
<td>• 2.37 million micro, small and medium enterprises</td>
<td>• 1.43 million micro, small and medium enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 200,000 jobs</td>
<td>• USD 295 million income</td>
<td>• USD 244 million income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• USD 140 million income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project felt by MoC, while at the same time gaining recognition of Katalyst’s work and results among Bangladesh’s various government agencies.

### 3.2 Katalyst’s interventions with public agencies

Depending on the situation of its sectors, Katalyst collaborated with the public sector in various ways, as follows:

1. supporting the public sector in ensuring an enabling environment for PSD
2. supporting public institutions to better deliver active support to PSD
3. working with state-owned entities to improve their efficiency and reduce distortion
4. working with the public sector to scale up systemic interventions

For a deeper understanding of Katalyst’s collaboration with public agencies, the authors of this paper selected eight out of 17 of the project’s relevant interventions. The intervention portfolio was selected based on discussions with Katalyst management team considering the spread over the phases, type of partners, role of the public agencies as policy-enablers or service providers, impact, and availability of information/institutional memory. The following sections presents these eight interventions with, in each case, particular views (mostly from the perspective of the partner public agency) on success and the impediments to collaboration.
As per Export Promotion Bureau of Bangladesh, the country has been exporting various agro products since 1982 onwards. Challenges exist however in terms of, among others, compliances, quality of product and identification of new markets. To boost export sectors, MoC has developed a special unit – the Business Promotion Council – with a mandate to enhance export readiness, export promotion and diversification through public-private partnerships. Principally dedicated to take care of supply side constraints. BPC’s objective is to promote competitiveness of the selected sectors in international markets by supporting the private sector in technology transfer, facilities and supply chain development, and by linking with export markets. It has sub-units targeting specific export sectors, including leather, agro-products, fisheries, light engineering, medicinal plant and herbal products, and ICT. In Phase 3, Katalyst started interaction with BPC and began collaboration to promote export readiness of the relevant sectors to enable them to become competitive on the international market. Engagement with BPC was strengthened further in Phase 3, and the renewed commitments by Katalyst and BPC gave mileage to the collaboration objectives. The primary objectives of the collaboration were: a) supporting BPC constituent member associations representing the fisheries and agro-products sectors to become export-ready by strengthening the supply chain; and b) capacity development of BPC to carry out sector-specific activities and in terms of implementing large-scale projects.

**Description (constraints of the sector, partner identification, collaboration details)**

The following activities were conducted in Phase 3 by BPC as part of cooperation with Katalyst:

- Value chain development for fish processing for domestic and international markets
- Facilitating industries to produce quality feed meal and fish oil by using offal
- Addressing Golda hatchery failure scenario
- Developing e-traceability system to ensure quality and standards for export
- Development of contract farming guidelines for vegetables for export
- Development of a five-year strategic plan (2017-21) for the BPC
- Development of an information portal and knowledge management system

**Sustainability/impact**

After successful implementation of a pilot intervention in vegetables, BPC is replicating the learnings in other associations export product associations, such as fish. BPC appears to have internalised the learning and is in the process of developing handbooks/guides for exporters to support them in procuring appropriate products for export. Katalyst currently supports BPC to develop...
a docudrama as a tool for dissemination among its members. With a successful pilot of exporting vegetables using the contract farming model (engaging 490 farmers), BPC was convinced of the initiative and was ready to drive/replicate the model further. However, bureaucratic issues and lack of cost-sharing attitudes of the private sector still pose a challenge for further enhancement of this sector.

Analysis of collaboration process (from the perspective of the public agency)

Benefits
After successful implementation of a pilot intervention in fish and vegetables, BPC is planning to replicate the learning in other export product associations. In collaboration with the Bangladesh Shrimp & Fisheries Foundation (BSFF), BPC has also initiated the e-traceability system to ensure quality and standards, traceable throughout the entire value chain. This system is now being replicated by other sectors. BPC has internalised the learning and is in the process of developing handbooks/guides for exporters to support them in procuring appropriate products for export. Katalyst has extended its facilitation to BSFF and the Bangladesh Fruits Vegetables & Allied Product Exporters Association (BFVAPEA) to address supply side constraints by developing contract farming guidelines, promotion of e-traceability system, development of a video documentary and docudrama, creating export readiness activities through participation at trade fair, and policy advocacy. With a successful pilot of exporting vegetables using the contract farming model (engaging 490 farmers), BPC was convinced of the benefits of the initiative and was ready to drive/replicate the model further. However, bureaucratic issues and lack of cost-sharing attitudes of private sector actors still poses a challenge to the further enhancement of this sector.

Areas of improvement
A key challenge faced by both parties of this collaboration related to the facilitation approach, which was not easily understood or accepted by government bodies. To a great extent, this delayed the ownership and implementation of the intervention. Furthermore, BPC felt that Katalyst should have been more flexible in the choice of the export products and selected them by relying on BPC’s experience in previous years. Instead, Katalyst had its own mandate and sector portfolio, and BPC felt that the selection of agriculture commodities was very much based on the project’s mandate rather than its own.
Katalyst research indicates that 90% of Bangladesh’s farmers watch television, of whom almost 55% watch agriculture-based television programmes, while print media continues to play a key role as advocate for the country’s small holder farmers. The implication is that the media industry can play a pivotal role in addressing the information gaps of small holder farmers, and raise with policymakers those agricultural issues of key concern to farmers. Despite the growth of various public and private media channels in Bangladesh, constraints such as poor levels of journalistic and editorial skills with which to address agricultural issues result in an inadequate supply of relevant information solutions to small-holder farmers, and limits advocacy of major agriculture issues concerning farmers.

Katalyst collaborated with the renowned state-owned academic institute, the University of Dhaka, to introduce an Agriculture Journalism course targeting undergraduate level students in the television and film studies department. The course was made compulsory for all undergraduate students, and in order to launch it, along with supporting reading material, University of Dhaka, with Katalyst’s guidance, undertook the following activities:

- held a round-table discussion with key stakeholders to identify the requirements and recommendations for development of the course curriculum
- arranged draft course outline development by an international consultant in collaboration with university faculties
- obtained feedback from key stakeholders regarding course outline
- facilitated course curriculum development by an international consultant in collaboration with university faculties
- facilitated guidebook development for teachers’ training and demonstration session
- arranged a knowledge-sharing visit of University of Dhaka to University of Los Banos, Philippines.
- organised promotional workshops to motivate students about the agriculture journalism course.

