**Effects of Stock holding policy on Maize Prices: Evidence from Zambia**

**Yujun Zhou, Kathy Baylis**

**Abstract:** Public stockholding programs are prevalent, and have recently gained traction, particularly in developing countries. Governments directly purchase and store staple grains, usually with an objective of stabilizing price for both producers and consumers. Despite the massive spending on stockholding programs, little is known about their effectiveness in mitigating the retail price swings associated with production shocks. This paper estimates the effects of the purchase and sales activities of the Food Reserve Agency (FRA) on maize market prices across more than thirty markets in Zambia using monthly price data from 2003 to 2008. To deal with the endogeneity in purchase and sales, we use predicted FRA purchase and sales targets as instrumental variables. Controlling for other policies in place, we find evidence that FRA activities stabilizes retail prices in the major district markets from annual swings. Results also show that FRA purchases raise local prices for surplus maize producers for about 3% on average during the time of harvest and FRA sales help to lower the price during the lean season up to 7%.

**JEL classifications: Q11, Q18**

**Keywords:** Public stockholding; Maize marketing board; Price shocks; Zambia

Yujun Zhou is a Ph.D. student in the Department of Agricultural and Consumer Economics at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Kathy Baylis is a Professor in the Department of Agricultural and Consumer Economics at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

**Effects of Stock-holding policy on Maize Prices: Evidence from Zambia**

1. **Introduction**

Public stockholding is widely used in developing countries to stabilize staple food prices. India’s combined stock-holding and food subsidy program is the largest social safety net in the world, costing 6% of the government budget. Thailand, one of the largest rice exporters, bought rice from the farmers at a price 40% higher than markets average to build public stocks (Deuss 2015). In Africa, stockholding has become increasingly popular among governments over the past decade, and government marketing boards have become major players in African food markets (Jayne, 2012).

Volatile food prices endanger the food security of households and can lead to social unrest and civil conflict (Bellemare 2015; Fjelde 2014). Price increases are associated with a low stock to use ratio, suggesting increased (Wright, 2012). Numerous papers develop theoretical that demonstrate the role of public storage in reducing fluctuations in food prices (Scheinkman and Schechtman (1983); Wright and Williams (1982), among others). Gouel and Jean (2012) propose a theoretically optimal policy for stabilizing food prices in a developing country by maintaining a public stock along with a subsidy on agricultural production. Stock holding and agricultural subsidies is precisely the policy combination used in Zambia, where we focus our research.

Equipped with ample storage facilities in various district markets, the Food Reserve Agency (FRA) in Zambia purchases a substantial amount of maize from small households in various geographic regions. The FRA started to buy maize in the 1996/1997 marketing year, but purchases were limited to five district markets. Due to a lack of funding, it suspended purchases during 1998/1999 – 2001/2002. It was not until 2003/04 that the agency expanded purchases to more than thirty markets across the country (Mason and Myers 2013). The FRA sets a national purchase price every year, typically announced in May (the beginning of the harvest season). Due to the volumes purchased, the FRA has become the dominant buyer in the market. In the 2006/2007 marketing year, the FRA bought approximately 85% of the maize sold by smallholder farmers (Ricker-Gilbert et al. 2013), bringing national maize stocks to historic highs in 2009. These buffer stocks are intended to reduce variability in grain prices and to provide liquidity in the maize market (Govereh, Jayne, and Chapoto 2008). To support the high FRA purchase price, along with storage and logistics costs, the estimated total cost of FRA activities consists of 7% of the entire government budget in Zambia (Nkonde et al. 2011; IMF, 2012).

This paper asks whether the stockholding policy was effective in stabilizing prices. Specifically, we ask: can FRA purchases increase the price that farmers receive during the time of harvest? Second, Can FRA sales mitigate the retail price swings associated with domestic production shocks during the lean season? Third, can FRA activities stabilize prices across years with good or bad harvest?

Despite its popularity among governments, evidence on the effectiveness of stockholding policy on stabilizing prices is relatively scarce and inconsistent. Using a vector autoregression (VAR) model, Jayne et al. (2008) find the National Cereals and Produce Board (NCPB) in Kenya increases maize price by 20% between 1995-2004 but decreases price during the early 1990s. Pierre et al. (2018) use a vector error correction model (VECM) to explore the effect of National Food Reserve Agency on maizes prices in Tanzania. They do not find a significant effect in general, except for a small decrease effect in some markets. Despite the similarities in the policy between countries, the FRA in Zambia operates on a larger scale both financially and geographically and has a focus on smallholder farmers. The studies on the Zambia case are, therefore, more relevant. Chapoto and Jayne (2009) find evidence of FRA sales reducing market prices but no significant results on stabilizing effects. Like our study, they estimate a reduced form model on three wholesale markets and regard FRA activities as demand and supply shifters. Mason and Myers (2013) apply a VAR based approach to analyze price dynamics in the two cities of Lusaka and Choma (representing regions of maize consumption and production, respectively). Simulation results from their model suggest that the FRA had a stabilizing effect on the prices over time, and approximately increased prices by 20% between 2003-2008. The authors note that the welfare gains for smallholder net maize sellers from this policy seem rather small compared to the considerable financial cost to build and maintain the buffer stock. In other countries, Intal et al. (2012) show that the National Food Authority (NFA) in Philippines stabilized domestic prices when there was a price shock in the international markets in the 1990s and early 2000s. McCreary (2012) find evidence that the Food Corporation of India (FCI) has a stabilizing effect on wheat and rice prices.