**CASE STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Name</th>
<th>Description (constraints of the sector, partner identification, collaboration details)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing agro-journalism as part of core course in University of Dhaka</td>
<td>Katalyst collaborated with the renowned state-owned academic institute, the University of Dhaka, to introduce an Agriculture Journalism course targeting undergraduate level students in the television and film studies department. The course was made compulsory for all undergraduate students, and in order to launch it, along with supporting reading material, University of Dhaka, with Katalyst’s guidance, undertook the following activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- held a round-table discussion with key stakeholders to identify the requirements and recommendations for development of the course curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- arranged draft course outline development by an international consultant in collaboration with university faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- obtained feedback from key stakeholders regarding course outline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- facilitated course curriculum development by an international consultant in collaboration with university faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- facilitated guidebook development for teachers’ training and demonstration session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- arranged a knowledge-sharing visit of University of Dhaka to University of Los Banos, Philippines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- organised promotional workshops to motivate students about the agriculture journalism course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Intervention Duration</th>
<th>Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2014-2017</td>
<td>University of Dhaka (DU)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sustainability/impact**

The course has already been approved as a core course for undergraduates and will remain so. The first batch of students taking the course is due to graduate in mid-2018. According to the Department Head, DU is the first university in Bangladesh (in fact, the first in South Asia) to offer an agro-journalism course. Other universities (including private ones) are considering using the DU curricula to start similar courses.

**Analysis of collaboration process (from the perspective of the public agency)**

**Benefits**

Media houses were demanding such a course but lacked capacity to develop and introduce it. Collaboration with Katalyst was immensely helpful in this regard. The exposure visit to Philippines was particularly eye-opening as it exposed the DU delegation to new ideas and possibilities in agro-journalism.

**Areas of improvement**

Katalyst hired experts from abroad to support the DU faculty in development of the course. Availability of an appropriate expert for the Bangladeshi context was difficult; as a result, DU (particularly the Department Head) had to engage a lot in development of the curriculum. Furthermore, inclusion of field-based modules in the curriculum would have increased the effectiveness of the course. This was discussed but not implemented, an issue which Katalyst should have focused on more. Another challenge mentioned was the insufficient capacity of Katalyst staff to deal with agencies such as DU, which at times delayed the work.
**Description (constraints of the sector, partner identification, collaboration details)**

In 2006, Katalyst developed a new model which sought to improve the effectiveness of the process which enabled the extension agencies to better coordinate their delivery of service to farmers. Key objectives of the interventions were:

- to increase outreach and coverage of farmers untouched by previous extension efforts, and
- to promote public-private partnerships for a better extension service

The model was created premised on the leveraging of local private sector incentives and skill sets in order to circumvent the known and binding constraints of public offices, namely, limited manpower and the high transaction costs associated with carrying out extension services. Katalyst approached existing groups of private retailers, traders and dealers to encourage them to build upon their networks with the farming community. The intervention model was based on creating linkages between local traders associations, the farming community and government extension officers in the form of “Public-Private Initiatives” or PPI. In 2010, the three central government agencies for agricultural, livestock and fisheries extension agreed to take a more hands-on role in overseeing the extension of the model and a task force was formed. Scaling up of the initiative of the model was done in 180 upazilas in 2014, during which a formal MoU was signed between Katalyst and DAE.

**Sustainability/impact**

Post-intervention assessment by Katalyst shows that the network is continuing in some locations, as it offers mutual benefits to the traders and the farmers. Although relevant officials of the central extension agencies’ planning wing were trained in project implementation of LAN using the PPI concept, scaling up of the PPI was challenging due to the frequent transfers of relevant, central, agency extension officials and lack of a policy regarding PPI implementation.

**Analysis of collaboration process (from the perspective of the public agency and Katalyst)**

**Benefits**

Through traders, the implementation of the model provided farmers with access to improved information, and extension officials with good access to more farmers. The intervention was innovative as it determined the core incentive of the traders to interact with farmers. The establishment of the model in the upazilas created examples of how the value chain actors (farmers, traders, extension officers) can work together and achieve a win-win solution.

The recruitment of field facilitators (with graduate degrees and five-years’ field experience) was particularly helpful in implementing the intervention
due to their prior NGO/private sector experience in the field.

**Areas of improvement**

An MoU or other forms of understanding with ministry-level on the issues is important. This would have expedited buy-in and implementation of the initiative on a large scale and embedded it in the government system.

Other collaboration learnings mentioned were:

- Frequent transfers of the officials at upazilla-level hampered the adoption of the model by the local office. Later, as officials found the initiative improved performance targets (of reaching farmers) and helped the network to receive support from officials.

- Better buy-in was evident from upazila-level training officials after they themselves received training—since they found the training in capacity development on PPI to be empowering.

- To support the initiative from the viewpoint of the agencies, forming a monitoring task force at ministry-level would be important as the agencies receive directives from ministries.

- Agencies are mainly dependent on individual personal experience at local, regional and national levels which is required by them to facilitate scale-up. The capacity to scale up the model requires different levels of skill and knowledge, only obtained through practical experience.
Sustainability/impact

With the policy amendment, hatcheries now have access to quality brood. The development of hatchery associations facilitated by Katalyst made possible the import of brood from Vietnam, Phillipines and Thailand. After the intervention was completed, large companies such as Meridian Group and Eon Group imported brood. Smaller hatcheries purchased the brood from the larger ones, eventually enabling production of quality fish in the market. These hatcheries also expanded the varieties of brood fish import. All these factors indicate the sustainability of this intervention.

Description (constraints of the sector, partner identification, collaboration details)

Broodstock in Bangladesh was imported over 15 years ago, and its quality has deteriorated over time as a result of inbreeding, absence of proper brood rearing methods and over-utilisation of the same broodstock. This led to low quality broodstock in the hatcheries, despite it originating from foreign species. At the same time, no new link between hatcheries and international brood sources was created, which was a big constraint in the market.

The main idea of this intervention was to create a linkage between hatcheries and international brood suppliers, enabling the former to source brood from the latter. The primary objective was twofold: to ensure the availability of higher quality fingerlings from imported brood, along with appropriate technical knowledge from international sources. However, the Fish Hatchery Act 2010 imposed restrictions on importing brood. Katalyst supported hatchery owners to present these constraints to DoF, facilitating discussions between hatchery owners and DoF. As a result of these discussions, DoF sanctioned the import of brood by hatchery associations in 2014. Katalyst later supported hatchery owners in linking up with Thailand, Phillipines and Vietnam to enable brood import.

In Phase 3, the following activities were carried out by hatchery owners and DoF, as part of cooperation with Katalyst:

- formation of regional Fish Hatchery Associations
- coordination with DoF to prepare a document checklist required for brood imports
- coordination among Regional Fish Hatchery Association, Bangladesh Fisheries Research Forum and DoF for approval in importing high-value species of fish
- engagement of international consultant to select international sources of quality brood, provide training to hatchery owners and facilitate brood import process
- visit to Vietnam for hatchery representatives
- formation of national hatchery association
- visit to Philippines for by hatchery representatives

Sustainability/impact

With the policy amendment, hatcheries now have access to quality brood. The development of hatchery associations facilitated by Katalyst made possible the import of brood from Vietnam, Phillipines and Thailand. After the intervention was completed, large companies such as Meridian Group and Eon Group imported brood. Smaller hatcheries purchased the brood from the larger ones, eventually enabling production of quality fish in the market. These hatcheries also expanded the varieties of brood fish import. All these factors indicate the sustainability of this intervention.
Analysis of collaboration process (from the perspective of Katalyst and the public agency)

Benefits
Import of quality brood fish was important for the sector and yielded high production of the species after 2014. Involving officials from DoF from the very beginning of the intervention was an important success factor of the intervention as the buy-in was from the government to improve the brood situation was possible. Good networks with senior DoF officials also expedited the success of this intervention.