This paper makes several contributions to previous studies on stockholding policies and FRA in Zambia. Different from the time series analysis commonly applied in the previous literature, we use a panel regression approach to explore the spatial variation across thirty-two district markets that vary in geography and economic status. The purchases and sales are made locally, and we would expect the effect of the program to be largest in those areas and times where the FRA actively buys and sells. For this assumption to hold, prices cannot be perfectly integrated throughout the country. We test for cointegration in several markets in our data and find that the prices in different district markets are not fully integrated in terms of long-run price movement (detailed results presented in Table A1). This finding is in line with Mason and Myers (2013), as they rejected the possibility of cointegration between the two districts prices and the FRA purchase price. Instead of using government purchase and sales directly as in Chapoto and Jayne (2009), we instrument for the purchases and sales by using their administrative targets averaged over time to avoid the potentially unobserved correlation between annual changes in purchases or sales in a district driven by unexpected local price shocks. To our knowledge, this article is the first among the studies on stockholding policies to use instrumental variables to address the issue of endogeneity on evaluating the effects of the government purchases.

The endogeneity issue of identifying the effects of the stockholding policy on maize prices is three-fold. First, since the FRA explicitly targets areas that are predicted to be in the surplus as locations for their purchases, we need to control for endogeneity in the amount and location of FRA purchases. Otherwise, we would tend to underestimate the stabilizing effect since purchases are typically made in places of surplus maize where prices might be lowest. Second, the FRA tends to sell more maize when the price is higher. If we did not control for this effect, we would likely observe FRA sales as being positively correlated with market price, again underestimating the price smoothing effect. To tackle with these two issues, we use predicted FRA purchase and sales targets as instrumental variables for the actual purchases and sales as they are relevant to the stockholding activities but not directly correlated with production shocks or grain prices in that location, in that year.

The third threat to identification is that other policies that affect grain prices are also in place. These policies include but not limited to temporary export bans, government subsided imported maize from South Africa and targeted fertilizer subsidy program for smallholder farmers. Without controlling for other policies, we risk attributing stabilizing effects to the FRA stockholding policies, whereas it may be the result of a combination of policies. As most of the policies listed above are set at an annual level, we control for these policies and by including monthly dummies when the export bans are in place.

Quantifying the effects of stockholding policy matters to policy makers aiming at improving food security. Considering the massive spending on supporting the high purchase prices and building the facilities for grain storage, we require high returns on the stockholding policy. Understanding both the benefits and costs involved in carrying out the stockholding policies can help evaluate policy alternatives in stabilizing the grain market. Both the short-term effectiveness and economic sustainability are at stake here.

1. **Background**

Zambia ranks 139 out of 188 countries in the 2015 UNDP Human Development Report and is classified as a lower middle-income country by the World Bank (Cammelbeeck 2015). With sixty percent of its population below the poverty line and almost fifty percent malnourished, the country suffers from widespread poverty and food insecurity (Sitko et al. 2011).

The agricultural sector in the country is comprised of roughly 1.5 million smallholders and 2,000 large-scale farmers. More than ninety percent of maize production and eighty percent of maize sales come from smallholder farms (Tembo et al. 2009). Even so, maize production is not evenly distributed across farms. Around two percent of the small and medium farmers generate roughly half of maize output. A large number of small farm households are still net buyers of maize (Sitko et al. 2011). The dependence on volatile rainfall and a lack of irrigation make the agricultural output extremely unstable. Years of drought, flood, and insufficient input supply, which occurs an average of one year out of three, lead to deficient maize production to satisfy food demand at the national level (Dorosh, Dradri, and Haggblade 2009). Since weather shocks are localized, specific production regions experience more severe shocks than others. Zambia is a net exporter in most years and its price tends to be below the price in South Africa (Sitko, Kuteya and Chisanga 2014). Only during years of substantial production shortages, the domestic maize price in Zambia will rise to the Republic of South Africa’s maize import parity (Myers and Jayne 2012).

Past maize price fluctuations and the consequent social unrest have led the government of Zambia to believe food prices are far too strategically and politically important to leave to the market (Chapoto 2012). The government mistrusts private traders in their ability to bring in enough maize to ensure availability and stabilize market prices (Myers and Jayne 2012). The government has argued that uncertainties in imports and the transmission of shocks from other countries make trade an unreliable tool to address domestic food shortages. Besides, storage is needed to supply the market throughout the year, and in periods of shortfalls, before the imports arrive. Consequently, the government has pursued national grain storage policy to secure domestic food security (Dorosh 2009).

The Food Reserve Agency (FRA) was established in 1996 with the aim of building and managing national grain stocks (Govereh, Jayne, and Chapoto 2008). The FRA started by purchasing small quantities in five out of a total of 72 districts in 1996. In May 2003, the agency expanded the purchase to 37 districts and set a pan-territorial purchase price for the first time (Mason, Jayne and Myers, 2015). Most of the purchases are made in production areas predicted to have surplus maize, namely the “maize belt” region. Figure 1 shows a map of the average FRA purchase by district between 2002/03 -2009/10. During the marketing year 2006/07, the FRA buy price was set at 38,000 ZMK (for a 50-kg bag), which was substantially higher than the average wholesale price of 23,000–31,000 ZMK (Mason and Myers, 2013). The FRA usually announce the purchase price in May and continue to purchase maize from smallholders throughout the harvest season until October. According to the estimates in Mason, Jayne, and Myers (2015), more than half of the smallholder maize sales were made to the FRA for five consecutive years since the 2002/03 marketing year.

The purchased maize is stored in more than 400 facilities across the country, maintained by the FRA. These stocks are intended to stabilize maize prices and provide available maize supply to the market during time of maize shortage in the market. The FRA cooperates with large scale millers and sell the stored maize at subsidized prices. There are 78 milling operations in Zambia, only 20 of them are large scale and most of them are in Lusaka and Copperbelt province. The rest of the medium and large-scale millers are primarily located in urban areas in Northern and Central province, according to the Millers Association in Zambia. Thus, we would anticipate that the price effect of FRA sales would be largest in those areas that have, or are near, commercial millers. A map of the location of the district markets and location of the millers is presented in Figure 2.