Areas of improvement
According to the DoF official interviewed, donor projects are too prescriptive and need to understand the norms of public agencies, particularly in terms of providing incentives to government officers for field activities. Activities related to brood fish is very technical and sensitive, and Katalyst’s young staff were not always aware of technical details, which created certain communication gaps during the collaboration. Involvement of officials from the Bangladesh Fish Research Institute (BFRI) would have helped in implementing the intervention. Katalyst involved BFRI staff in later intervention activities, and they played a significant role in helping hatcheries continue to retain the quality of brood imported from abroad.

Description (constraints of the sector, partner identification, collaboration details)
Agriculture productivity in Bangladesh tends to be hampered by lack of farmer awareness of appropriate dosage of fertilisers and other agri-inputs. The Soil Research and Development Institute (SRDI) under the Ministry of Agriculture is mandated to research and analyse soil conditions throughout the country and determine the correct type and right dosage of fertiliser required to provide the soil with appropriate nutrients. The agency is equipped with the necessary laboratory infrastructure in Dhaka and selected locations of the country, and had already developed a Fertiliser Recommendation Handbook to enable government extension officers to provide farmers with advice on appropriate fertiliser dosage. In 2007/8, Katalyst initiated a pilot intervention in Jessore to train traders and retailers in using the handbook to make fertiliser recommendations to farmers. After a successful pilot, Katalyst planned to scale up the intervention in other parts of the country; however, this was found to require a more user-friendly mechanism of using the fertiliser recommendation handbook. The innovative idea of developing an ICT-based Fertiliser Recommendation Software (FRS) was conceived by Katalyst in partnership with SRDI. Katalyst supported SRDI in designing and hosting the FRS domain server, and the intervention tested and implemented dissemination mechanisms through DAE, and mobile phone operators such as Grameen Phone and Banglalink. The intervention undertook the following major activities:

- development of FRS
- facilitation of FRS data entries for 100 upzilas
- conducting of an FRS impact study
- web-hosting and domain registration for FRS (2009-13)
- promoting of FRS
- conducting feasibility study offering fertiliser recommendations through different ICT channels
Analysis of the collaboration process (from the perspective of the public agency)

Benefits
SRDI has expressed appreciation for the amount of time and financial support given by Katalyst for the development of FRS. Back in 2009, the idea of an ICT-based fertiliser recommendation process seemed far-fetched to many government agency experts; however, the perseverance of Katalyst and selected SRDI officials meant that the initiative took off and became a success. SRDI also received substantial recognition for FRS from stakeholders in the agriculture sector.

Areas of improvement
Despite the hard work, time and financial resources invested in developing and implementing the software, developing the solution took longer than anticipated. For example, the data entry process took substantial amount of time. As this is an innovative intervention, it is understandable that it needed extensive time involvement. However, to avoid such unforeseeable delays, interventions like this need to be carefully crafted from the beginning of the project design. An additional drawback was that, while promoting the tool in the field, extension officials expected an honorarium/remuneration from the project. As Katalyst follows M4P principles (which preclude this), was not possible. When working with public partners therefore, a market development project like Katalyst should be flexible regarding monetary aspects as per norms in such situations.

Sustainability/impact
Encouraged by the acknowledgment and wide scale recognition of the effectiveness of FRS, SRDI now firmly own FRS. The solution is continuing to be used by extension officers and private sector companies to make fertiliser recommendations to farmers. After the successful initiation of the software, SRDI further invested in the data automation process whereby laboratory analysis can now be directly transferred to the software, removing previous time-consuming paperwork and steps to the process. This initiative was funded by the Access to Information (A2I) project under the Prime Minister’s Office. Furthermore, SRDI has internalised the process of training DAE officials in FRS use as one of its mandates.
Eighty percent of the total fish production of the country is contributed by the inland fisheries sector, which includes baors, coastal aquaculture, river and estuaries, beels and haors, lakes, flood plains and ditches. However, a large number of genuine, poor fisherfolk are denied access to these publicly-owned (khas) waterbodies. Although the Public Water Body Management (PWBM) Policy 2005 in theory gave priority to poor fisherfolk in terms of leasing these publicly-owned waterbodies, the actual scenario was quite different. A fish- and fisherfolk-friendly waterbody management policy was therefore essential to enable the full growth potential of the fish sector and improve the lives of the workers in the fisheries sector. In 2008, Katalyst involved the private sector, conducting a pilot project in Faridpur district. Its successful completion ensured access of poor fisherfolk to public waterbodies which increased their income. Katalyst also approached the Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock (MoFL) to scale up the model of private sector management in other parts of the country, in response to which MoFL launched the pilot project in five other districts. In addition, Katalyst, in collaboration with DoF, prepared and submitted an amendment proposal for the waterbody management policy 2005 in order to make it more fish- and fisherfolk-friendly. The amendment was finalised by the Cabinet on 23 June 2009, with gazette publication on 6 July, 2009. Although the PWBM Policy 2009 was jointly developed by Katalyst and DoF, the recommendations made by Katalyst were key, particularly those aspects regarding the inclusion of poor fisherfolk in the leasing process. Key activities of this intervention included:

- formation of a multi-stakeholder platform where public and private sector-related organisations can participate
- facilitation of a common leasing process
- development of DoF capacity to promote leasing
- listing of waterbodies to enable them to be leased out

Since the recommended amendments were passed into law, the relevant authorities are bound to follow the process accordingly. However, Katalyst’s assessment is that implementation of the 2009 policy did not happen at the scale expected. The team had planned follow-up phases of the intervention, including the digitisation of all relevant waterbodies for listing under the leasing process. However, due to changes in Katalyst’s priorities in 2010, as well as DoF’s plan to have a separate project for digitisation, further follow-up was not done.

**Analysis of the collaboration process (from the perspective of Katalyst)**

**Benefits**

A key driver of the policy amendment was the political situation in 2009, when the caretaker government was in place and the political environment was conducive to policy change without pressures from the different parties. Another key driver of successful policy change was the working model/pilot in the field, along with the exposure visit of a government delegation to China organised by Katalyst. Together, these motivated GoB officials to appreciate the potential for pro-poor growth in the fisheries sector through this intervention.