In part to protect the dominant market position of the FRA, the government implemented a series of policies including export bans, import tariffs, and imports through the FRA (Tschirley and Jayne 2010). Most of the stored maize are sold to large industrial processors and trading companies that cooperate with the FRA through a tender process, often at below-market prices (Mason and Myers, 2013).

In this article, we focus on the effects of the FRA’s purchase and sales activities on maize prices. We evaluate the effectiveness of the policy by analysing maize prices in 32 markets in Zambia from 2003 to 2008, aiming to shed light on the cost and benefit analysis of the policy.

1. **Method**

To help explain how FRA purchases and sales affect retail maize prices, we set up the following model of demand and supply of maize in Zambia. Consider a system of demand and supply of maize as specified in equation (1) and (2):

where is the supply of maize at district at time t, is the amount of net imports of maize at time t, and are the price of inputs and weather at district in the previous period respectively and is farmers’ expected farm gate price of maize in the next year; is the demand for maize, affected by the current price of maize, the income of consumers and possible restrictions on export in place.

FRA activities are intended to smooth price both over time and over space. Most of the FRA purchases are made during the harvest season between July to October from smallholdings in surplus maize areas, then stored in the storage facilities in the major districts. Most of the sales are made during December to March, at a subsidized price to commercial millers in cooperation with the FRA (Mason and Myers, 2013). The monthly shares of FRA purchase and sales are presented in Figure 3.

Equation (3) and (4) show a number of determinants that can affect the quantity of FRA sales (supply from the FRA) and FRA purchases (demand from FRA) in district i at time t :

Where is the distance matrix of district to the districts with large millers located, is the quantity of FRA sales of at time t at a nearest miller district m , and is the price at the nearby miller location at time t. is the cost of transportation. The FRA purchase can be modeled as a function of past grain stocks and estimated current excess harvest or total storage target. is the pan-territorial FRA buying price set for the year.

Consider retail maize price as a function of total supply and demand of maize on the market, where FRA purchases affect demand and FRA sales affect supply, as is shown in equation (5). Without the FRA, we would expect prices to be lowest at harvest in surplus production regions, and to increase by the cost of storage throughout the year. Through arbitrage, we would expect the price in the main consumption districts to be the price of South African maize plus transport price. But with a pan-territorial FRA purchase price, we would expect the purchase price of maize to increase in production areas and see a smoothing effect between markets or over space. Similarly, with the release of FRA stocks during the lean months at subsidized prices, we would expect a smoothing effect price between the consumer region and production region. Also, we would expect that FRA activities would shrink the prices difference between lean seasons and harvest seasons. In other words, they have a smoothing effect over time. Figure 4 shows the spatial distribution of average price during the lean season and harvest season.

Solving a structural model consisting of a system of equations (1) through (5) is difficult both theoretically and empirically. We only observe the quantity of maize harvested once a year on a national level, but our price data covers a broad range of markets in different geospatial areas and are updated at a monthly frequency. Given the data limitation, we follow the approach used in Chapoto and Jayne (2009) and start with a reduced form framework with demand and supply shifters as regressors subject to the availability of data.

We identify the effect of FRA purchases by the assumption that they will have the largest effect in those locations where they buy, and we identify the effect of FRA sales by using the distance-weighting to the locations where those sales are made. Due to the incomplete infrastructure and a lack of market information system, the prices are not perfectly integrated between the primary district markets. Table A1 presents results on price integration analysis. For the six selected district markets from different geographic regions in Zambia, we are seeing at most two cointegration relationships among them from the result of Johansen Co-Integration Trace Test. The trace test is conducted on the original price data since the unit root test presented in Table A2 suggest the price series of six selected markets are stationary in levels. The test results suggest that prices in district markets far away from the primary production and consumer centers are not fully integrated with price movements with other markets.

We apply a vector of weather measures in the previous growing season as exogenous supply shifters to the maize harvested by smaller holder farmers, since the actual quantity of maize supplied is endogenous to maize prices. We use local market weather as controls in the main specification and use weather shocks in the production region and the average weather shocks in the entire country as part of the robustness checks. By adding in the market fixed effect and month fixed effect in the model, we can compare regions that are less affected by FRA purchases and sales as controls (both unaffected by price arbitrage or by the FRA purchases) to reflect the effect of stockholding policy.

With all these factors considered, we estimate a reduced form model (equation 6) to evaluate the effects of FRA purchase and FRA sales on price levels and price stability. Using a standard panel approach, we control for unobserved or unmeasurable heterogeneity within each district market that do not vary over time.

where Yit is price and price deviations at district i at time t, and are the quantity bought and sold by the FRA (usually they do not occur at the same time), is a vector of weather variables from the previous growing season, is a vector of other covariates of demand and supply shifters, and is a random error term. The coefficient of interest throughout the paper is , the effect of FRA purchase on the prices and for the effects of FRA sales. The price deviations variable is generated by the squared term of the deviation from the long-term average price of each district. We employ district fixed effects models to control for unobserved time-invariant factors that might affect food production and food prices such as the geographical location and climate associated with it. We control for seasonal effects by adding month dummies in the model.

The potential problem with the above regression is that the current FRA purchases and FRA sales, are endogenous to current prices, . As is discussed earlier, the OLS estimator of the coefficient of FRA purchase would underestimate since the purchases are typically made in places of surplus maize and price tend to be more stable. At an extreme, the estimated coefficient on FRA sales might be the opposite of what we expect them to be, if not attenuated to zero.

Inspired by the policy design, we come up with instrumental variables for actual purchases and sales by using predicted purchase and sales targets from the Crop Forecast Survey (CFS). Every year (except for the 2010/2011 marketing year), the Central Statistics Office of Zambia surveys during in the spring before harvest, to get an estimate of the local production for the major districts. The CFS collects a nationally representative sample to get an estimate of national harvest and are used as references for setting goals for FRA purchases quantity and FRA purchase price. By analyzing the CFS data, we get an estimate of the harvest before the actual harvest for each year.