**Areas of improvement:**

In retrospect, Katalyst’s assessment is that it should have collaborated closely with the Ministry of Land (MoL) instead of only the MoF. Relevant MoF government officers were not aware of the policy amendment, even six months after the change. Katalyst should have had further collaboration with DoF and MoL to follow through on policy implementation; this however it was not possible due to changes in Katalyst’s strategies and budget allocation. Although Katalyst recruited a lobbyist to support policy amendment, their earlier recruitment (that is, at the intervention design stage) may have ensured early recognition of the above issues.
In Phase 2, Katalyst initiated supporting several Bangladeshi private biopesticide companies and public research organisations (such as Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute, or BARI), in order to promote integrated pest management (IPM). In 2009, it conducted a study of IPM in Bangladesh to examine the technology, its applicability, growth potential and limitations. The study found that with certain crops, the cost of pesticide could be reduced by one-third using IPM methods. The study indicated that The Pesticide Rules 1985 had no provision for the commercial production and marketing of biochemical pesticides, and that this hindered overall growth of the industry. In February 2010, Katalyst organised a workshop, Prospects of IPM in Bangladesh to disseminate the findings of the study, and held discussions on developing the strategic direction of IPM while emphasising its benefits to farmers as an environment-friendly pest management technology. Based on recommendations developed from workshop discussions, in May 2010 the GoB Ministry of Agriculture amended The Pesticide Rules. The newly modified policy allowed the registration, commercial production and marketing of biochemical pesticides, including their distribution and use. The amendment opened up new horizons for companies to import, produce and promote these products in the market. In recent years, use of biochemical pesticides has gained popularity among farmers, and government agencies are keen to invest in developing these products further (also because Goal 3 of the Sustainable Development Goals mentions the awareness and promotion of bio-products in agriculture).

Katalyst carried out the following key activities under this intervention:

- conducted a study on the prospects of IPM in Bangladesh
- prepared and presented a policy recommendation paper to relevant government representatives

### Sustainability/impact

Due to the change in The Pesticides Rules, five renowned Bangladesh private companies have started to import and market around 23 IPM products in Bangladesh. The registration process used to take over a year to complete; now it takes around six to ten months. The presence of multiple providers makes the price of IPM products competitive and affordable for farmers. Government agencies (BARI and DAE) have in recent years allocated years allocated BDT 33 crore\(^3\) to conduct research, further develop the private sector, and promote awareness among farmers on IPM-related issues.

### Analysis of collaboration process (from the perspective of the public agency)

#### Benefits

Katalyst’s greatest contribution to the IPM sector was its support in creating awareness among various stakeholders of the use and benefits of IPM products. The workshop held in 2009, as well as field support to private sector companies such as Ispahani Agro Ltd, expedited the development of systems of IPM product registration and marketing across the country. Furthermore, a strong thrust by the Minister of Agriculture on IPM promotion ensured the coordination of other government agencies with each other and the policy’s implementation.

#### Areas of improvement

After the policy amendment, Katalyst initiated research to identify major pests and their available IPM solutions, and suggested crop-specific IPM solution packages. The report was meant to be a guideline for companies willing to venture into the biochemical pesticide business. However, the expert selected to conduct the research was insufficiently equipped with the appropriate information, resulting in the research outcomes being not useful for the sector. According to the government official interviewed, this research could have been a tremendous support for the sector.

---

\(3. \) This is equivalent to USD 39,34,140
**Intervention Name**

Developing a One-Stop Service (Computerisation of Business Licenses) at Rajshahi City Corporation (RCC)

**Phase** | **Duration** | **Partner**
---|---|---
1 | 2004-2006 | Rajshahi City Corporation (RCC)

**Description (constraints of the sector, partner identification, collaboration details)**

A Premises Licence is the legal entity for SMEs and a prerequisite for accessing additional services, such as a trade licence and access to finance. In Phase 1 of the project, assessments showed that the majority of the small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in Rajshahi were running businesses without a premises or other appropriate licence. Those without them were penalised by the mobile court, resulting in huge financial loss. Furthermore, these businesses lacked awareness of the processes involved in ensuring proper licences and there was no coordinated body to support them on this.

Katalyst then partnered with Rajshahi City Corporation (RCC) to establish a One-Stop Service (OSS) to provide SMEs services related to trade, premise and construction licences under one roof, using a computerised network. At the time in Bangladesh, this was a new concept of improving service delivery at the local government level. The establishment of RCC’s OSS aimed to reduce the time and paperwork needed to issue licences, thereby reducing the cost of doing business. At the same time, it would increase the transparency and revenue of RCC. The key activities of the intervention were:

- identifying the needs of SMEs on issues related to licensing
- engaging a software firm to support RCC in the automation of the licensing process
- organising seminars/symposiums for capacity development of RCC officials

**Sustainability/impact**

The RCC’s OSS still exists and now includes additional ICT-based services for, among others, tax returns, healthcare and road construction issues. Five officials are directly engaged by the unit, while different departments of the city corporation coordinate their activities with it. According to feedback from RCC’s Chief Engineer, the lessons learned by RCC’s OSS are being used by local municipalities to provide better services to businesses.

**Analysis of collaboration process (from the perspective of Katalyst and public agency)**

**Benefits**

Katalyst’s support made the computerisation of the OSS possible; this would have taken longer if the government had done it on its own. Local SMEs benefited from the digitised services and the transaction costs of obtaining the required legal licenses have been reduced.

**Areas of improvement**

The Rajshahi OSS was a pilot, replicated in Rangpur city corporation later in 2007/8. However, the scale-up strategy of setting up such units was not planned in detail due to shift in Katalyst’s sector portfolio and priorities. Further follow-up and a focused strategy to work with the central government on this issue would have resulted in the achievement of scale.
4.1 Governance principles – what are they and why are they needed?

Up to this point, the paper has presented the evolving role of the GoB in terms of engaging with the private sector and explored the experiences of Katalyst in engaging with government agencies. However, it is important to note that engaging with the public sector in market systems development needs to be done within a broad ‘governance’ or ‘good governance’ framework. There are two specific reasons behind this:

- Considering the range of GoB planning and policy documents, it is quite evident that the government has placed significant emphasis on issues related to governance. These documents clearly point out that in providing services to the citizens of Bangladesh and in conducting their activities, government agencies need to be more capable, transparent, accountable and responsive. Both the Perspective Plan (2010-2021) and the Seventh Five-Year Plan (2016-2020) have highlighted the importance of good governance. For a private sector act or working with the public sector it is therefore essential to understand how the government defines ‘governance’ and ‘good governance’, and what factors it has identified as critical to promoting the latter.

- Because in the context of Bangladesh the notions of governance and good governance concentrate on enhancing the capacity of government institutions, making them more service-oriented, efficient and responsive (a term discussed further below), an understanding of this focus will also enhance the ability of private sector actors to approach the government strategically and suggest activities that will align their priorities with those championed by the GoB.

Considering this dual benefit of understanding the principles of governance and good governance, this section provides a brief analysis of these concepts, and highlights how these principles can be linked to PSD.

4.2 Good governance principles to promote PSD

The concept of governance became popular in the academic world in the mid-1990s. Generally speaking, government has always remained at the core of governance. In its simplest form, governance refers to the manner in which the government exercises power “…in the management of a country’s economic and social resources for development” (World Bank, 2002). From this perspective, governance means ensuring better interaction between government bureaucracy and citizens, where agencies work together with private and non-profit sector actors to serve the citizens in an effective and efficient way. Effective governance thus needs to include institutional and managerial aspects of government, as agencies are required to find modern, innovative management styles to increase their inclusion of non-government actors. This requires greater coordination and cooperation (Hill, 2004; Frederickson, 2005).

Whereas the concept of governance simply means the role of institutions in affecting the socio-political and economic processes of a country, preceding it with the word ‘good’ transforms a neutral word into a value-laden concept. Good governance not only addresses the status of institutional arrangements but also indicates what an ideal governance system should look like. The term was first used by the World Bank in 1989, when it introduced it in Africa as an instrument to ensure sustainable and equitable economic growth (Horta, 1999). Since then attempts have been made to define good governance by identifying various indicators and by analysing the state of these indicators within a country. Since 1996 however, the Bank has focused on measuring governance by emphasising three specific areas: i) the process of government selection, monitoring and replacement; ii) the ability of state institutions to develop and implement policies; and iii) the degree of respect and trust awarded to citizens in their state and its institutions. Under these three areas, six specific indicators have been identified (Kaufmann, Kraay & Mastruzzi, 2010: 3-4):
Voice and accountability refers to the ability of citizens to participate in the electoral process; freedom of expression; freedom of association; free media.

Political stability and absence of violence/terrorism captures “...perceptions of the likelihood that the government will be destabilised or overthrown by unconstitutional or violent means, including politically motivated violence and terrorism”.

Government effectiveness indicates the quality of public service; the ability of the civil service to remain free from political pressure, and to perform its duties and responsibilities effectively.

Regulatory quality refers to the ability and commitment of government to promote private sector growth through formulating and implementing policies.

Rule of law captures “perceptions of the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society, and in particular the quality of contract enforcement, property rights, the police, and the courts, as well as the likelihood of crime and violence”.

Control of corruption captures “perceptions of the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain, including both petty and grand forms of corruption, as well as ‘capture’ of the state by elites and private interests”.

1. Effectiveness and capacity, i.e. the capacity of the government agencies to develop and implement policies in an effective and efficient manner;

2. Equity and inclusion, i.e. whether government programmes, policies and plans are being developed while taking into consideration the concerns and comments of all the relevant actors, and whether these programmes are making an effort to ensure equitable distribution of resources;

3. Participation and responsiveness, i.e. whether different state and non-state actors (including the private sector) are participating in the implementation process. This issue area tries to understand whether the government’s service delivery mechanism is responsive to the needs of the citizens it serves, and whether there exists any mechanism through which citizens can voice any dissatisfaction with the delivered service;

4. Rule of law, i.e. the capacity of government agencies, especially law enforcement agencies, to enforce contracts, ensure property rights and to reduce the likelihood of crime and violence;

5. Transparency and accountability, i.e. whether the process followed in designing and implementing policies and programmes is sufficiently transparent and accountable.

The above points also match closely with the governance framework developed by SDC, which includes:

1. Accountability, i.e. the presence of checks and balances in the system which make a project accountable to the beneficiaries;

2. Transparency, i.e. the presence of a reporting mechanism through which organisations can disclose their activities and outcomes to their stakeholders;

3. Participation/ownership, i.e. the capacity of an organisation/project to ensure the participation of stakeholders so they can contribute to project development. At the same time, this indicator also attempts to measure the accessibility of the beneficiaries;

4. Equity, i.e. the capacity of an organisation/project to take into consideration the views of different marginalised groups in society and design programmes accordingly;

---
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5. **Efficiency**, i.e. whether the goals and objectives of a programme are realistic in nature and whether the organisation/project has adequate administrative and financial capacity to realise its stated goals.

The good governance criteria mentioned above are interdependent; their interaction ensures a scenario of good governance, which is essential for PSD to succeed. Assessing the good governance principles, the authors summarised the inter-relationships of these criteria (see Figure 1).

Figure 1 shows that good governance requirements for successful PSD consists of two basic components: i) an enabling political-economic environment to facilitate collaboration between private and public sector organisations, and ii) the presence (and implementation) of policy and programmatic interventions to ensure a legal and administrative framework enabling the private sector to engage with the public sector. Of these two, the effectiveness of the first component relies on three factors: i) whether the concerns and comments of the various stakeholders are taken into consideration in designing policies (**Equity**); ii) whether systematic efforts are made to include the relevant actors (including private sector organisations) in the policy and programme implementation process (**Participation/Ownership**); and iii) whether the transparency and accountability of the process is being ensured (**Transparency and Accountability**). The combination of these three indicates government effectiveness at ensuring an enabling environment for the private sector to collaborate. At the same time, the effective implementation of the second component depends on two factors: i) the presence of legal and policy guidelines (**Rule of Law and Capacity**); and ii) the ability of government agencies to implement policies which would support PSD (**Capacity and Efficiency**). The combination of these indicates the quality of the regulatory regime to promote the involvement of private sector.

### 4.3 How to collaborate with public agencies

To engage effectively with public agencies, MSD projects need to be aware of the broader governance framework, and to identify the key agencies having...
Figure 2: Framework for MSD project engagement with public agencies
4.3.1 Sector selection

The primary task of an MSD project is to select sectors appropriate to the given context. Katalyst made its selection based on three criteria: i) poverty reduction potential; ii) pro-poor growth potential; and iii) systemic intervention potential. A vital part of sector selection is an assessment of the government’s choice of poverty reduction thrust sectors, and to incorporate these government priorities as far as possible.

4.3.2 Sector assessment and actor identification

Katalyst’s experience indicates that it is essential to identify the right public agency (actor) with which to partner to achieve the expected goal. However, this can be quite tricky. Two main factors should be considered:

a) The public agency’s mandate. In selecting the public agency to work with, a key consideration is whether it has an adequate legal or policy mandate to work in the concerned sector or issue. Certain public agencies may have a strong mandate: government policies, Rules of Business and Allocations of Business may indicate that the organisation is supposed to play a pivotal role in that sector; other show ever may have a relatively low mandate with respect to the issue concerned.

b) Interest/incentives. Having a legal, policy or administrative mandate does not necessarily mean that the agency will be interested in addressing the particular issue with the private sector; the degree of interest may be high or low.