We use an instrument for FRA purchases by using the interaction term of long-run shares of production for each district and the expected total crop harvest to capture the annual purchase targets. The share is calculated as the average share of production in a specific district as a percentage of national harvest from 1999 to 2011. We believe this instrument to be valid because the policy design makes the estimated production relevant to FRA purchase behaviors, but not the instrument does not affect prices in a particular year directly. Since we are interacting the production with long-run averages shares, the instrument is not strongly correlated to a specific year’s harvest and hence not impacting the current local supply of maize directly. ~~Also, the CFS estimate may not be entirely accurate in terms of actual harvest and hence not strongly correlated with the current prices.~~

We instrument for distance-weighted FRA sales at a district by using predicted FRA stock, weighted by the number of millers in each district and by the distance to the nearby districts with millers. The validity of this instrument lies in that the estimated FRA stock is dependent on long term shares and are not strongly associated with shocks to food prices in a particular year. Distance to districts with milling companies are also relatively exogenous and tend to stay the same during the 5-year study period. Figure 5 is a map of predicted FRA purchase and sales in each district markets.

1. **Data**

The empirical application is based on the following data. First, we use monthly Zambia maize prices observed from Jan. 2003 to Dec. 2008 from 32 different markets that spread out in different geolocations in Zambia (a map of markets shown in Figure 3). There are considerable variations in the markets, including food demand, population, food production and cost of transportation. Price data were collected by the World Food Program and the Central Statistical Office in Zambia.

We generate measures of agriculturally-relevant precipitation from the Climate Hazards Group InfraRed Precipitation with Station (CHIRPS) dataset (Funk et al., 2015). To measure the effects of weather on agriculture more accurately, we use the total amount of rainfall that fell during the October–April growing season. For the same season, we define the length of the longest dry spell as the number of continuous days with no rain. To measure the beginning of the rainy season, we calculate the number of days after October 1st in which rainfall more significant than 10 mm fell three days out of 5. These three variables are taken from the prior agricultural season to predict food availability for the June/July maize harvest. Temperature data are from the African Drought Monitor, also limited to the maize growing season. We created average temperature during the growing season, growing degree days (number of days where the temp was between 8 to 32 C) and heat days (days temperature greater than 30 C) following Deschênes and Greenstone (2007). The weather measures used in this paper are more accurate and complete compared to only using precipitation as in Dorosh (2009) and Chaopoto and Jayne (2009).

In this study, we use annual Zambia FRA purchases from 2002 to 2009 from different local district markets and monthly national aggregated FRA sales from the FRA. South African prices, net imports from South Africa from Johannesburg Stock Exchange and South African Reserve Bank. Annual production estimates are from the FAO. We got the list of commercial millers working with the FRA from CSO. Table 1 presents summary statistics of the key variables used in the analysis.

1. **Results**

For both of the outcome variable, we estimate four specifications as follows. Model (1) is a fixed effect model, assuming exogeneity on all the regressors. Model (2) is a fixed-effects model with instrumental variables and the estimated coefficient on the variables of interest (FRA purchase and FRA sales) are obtained through two-stage least squares method (2SLS). Model (2) is our main specification and the preferred model because it controls for the endogeneity of various explanatory variables as described above. Models (3) and (4) use the same estimation method on the key variables but are using different specifications for robustness check. Model (3) includes year dummies instead of the weather variables. Model (4) explores monthly variations in the model by including the price of the same district from the previous month in the model. In this specification, most of the annual level control variables are removed by comparing prices from one month to another.

In all the instrumental variables regressions, we use the Anderson-Rubin Wald test to detect under identification of endogenous variables and use the Cragg-Donald Wald F statistic to test whether we have weak instruments. The over-identification test is not necessary since the number of instruments is the same as the number of endogenous variables.

Table 2 presents the regression results of the maize price regressions. As expected, we can see the FRA purchases increases maize price, and FRA sales decrease maize prices across four different model specifications. All the estimates are that the variables of interest are statistically significant. By comparing the OLS estimates (Model (1)) and the IV estimates (Model (2)), we can notice the sharp contrast in the scale of estimated coefficient on the FRA sales variable. When we fail to account for the endogeneity in the sales behavior, the estimated coefficients of the FRA sales variable are attenuated toward zero or even positive with a marginal effect of only -0.467. The 2SLS estimates of the marginal effect on the FRA sales on price is as large as -8.316. In other words, the FE model risks underestimating the true underlying effects of FRA sales in decrease price swings by proving liquidity to the maize market through releasing stocks and subsidizing the price that the farmers are getting. The 2SLS estimates of the marginal effect of the FRA purchase on prices are similar to the OLS estimate, and both are showing a statistically positive effect on the maize prices. To put numbers in perspective, for an averaged purchase quantity of 1000 MT at a district market, the estimated FRA purchases effect raises the mean local prices at 570 ZMK by 1%-3%. We find that, all else equal, the average amount FRA sales help to lower the mean price of maize during the lean seasons by as much as 7% in Lusaka, 3% in Kitwe and decreases towards 0 as the distance to districts with commercial millers increase. The estimated effect of the FRA sales varies across districts, as our FRA sales variable are distance-weighted. The estimates provide us with insights on the spatial difference on FRA sales to prices.

Comparing the estimation results from model (3) and model (4) with our main specification model (2), we can find that the estimates are consistent in signs and significance. Model (3) uses yearly dummies as proxy for weather variables and the estimated coefficient are slightly bigger than the ones in model (2). This shows the omitted variable of weather are positively correlated with the prices by reducing maize supply. Model (4) is essentially a price difference regression by having the lagged price in the regression and the variables measured at the annual level are removed. While the interpretation of the marginal effects of model (4) and model (2) are slightly different, the coefficients are largely consistent with our main specification, suggesting that the relationship between FRA sales and FRA purchase also exists in short term variables between months.