The combination of these two factors will play an important role in the initial identification of actors. Figure 3 presents this and highlights four possibilities:

a. Encourage. If the public organisation has a strong mandate but is not interested in collaborating, the most effective strategy can be to search for motivations to trigger its interest. As the agency has the necessary mandate to perform in a given sector, it is possible that through introducing proper motivation, the relevant issue can be addressed (such as in Case Study #1 where BPC is rightly placed for export promotion, justifying Katalyst’s partnering with them).

b. Exclude. If the public sector actor lacks the mandate and is not interested in working collaboratively, the best strategy is to exclude them from consideration. Furthermore, MSD projects have a pre-determined budget and time-frame, meaning it may not be possible to explore the potential of such stakeholders.

c. Explore. When the interest of a public organisation in a particular issue is high but it lacks the necessary mandate, the best strategy would be to explore avenues through which the agency’s involvement can be made possible. If an initial exploration does not yield results, the project needs to decide whether to build the agency’s capacity or to disengage altogether.

d. Engage. In cases where both the mandate and interest/incentives of the public agency are high, MSD projects should actively engage.

Figure 3: Partner selection matrix
Illustrations from Katalyst case studies:
Katalyst’s own experiences provide a clear indication of the importance of correctly identifying the appropriate actors when working with government agencies. For instance, in the case of strengthening its Local Agri-business Network (LAN), Katalyst made the right decision to ‘engage’ the Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE), as this particular government agency had the mandate to initiate changes in the programme area, while at the same time its officials were interested in the project. Similarly, in case of changing the Fish Hatchery Act of 2010 to improve the quality of imported brood fish, Katalyst decided to engage with the DoF. Of note, however, is the case when to improve the access of fisheries to waterbodies the need was felt to amend the Water Body Management Policy of 2005 but Katalyst was initially unable to identify the appropriate actor. Even though it was supposed (in terms of its mandate) to ‘engage’ the Ministry of Land, it instead worked with Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock, which lacked the necessary mandate in this particular area. Engaging an actor which should be actively ‘encouraged’ to participate made the entire process lengthy and difficult.

4.3.3 Timing of engagement

Once the ‘actor identification’ is done, the next step should be to determine the time, that is, to decide when the process to engage the public sector actor should start. There are three possibilities in this case:

a. **Before implementing in the field.** This refers to the situation when the MSD project engages with the public sector before implementing their programmatic intervention, or at the early stage when they are designing their programmes/plans. For selected public actors, if the strategy is to ‘encourage’ and ‘engage’, then they should be involved from the very beginning. Adopting this ‘before’ strategy plays an important role in ensuring the buy-in of the public agency. For instance, while working with BPC, Katalyst started interacting with the government agencies from the very beginning and developed capacity development plans while relying on inputs provided by BPC. As a result, Katalyst identified specific capacity needs of BPC, an effort appreciated by BPC. This also helped the development of a sense of ownership within BPC. In the case of initiating IPM in Bangladesh, Katalyst adopted an evidence-based approach and after conducting initial experiments pointed out the need for change in Pesticide Rules of the GoB. The fact that Katalyst relied on evidence and interacted with the GoB ‘during’ implementing a programme played a key role in amending The Pesticide Rules in 2010. However, Katalyst’s experience also shows that bad timing can impede project implementation. In the case of LAN, although the organisation succeeded in identifying the right actor (that is, DAE), it did not sign an MoU with the DAE at the initial stage, making the implementation process quite difficult.

b. **During intervention/implementation in the field.** At the same time, MSD projects may choose to engage public sector actors when implementation has already started. This can be a viable option in the case of ‘encourage’ and ‘explore’, as it will help private sector actors to deal with the challenges in implementing programmes, while providing exposure to the public agency in understanding field issues.

c. **After conducting field implementation.** Another strategy could be to engage with the public agency after the MSD project has tested pilots in the field and is confident of the results/outcomes. This could be used for scaling up successful pilots. It is, however, best to consider this strategy only if the MSD project is unable to convince public agency to work with them at the initial stage.

Illustrations from Katalyst case studies:
The case studies described above indicate the essential nature of correct timing when developing engagement with the public sector actors. For instance, while working with BPC, Katalyst started interacting with the government agencies from the very beginning and developed capacity development plans and other interventions while relying on inputs provided by BPC. As a result, Katalyst identified specific capacity needs of BPC, an effort appreciated by BPC. This also helped the development of a sense of ownership within BPC. In the case of initiating IPM in Bangladesh, Katalyst adopted an evidence-based approach and after conducting initial experiments pointed out the need for change in Pesticide Rules of the GoB. The fact that Katalyst relied on evidence and interacted with the GoB ‘during’ implementing a programme played a key role in amending The Pesticide Rules in 2010. However, Katalyst’s experience also shows that bad timing can impede project implementation. In the case of LAN, although the organisation succeeded in identifying the right actor (that is, DAE), it did not sign an MoU with the public agency at an early stage. Katalyst staff report that in the absence of an MoU, it was very difficult for them to implement the LAN programme in an effective and efficient manner.
4.3.4 Intervention design and organisation assessment

When an agency is identified as suitable for collaboration, the project should conduct organisational scanning to understand what it can expect from a public sector actor it is involved with in a collaborative relationship. This assessment will depend on two factors:

a. **Degree of autonomy of the public sector organisation.** In the context of Bangladesh, having a mandate does not necessarily mean that the agency will be able to function according to its mandate. Katalyst’s experience indicates that although some government agencies, directorates and divisions are relatively autonomous and do not have to seek the approval of their parent ministry/authority, others cannot function at all without the approval of its higher authority. From this perspective, its degree of autonomy can vary. For example, Katalyst’s work with BPC (Case Study 1) under the Ministry of Commerce was beneficial as BPC had the autonomy to operate under an export mandate.

b. **Nature of organisational culture.** The organisational culture of a public agency can play a major role in determining its performance. Although its ‘interest’ in promoting PSD may exist, an overall understanding of culture is more complicated in nature and will reflect not just the agency’s perception of PSD but also the capacity of its staff to be more responsive, innovative, motivated and change-oriented. An organisational culture can be described from two points to view – open and innovative OR closed and risk-averse. For example, due to its openness in trying innovative solutions, SRDI (Case Study 5) was keen to develop the FRS in partnership with Katalyst; on the other hand, in the case of DoF (Case Study 4), it took Katalyst significant efforts to convince the agency about the brood fish issue.

Figure 4 presents a combination of these factors which will enable MSD projects to determine their course of action.

---

**Illustrations from Katalyst Case Studies:**

In the BPC case study, a new programme of implementing contract farming by exporters could be implemented due to BPC’s high degree of autonomy and openness to accepting new solutions. At the same time, incremental changes in case of brood fish policy to allow the import of brood under a broader policy was possible due to the nature of DoF.

4.3.5 Intervention implementation and collaboration with the public sector

During the intervention implementation period and finalisation of the details of the collaboration with public agencies, clear expectations of the goals (that is, how the project and public agency’s goals complement each other) should be determined. Simultaneously, the project should concentrate on identifying champions with the public agency in attaining the intervention goals and begin to build a rapport with them.

With regards to determining the mode of collaboration, Katalyst experiences show that two factors need to be considered:

a. **Focus of Action.** In terms of intervention design, our case studies show that there can be two dimensions to an intervention: firstly, an intervention can be directed at designing new policies or changing existing ones; secondly, it can be carried out to develop or change new or existing programmes. For instance, in the case of strengthening the market for IPM, Katalyst eventually focused on policy changes; when building the capacity of hatcheries through importing brood fish, the partner organisations...
tried to introduce new policy. In both cases, identifying the right focus of action played an important role in implementation. When working with the Rajshahi City Corporation and DAE, Katalyst identified the need of the public organisations and responded by working to assist them in developing new programmatic solutions.

b. Capacity of the organisation. Staff need to have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities, and adequate technical knowledge to perform the latter. An organisation's capacity can be high when technically competent individuals understand and perform their duties, or low when lack of competence or lack of clear understanding hinders its performance. For instance, in the case of promoting exports through BPC, Katalyst identified that BPC lacked capacity and knowhow on implementing appropriate activities to foster export through the private sector. The project and BPC therefore implemented joint actions to support BPC in developing their capacity.

Based on the above factors, MSD projects should select from four different mode of interventions:

a. Advocacy. If while determining the focus of an intervention it becomes clear that new policies or programmes need to be developed, or that existing policies or programmes need to go through changes, the project should try to answer the following question: does that organisation have the necessary capacity to initiate changes or implement existing policies and programmes? If so, the project needs to focus on advocacy – that is, it should present new ideas and initiatives to the public sector organisations, and make them understand the value of these. At the same time, if necessary, a national-level advocacy initiative should be designed to ensure political interests do not jeopardise the change initiative. To a large extent, as part of its advocacy role the project should ensure the presence of an enabling policy environment which will allow a willing public organisation to perform its designated duties. For instance, in the case where Katalyst worked to strengthen the market for IPM, in identifying the focus of action it found that the Ministry had the necessary capacity and expertise to amend the existing pesticide rules. This allowed the project to focus on advocacy which eventually produced the desired outcome.

b. Policy analysis support. When a public organisation has the incentive to work under new policy guidelines or introduce policy changes but lacks the necessary capacity, the project’s best course of action would be to provide analysis support to facilitate the development of a sound policy at the central level and/or in field implementation.

c. Capacity building, technical assistance and/or implementation support. Where there is a new service delivery mechanism, if the public agency agrees with the proposed programmatic change but lacks the necessary capacity to implement the programmes, the project should concentrate on developing the capacity of the officials working within these public organisations. For example, Katalyst provided technical assistance and capacity building support to DU and RCC, addressing capacity issues and a need for a change in their implementation policies to meet private sector demand.

d. Financial/strategic support. When the public organisation has the capacity and the commitment to develop new programmes but lacks financial resources, the focus of collaboration could be to provide financial support. For example, in the FRS intervention, SRDI had the commitment and capacity to introduce the innovative FRS service but a financial resource limitation to kick-start the process, which was provided by Katalyst.

After considering these different modes of intervention, the project will have to choose the appropriate one. The final step of engagement with the public sector actor from the perspective of the private sector organisation will be to reach an agreement in terms of what success looks like, and results and monitoring mechanisms. MSD projects which collaborate with public agencies should remain cautious and integrate governance principles (highlighted in section 4.1) during the design, implementation and monitoring of the outcomes.
## 4.4 Practical tips for engaging with public agencies

The following table provides a list of practical tips for engagement with public agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Topics of Engagement</th>
<th>Practical Tips from Katalyst Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alignment of project policies/priorities with policies/mandates of relevant public agencies</td>
<td>When pilots are successful, the project should invest sufficient time/resources to follow through to scale. When project priorities change, proper communication with the relevant agency as to why the intervention had to be stalled or stopped should be made. In such cases, representatives of the project management team should be involved in communication with the agencies, rather than junior staff. The project should be flexible in aligning with the implementation policy/culture of public agencies and collaborate with them accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>It is imperative that project team makes clear communication with the relevant public agency about the project’s facilitation approach from the very beginning to set the right expectations. Maintaining written forms of communication is important, as this assists with future referencing when government staff changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Networking with multi-stakeholders and identifying champions</td>
<td>Project staff should maintain good networks with public sector officials at various levels (wherever possible) on a regular basis. An understanding of issues at an informal level helps in developing proactive solutions to any issues which arise during the collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Incentives and buy-in</td>
<td>To ensure buy-in and effective implementation, projects should not be prescriptive, but rather accommodating in terms of the needs of the agency. Determining the real incentives of government agency officials is important from early on (for example, linking intervention objectives with an agency’s performance targets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alignment with norms/culture of public agencies</td>
<td>MSD project staff members should understand the norm/culture of working with public agencies – understanding how to appropriately address and interact with senior government officials is key to effective communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Learning initiatives/visits for government officials</td>
<td>Many government officials have limited resources or face bureaucratic challenges when participating in learning initiatives, such as exposure visits. When dealing with innovative concepts, MSD projects are advised to look for examples within or outside the region and organise learning visits. Katalyst experiences show that such actions have promoted the motivation and interest of public agencies to work together on PSD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Orientation of project staff and assessing need for additional capacity</td>
<td>The profiling of those project staff who will deal with a project’s public agencies is important: a mix of senior/experienced and junior/new graduates would be helpful. Their proper capacity building, and orientation on dealing with government officials, is essential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Conclusions and Recommendations

Assessment of the Katalyst interventions reconfirms that fact that market systems development is not only based on how the private sector functions but also on the role of the public sector. In engaging with public agencies using a facilitative approach, necessary planning and proper steps should be adopted. Katalyst examples highlight the need to assess, identify and engage with the public sector early on in project implementation. This paper proposes a framework to be used as a guide for new MSD projects in their engagement with public agencies.