For the control variables, days without rain have a positive and statistically significant effect on prices as they negatively impact maize prices. Mean temperature have a negative and statistically significant effect on the maize prices, showing that when controlling for the number of heat days, higher mean temperature increases grain supplies and decreases maize prices.

Across the three different specifications with instrumental variables in Table 2, the under-identification test and weak instruments test supports the validity of the 2SLS estimates. The values of Cragg-Donald Wald F statistic are larger than 10, indicating that

we can reject the null of no correlation between the endogenous variables and the instrumental variables at 5% significance level. The Anderson canon. corr. LM statistic are larger than the critically value at 1%, indicating that we can safely reject the null hypothesis that the instrumental variables are under identifying the endogenous variables. Associated first stage results of the regressions are presented in Appendix Table A1.

Results on the price deviation variables are presented in Table 3. The model specification and variables in the model are the same as the price regressions presented in Table 2 but regressed on price deviations. We are seeing negative and statistically significant effects of FRA sales on price deviations across all three models of IV regressions, suggesting a stabilizing effect on maize price of FRA sales via releasing grain stocks during the lean season. Similar to the marginal effect estimated on the price regressions, the IV estimator are much larger in scale compared to the OLS estimates. This shows the endogeneity involved in the FRA sales and prices drives the estimate of marginal effect towards 0 and underestimates the stabilizing effect of FRA activities. This might help to explain the results in previous literature that stockholding policy have no significant impact on stabilizing the market when we would expect them to.

Table 4 presents results on coefficient of variation and standard variation as outcome variables.

Table 5 shows results of robustness checks. Column 1 is the result of our main specification, IV regression using local weather measure as control. Column 2 uses national average weather measures as control and column 3 uses the average weather measures in the production region. The coefficients of the variables of interest are close to our main specification in scale. The weather variables make more sense using production region averages in terms of their effects on the prices.

Figure 6 shows the comparison of the historical and simulated price in Mbala and Lusaka. We choose Mbala to represent a market in the production region with lots of FRA purchase but the districts with millers are far away. The simulated price without the FRA activities shows effects of clear effects of pricing raising effects during the time of harvest season in Mbala but few FRA sales effect. We choose Lusaka to represent the consumption region with few FRA purchase. The simulated price without the FRA activities went skyrocketing in month when FRA sales occured.

1. **Conclusion**

Among the wide variety of factors that affect price volatility in staple foods, this paper focuses on the effect of stockholding policy on lessen price instability. Following the previous literature on maize price and policy interventions, the model incorporates the influence of weather-induced production shocks, external market price transmission to separate the influence of the FRA activities. By controlling for the endogenity issues, the model can identify the effect of estimating the effect of FRA purchase and sales on maize price variability and maize price in Zambia.

A few interesting findings are derived from this empirical investigation. First, consistent with Chapoto & Jayne(2009) and Mason and Myers (2013), we find the

FRA activities have a signiciant impact on reducing maize prices and maize price volatity during the lean season and help to support the purchase price that the farmers are getting.

Second, this study finds that failing to control for the reverse caulity in food prices and FRA sales would lead to biased estimates of the marginal effects of FRA activities.

There are limitations to this paper. Due to data limitations, we are analyzing retail maize prices instead of wholesale or farmgate maize price. The actual effect on the prices received by smallholder farmers may be slightly lower than our estimates.

The result of this paper might be of interest to policymakers in the Southern Africa region and to developing countries that are considering public grain reserves as means to stablize the grain markets. A few things to consider: first, is the fiscal impact of building the public grain stock worth it? We are seeing signs of stabilizing grain prices and increases in the price received by smallholder farmers, but we should not ignore the opportunity cost in investing other programs such as subsiding farm inputs and develop better agricultural practices through education and extension. Second, the public stock may have a crowding out effect on the private sector as private traders have less incentive to build stocks on their own. As a result, governments would face a more prominent role on stabilizing the market and then more pressure on the budget. Third, international spillovers might be big as leaks the stabilizing effect to neighboring countries. Fourth, management and transparency matters, late payments to farmers are known to influence the effectiveness on getting more maize from the smallholder farmers.

**References**:

Bellemare, Marc F. 2015. “Rising Food Prices, Food Price Volatility, and Social Unrest.” American Journal of Agricultural Economics 97 (1): 1–21. doi:10.1093/ajae/aau038.

Cammelbeeck, Simon. 2015. “WFP Zambia Country Brief,” no. December: 2. <http://www.wfp.org/countries/zambia/>.

Chapoto, A., Jayne, T.S., 2009. Effects of maize marketing and trade policy on price unpredictability in Zambia. *Food Security Research Project Working Paper* No. 38. Available at: <http://www.aec.msu.edu/fs2/zambia/wp38.pdf>, Accessed March 2019.

Deuss, Annelies. "Review of the performance and impacts of recent stockholding policies." In *Issues in Agricultural Trade Policy: Proceedings of the 2014 OECD Global Forum on Agriculture. Paris: OECD Publishing*. 2015.

Dorosh, Paul A., Simon Dradri, and Steven Haggblade. 2009. “Regional Trade, Government Policy and Food Security: Recent Evidence from Zambia.” *Food Policy* 34 (4). Elsevier Ltd: 350–66. doi: 10.1016/j.foodpol.2009.02.001.

Deschenes, Olivier, and Michael Greenstone. "The economic impacts of climate change: evidence from agricultural output and random fluctuations in weather." *American Economic Review* 97, no. 1 (2007): 354-385.

FEWS NET. 2018. “Production and trade flow map: Zambia maize”, Production and Trade Flow Maps, <http://fews.net/sites/default/files/documents/reports/zm_maize_norm.pdf>(last accessed March 2019).

Fjelde, Hanne. "Farming or fighting? Agricultural price shocks and civil war in Africa." *World Development* 67 (2015): 525-534.