MSD is a multi-stakeholder approach which requires proper understanding of the context and the actions needed from all actors. For economic growth to be sustainable, donors, government agencies and the private sector need to work together. This paper makes the following recommendations:

a) **Donors of MSD projects** should be aware of the legal requirements of project set-up and ensure timely and effective liaisons with the relevant agencies to install the project. Proactive actions are needed to ensure smooth start-up, implementation and exits of MSD projects in collaboration with public agencies. It is the role of donors to lay the objectives of an MSD project clearly to their government counterparts of implementing countries. The (indirect) facilitation mechanism of donor projects is not always well-received by public agencies compared to projects with a more direct (asset-transfer) approach. Hence donors should clarify the approach well enough during the bilateral discussions with the government. Donors should also allocate budgets for capacity building of the public agencies as well as for capacity building of project staff to engage with the public sector appropriately. Furthermore, developing countries receive funds from multi-lateral donors and thus donor harmonisation and synergy is important to ensure effective use of resources and to avoid unnecessary expectations.

b) **Government agencies** in implementing countries can contribute strongly to developing market systems for the poor. Bangladesh has come a long way in promoting the private sector for economic growth but further opportunities exist to provide a more conducive environment for the private sector to grow inclusively. With respect to MSD projects, government agencies need to be willing to work with MSD projects, in light of the long-term and sustainable impact on poverty reduction, rather than achieving quick wins or short-term impact. Policies and regulations which can cut bureaucratic hassle and expedite the implementation of new ideas on the ground need to be worked upon. Bangladesh has a number of good and robust policies and regulations which, if implemented effectively, can improve the economic situation of the poor population. However, implementation challenges such as budget limitations and political forces impede execution of these policies on the ground.

c) **Katalyst interventions** prove that private sector development does lead to poverty reduction, and this paper presents examples of steps that a project can take to motivate the sector to promote inclusive business. The private sector in developing countries can take a strong role in developing public private partnerships. Private sector should accept the limitations of government's resources and need to step-up investments where feasible in sectors like agriculture that impacts the poor sections of the society. They should be open for dialogue with the government and also may take proactive actions to work with the public agencies for sustainable development of their business as well as the country's economy. Applying good business ethics, maintaining integrity, and fostering constructive dialogue with government agencies are essential factors for a quality public-private partnership.
Respondents Interviewed for the Paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Intervention Name</th>
<th>Katalyst Partner Staff</th>
<th>Katalyst (ex-) Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Capacity building of BPC as facilitator for export markets</td>
<td>Mr. Mir Shariful Bashar, Executive Officer (ICT); Mr. Abul Kalam Patwary, Executive Officer (Fishery Products); Ms. Ishrat Jahan, Executive Officer (Agro Products); Business Promotion Council</td>
<td>Ms. Mehjabin Ahmed, Mr. Nahin Ferdous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Developing agro-journalism as part of core course in DU</td>
<td>Dr. A J M Shafiul Alam Bhuiyan, Professor and Founder Chair, Department of Television, Film and Photography</td>
<td>Mr. Abu Saif Ansari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Strengthening LAN for better information exchange among stakeholders and farmers</td>
<td>Dr. Md. Hamidur Rahman, ex-Director General, DAE</td>
<td>Mr. Azman Ahmed Chowdhury, Mr. Shahnewaz Karim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Capacity building of hatcheries to import quality brood fish</td>
<td>Dr. Binoy Kumar Chakraborty, Project Director &amp; Researcher, Department of Fisheries, Bangladesh</td>
<td>Ms. Syeda Ishrat Fatema, Mr. Nahin Ferdous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Development of FRS using ICT</td>
<td>Dr. Md. Moqbul Hossain, Principal Scientific Officer, SRDI</td>
<td>Mr. Ashfaq Enayetullah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Improving public water body leasing policy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Mr. Azman Ahmed Chowdhury, Mr. Shahnewaz Karim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strengthening the market for IPM</td>
<td>Dr. Sayed Nurul Alam, Principal Scientific Officer, Department of Entomology, BARI</td>
<td>Ms. Mehjabin Ahmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Developing OSS at Rajshahi City Corporation</td>
<td>Mr. Ashraful Haque, Chief Engineer, Rajshahi City Corporation</td>
<td>Mr. Emdadul Haque</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The following Katalyst documents were referred to with respect to the interventions assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN.</th>
<th>Intervention Name</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Capacity building of BPC as facilitator for export markets</td>
<td>Business Promotion Council (BPC)</td>
<td>Concept note of the intervention with BPC, ‘Facilitate Industries to Produce Quality Feed Meal and Fish oil by Using Offal’</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Concept note of the intervention ‘Capacity Building of BPC as facilitator for Export Markets’</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Concept note of the intervention ‘Capacity Building of BPC as facilitator for Export Markets’</td>
<td>University of Dhaka</td>
<td>Developing agro-journalism as part of core course in University of Dhaka</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Intervention report of the intervention ‘Developing and launching Agriculture Journalism course in University of Dhaka’</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Concept note of the intervention ‘Institutionalize the concept of Public Private Initiative within government extension departments’</td>
<td>Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE)</td>
<td>Strengthening local agri-business network (LAN) for better information exchange among stakeholders and farmers</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Intervention report of the intervention ‘Anchoring learning at Agriculture Training Institutes (ATI),’</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Report, ‘Systemic change assessment in Katalyst: the case of the LAN sector’</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Report, ‘Training on Project Implementation, Monitoring &amp; Evaluation and Reporting for the Officers of Planning Wing, Central Extension Departments of Government of Bangladesh’</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Intervention report of the intervention ‘Capacity building of hatcheries by establishing linkage with international brood suppliers to ensure supply of quality fingerling to farmers’</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Comprehensive study, ‘The Aquaculture Sector in Bangladesh with Particular Focus on Existing Policy Support Received by the Sector and Scope for Improvements’</td>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Comprehensive study, ‘High Value Fish (Tilapia, Pangas and Koi) in Bangladesh’</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN.</td>
<td>Intervention Name</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Developing the fertiliser recommendation software (FRS) using ICT</td>
<td>Soil Research and Development Institute (SRDI)</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Katalyst (Swisscontact) and the Soil Resource Development Institute (SRDI), ‘Developing the Fertiliser Recommendation Software (FRS) using ICT’</td>
<td>January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Improving public waterbody leasing policy</td>
<td>Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock (MoFL)</td>
<td>Intervention report detailing the intervention ‘Developing the Fertiliser Recommendation Software (FRS) using ICT’</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Promoting integrated pest management (IPM)</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture (MoA)</td>
<td>Concept note of the intervention ‘Developing the Fertiliser Recommendation Software (FRS) using ICT’</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Developing a one-stop service (Computerisation of Business Licenses) at Rajshahi City Corporation (RCC)</td>
<td>Rajshahi City Corporation (RCC)</td>
<td>Katalyst Newsletter: Public Water Body Management Policy 2009 – Beginning of a new era for the poor fishermen in Bangladesh</td>
<td>August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Improving public waterbody leasing policy</td>
<td>Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock (MoFL)</td>
<td>Katalyst Newsletter – Amendment of Pesticides Rules – A Milestone to Promote Integrated Pest Management Report on IPM Exposure Visit to Thailand</td>
<td>August 2010 October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Promoting integrated pest management (IPM)</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture (MoA)</td>
<td>Intervention Plan for Process improvement of Business Licenses, Construction Permits and Health &amp; Sanitation Permits in Rajshahi City Corporation</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>