Funk, Chris, Pete Peterson, Martin Landsfeld, Diego Pedreros, James Verdin, Shraddhanand Shukla, Gregory Husak et al. "The climate hazards infrared precipitation with stations—a new environmental record for monitoring extremes." *Scientific data* 2 (2015): 150066.

Gouel, Christophe, and Sébastien Jean. 2012. “Optimal Food Price Stabilization in a Small Open Developing Country.” *The World Bank Economic Review,* Volume 29, Issue 1, 1 January 2015, Pages 72–101, https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/lht018

Govereh, Jones, T.S. Jayne, and A. Chapoto. 2008. “Assessment of Alternative Maize Trade and Market Policy Interventions in Zambia.” *Food Security Research Project Working Paper*, no. 33.

Intal Jr, Ponciano, Leah Francine Cu, and Jo Anne Illescas. 2012. Rice prices and the national food authority. No. 2012-27. *PIDS Discussion Paper Series*.

IMF (International Monetary Fund). Zambia: 2012 Article IV Consultation, IMF Country Report No. 12/200, July (IMF, Washington, DC, 2012). Available at: https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/scr/2012/cr12200.pdf (last accessed March 2019).

Jayne, T. S. "Managing food price instability in East and Southern Africa." *Global Food Security* 1, no. 2 (2012): 143-149.

Mason, Nicole M., and Robert J. Myers. 2013. “The Effects of the Food Reserve Agency on Maize Market Prices in Zambia.” *Agricultural Economics (United Kingdom)* 44 (2): 203–16. doi:10.1111/agec.12004.

Mason, Nicole M., Thomas S. Jayne, and Robert J. Myers. "Smallholder supply response to marketing board activities in a dual channel marketing system: The case of Zambia." *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 66, no. 1 (2015): 36-65.

McCreary, Ian. "Food reserves in India." *Canadian Foodgrains Bank Occasional Paper. Canadian Foodgrains Bank, Winnipeg*, MB (2012).

Minot, Nicholas. 2011. “Transmission of World Food Price Changes to Markets in Sub-Saharan Africa.” *IFPRI Discussion Paper Series* 01059 (January): 1–44.

Montemayor, Raul. "Public Stockholding for Food Security Purposes." *ICTSD Programme on Agricultural Trade and Sustainable Development.* Issue Paper 51 (2014).

Myers, Robert J., and T. S. Jayne. 2012. “Multiple-Regime Spatial Price Transmission with an Application to Maize Markets in Southern Africa.” *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 94 (1): 174–88. doi:10.1093/ajae/aar123.

Nkonde, Chewe, Nicole M Mason, Nicholas J Sitko, and TS Jayne. 2011. “Who Gained and Who Lost from Zambia’s 2010 Maize Marketing Policies?” *Food Security Collaborative Working Papers* 2011 (49).

Ricker‐Gilbert, Jacob, Nicole M. Mason, Francis A. Darko, and Solomon T. Tembo. "What are the effects of input subsidy programs on maize prices? Evidence from Malawi and Zambia." *Agricultural Economics* 44, no. 6 (2013): 671-686.

Scheinkman, Jose A., and Jack Schechtman. "A simple competitive model with production and storage." *The Review of Economic Studies* 50, no. 3 (1983): 427-441.

Sitko, Nicholas J, Antony Chapoto, Steven Kabwe, Solomon Tembo, Munguzwe Hichaambwa, Harrison Chiwawa, Mebelo Mataa, Simon Heck, and Dorothy Nthani 2011. “Technical Compendium: Descriptive Agricultural Statistics and Analysis for Zambia ins upport of the USAID Mission’s Feed the Future Strategic Review.” *Food Security Research Project WORKING PAPER* No. 52 2011 (52): 172.

Sitko, N. J., A. N. Kuteya, and B. Chisanga. "Analysis of the Effects of Maize Trade Restrictions in the COMESA Region on Food Prices and Market Development." *Indaba Agricultural Policy Research Institute* (2014).

Tschirley, David L., and T. S. Jayne. 2010. “Exploring the Logic Behind Southern Africa’s Food Crises.” *World Development* 38 (1). Elsevier Ltd: 76–87. doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2009.09.008.

Tembo, G., Chapoto, A., Jayne, T.S., Weber, M.T., 2009. Fostering agricultural market development in Zambia. *Food Security Research Project Working Paper* No. 40. Available at:  [https://ageconsearch.umn.edu/record/54501/files/wp40.pdf](http://www.aec.msu.edu/fs2/zambia/wp40.pdf) , Accessed March 2019.

Wright, Brian D., and Jeffrey C. Williams. "The economic role of commodity storage." *The Economic Journal* 92, no. 367 (1982): 596-614.

**Table 1. Summary Statistics of Variables**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | Mean | SD | Min | Max |
| **Dependent variables** |  |  |  |  |
| Maize Price (ZMK/ kg) | 573.805 | 182.059 | 235.380 | 1555.600 |
| Price Deviation Squared | 26.094 | 52.641 | 0.000 | 674.143 |
| **Key variables** |  |  |  |  |
| FRA Purchase (MT) | 257.466 | 845.530 | 0.000 | 10310.930 |
| FRA Sales (MT) | 5.122 | 31.832 | 0.000 | 655.875 |
| **Explanatory variables** |  |  |  |  |
| Days without rain | 27.453 | 11.520 | 1.000 | 56.000 |
| Precipitation(mm) | 1068.551 | 197.276 | 550.444 | 1640.263 |
| Precipitation Squared | 1201031 | 55893.1 | 1123675 | 1305399 |
| First Day of rain (days) | 33.292 | 11.703 | 3.000 | 70.000 |
| Mean Temperature (°C) | 24.918 | 0.837 | 23.220 | 27.064 |
| SAFEX Price (ZMK/ kg) | 789.909 | 217.037 | 468.753 | 1279.758 |
| **Instrumental variables** |  |  |  |  |
| **Production Region** |  |  |  |  |
| Predicted purchase target (MT) | 134.695 | 432.409 | 0.000 | 4595.748 |
| Predicted sales target (MT) | 2.017 | 6.716 | 0.000 | 86.699 |

**Table 2: Regression Results of Maize Price**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| Price | FE | FE+IV | FE+IV | FE+IV |
| FRA Purchase | 0.020\*\*\* | 0.031\*\*\* | 0.031\*\*\* | 0.020\*\*\* |
|  | (0.002) | (0.009) | (0.009) | (0.006) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| FRA Sales | -0.458\*\*\* | -7.908\*\*\* | -7.908\*\*\* | -4.531\*\*\* |
|  | (0.092) | (1.491) | (1.491) | (1.004) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Days without rain | 23.376\*\*\* | 19.813\*\*\* |  |  |
|  | (3.262) | (3.058) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Precipitation | 299.684\*\*\* | 249.174\*\* |  |  |
|  | (54.551) | (100.651) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Precipitation Squared | -0.136\*\*\* | -0.113\*\* |  |  |
|  | (0.025) | (0.046) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| First Day of Rain | 5.829\* | 4.523 |  |  |
|  | (2.953) | (5.056) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean Temperature | -16.658 | -112.066\* |  |  |
|  | (29.484) | (59.867) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| SAFEX Price | -0.309\*\*\* | -0.354\*\*\* | -0.354\*\*\* | -0.113\*\*\* |
|  | (0.039) | (0.057) | (0.057) | (0.019) |
| Price Lag |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 0.554\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  | (0.026) |
| N | 2304 | 2304 | 2304 | 2232 |
| Cluster | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 |
| *Anderson canon. corr. LM statistic* | - | 33.262 | 33.262 | 31.851 |
| *Cragg-Donald Wald F statistic* | - | 16.501 | 16.501 | 15.823 |
| *Year Fixed Effect* | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| *Month Fixed Effect* | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| *Market Fixed Effect* | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. \* *p* < 0.10, \*\* *p* < 0.05, \*\*\* *p* < 0.01. Specifications of the models: (1): FE, (2): FE-IV (using weather variables), (3) FE-IV (using year fixed effect), (4) FE-IV (difference in month prices). Cragg-Donald Wald statistic and Anderson-Canon correlation statistic are distributed as chi-squared with degrees of freedom of 1.

**Table 3: IV Regression of Maize Price Deviation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | | (3) | (4) |
| Price | FE | FE+IV | | FE+IV | FE+IV |
| FRA Purchase | 0.004\*\*\* | | 0.005\*\* | 0.005\*\* | 0.002 |
|  | (0.001) | | (0.002) | (0.002) | (0.002) |
|  |  | |  |  |  |
| FRA Sales | -0.047\*\* | | -1.332\*\*\* | -1.332\*\*\* | -0.583\* |
|  | (0.020) | | (0.360) | (0.360) | (0.304) |
|  |  | |  |  |  |
| Days without rain | 7.201\*\*\* | | 6.586\*\*\* |  |  |
|  | (1.879) | | (0.737) |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  |  |
| Precipitation | 121.214\*\*\* | | 112.456\*\*\* |  |  |
|  | (19.270) | | (24.276) |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  |  |
| Precipitation Squared | -0.055\*\*\* | | -0.051\*\*\* |  |  |
|  | (0.009) | | (0.011) |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  |  |
| First Day of Rain | 3.864\*\*\* | | 3.643\*\*\* |  |  |
|  | (0.869) | | (1.220) |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  |  |
| Mean Temperature | 41.693\*\*\* | | 25.036\* |  |  |
|  | (8.244) | | (14.439) |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  |  |
| SAFEX Price | -0.035\*\* | | -0.043\*\*\* | -0.043\*\*\* | 0.003 |
|  | (0.013) | | (0.014) | (0.014) | (0.011) |
| Price Lag |  | |  |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 0.140\*\*\* |
|  |  | |  |  | (0.008) |
| N | 2304 | 2304 | | 2304 | 2232 |
| Cluster | 32 | 32 | | 32 | 32 |
| *Anderson canon. corr. LM statistic* | - | 33.262 | | 33.262 | 27.983 |
| *Cragg-Donald Wald F statistic* | - | 16.501 | | 16.501 | 13.845 |
| *Year Fixed Effect* | No | No | | Yes | Yes |
| *Month Fixed Effect* | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes |
| *Market Fixed Effect* | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes |

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. \* *p* < 0.10, \*\* *p* < 0.05, \*\*\* *p* < 0.01. Specifications of the models: (1): FE, (2): FE-IV (using weather variables), (3) FE-IV (using year fixed effect), (4) FE-IV (difference in month price deviations). Cragg-Donald Wald statistic and Anderson-Canon correlation statistic are distributed as chi-squared with degrees of freedom of 1.

**Table 4. Regression Results of Coefficient of Variation and Standard Deviation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  | CV  (FE) | CV (FE+IV) | CV (FE+IV)) | CV (FE+IV) |
| FRA Purchase | 0.021 | -0.084\*\*\* | 0.013 | 0.006 |
|  | (0.040) | (0.026) | (0.045) | (0.025) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| FRA Purchase \* Rain | -0.002 |  | -0.004\*\* | -0.001 |
|  | (0.001) |  | (0.002) | (0.001) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| FRA Sales | 0.607 | -3.623 |  |  |
|  | (0.500) | (4.424) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Days without rain | 74.019\*\*\* | 59.105\*\*\* | 75.261\*\*\* |  |
|  | (14.086) | (12.099) | (13.537) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Precipitation | 8.794\*\*\* | 9.416\*\*\* | 8.712\*\*\* |  |
|  | (3.010) | (3.435) | (2.748) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Precipitation Squared | -0.003\*\* | -0.003\*\* | -0.003\*\* |  |
|  | (0.001) | (0.002) | (0.001) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| First Day of Rain | -2.699 | 0.376 | 1.494 |  |
|  | (6.246) | (6.163) | (5.806) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean Temperature | 956.631\*\*\* | 482.485 | 560.653\*\* |  |
|  | (233.865) | (451.032) | (225.762) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| N | 192 | 192 | 192 | 192 |
| Cluster | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 |
| *Anderson canon. corr. LM statistic* | - | 3.862 | 117.616 | 118.173 |
| *Cragg-Donald Wald F statistic* | - | 1.570 | 121.753 | 122.453 |
| *Year Fixed Effect* | No | No | No | Yes |
| *Month Fixed Effect* | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| *Market Fixed Effect* | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. \* *p* < 0.10, \*\* *p* < 0.05, \*\*\* *p* < 0.01. Specifications of the models: (1): Coefficient of Variation using FE model, (2): Coefficient of Variation using FE-IV model, (3) Coefficient of Variation using FE-IV model,, (4): Coefficient of Variation using FE-IV model with year fixed effect, Cragg-Donald Wald statistic and Anderson-Canon correlation statistic are distributed as chi-squared with degrees of freedom of 1.

**Table 5. Robustness Checks for Market Center Subsample**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| Price | Whole Sample | Market Center  Subsample | Remote Market  Subsample |
| FRA Purchase | 0.031\*\*\* | 0.029\*\* | 0.043\*\* |
|  | (0.009) | (0.014) | (0.018) |
|  |  |  |  |
| FRA Sales | -7.908\*\*\* | -11.258\*\* | -5.612\*\*\* |
|  | (1.491) | (4.454) | (0.954) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Days without rain | 19.813\*\*\* | 16.743\*\*\* | 23.570\*\*\* |
|  | (3.058) | (5.573) | (3.731) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Precipitation | 249.174\*\* | 225.325 | 273.794\*\* |
|  | (100.651) | (178.678) | (124.593) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Precipitation Squared | -0.113\*\* | -0.102 | -0.125\*\* |
|  | (0.046) | (0.081) | (0.056) |
|  |  |  |  |
| First Day of Rain | 4.523 | 4.279 | 4.643 |
|  | (5.056) | (8.931) | (6.274) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Mean Temperature | -112.066\* | -126.555 | -111.760 |
|  | (59.867) | (112.897) | (71.529) |
|  |  |  |  |
| SAFEX Price | -0.354\*\*\* | -0.351\*\*\* | -0.367\*\*\* |
|  | (0.057) | (0.101) | (0.070) |
|  |  |  |  |
| N | 2304 | 1368 | 936 |
| Cluster | 32 | 19 | 13 |
| *Anderson canon. corr. LM statistic* | 33.262 | 6.711 | 53.141 |
| *Cragg-Donald Wald F statistic* | 16.501 | 3.279 | 27.207 |
| *Year Fixed Effect* | No | No | No |
| *Month Fixed Effect* | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| *Market Fixed Effect* | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. \* *p* < 0.10, \*\* *p* < 0.05, \*\*\* *p* < 0.01. Specifications of the models: (1): Coefficient of Variation using FE model, (2): Coefficient of Variation using FE-IV model, (3) Standard Deviation using FE model, (4): Standard Deviation using FE-IV model, Cragg-Donald Wald statistic and Anderson-Canon correlation statistic are distributed as chi-squared with degrees of freedom of 1.

**Figure 1. Average FRA Purchase by District from 2002/03 to 2009/10**

A picture containing text, map


Description generated with very high confidence

**Figure 2. Map of Major District Markets in Zambia**

A picture containing text, map

Description generated with very high confidence

**Figure 3. Monthly Shares of FRA Purchase and Sales**



**Figure 4. Average Price Distribution by District in Lean Season and Harvest Season**

A close up of a map

Description generated with high confidence

A picture containing text, map

Description generated with very high confidence**Figure 5.** **Map of Predicted FRA Purchase and Sales**

**A close up of text on a white background

Description generated with high confidenceFigure 6. Historical and Simulated Price in Production and Consumption Region**

**Table A1. Result of** **Johansen Co-Integration Trace Test on Six Selected Markets in Zambia**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Null hypothesis | Alternative hypothesis | Trace statistic | 1% Critical value | 5% Critical value | Hypothesized No of Cointegrating Equation(s) |
| r = 0 | r = 1 | 132.98 | 104.2 | 90.39 | None\*\* |
| r <= 1 | r = 2 | 89.14 | 78.87 | 70.6 | At most 1\*\* |
| r <= 2 | r = 3 | 58.55 | 55.43 | 48.28 | At most 2\*\* |
| r <= 3 | r = 4 | 35.09 | 37.22 | 31.52 | At most 3\* |
| r <= 4 | r = 5 | 17.02 | 23.52 | 17.95 | At most 4 |
| r <= 5 | r = 6 | 1.95 | 11.65 | 8.18 | At most 5 |

**Table A2. Augmented Dickey-Fuller Test of Six Selected Markets in Zambia**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Market | ADF statistics | p-value | Order of Integration |
| Lusaka | -4.1233 | 0.01 | Stationary at level, I (0) |
| Mbala | -3.6429 | 0.03595 | Stationary at level, I (0) |
| Kaoma | -4.3723 | 0.01 | Stationary at level, I (0) |
| Solwezi | -3.3507 | 0.07059 | Stationary at level, I (0) |
| Senanga | -3.7543 | 0.0264 | Stationary at level, I (0) |
| Kawambwa | -3.9193 | 0.01831 | Stationary at level, I (0) |

**Table A3. First stage results for Instrumental Variables**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | | (2) | | | (3) | |
|  |
|  | FRA  Purchase | FRA Sales | | FRA Purchase | FRA Sales | FRA Purchase | FRA Sales |
| Predicted Purchase | 1.701\*\*\* | 0.002 | | 1.701\*\*\* | 0.002 | 1.700\*\*\* | 1.701\*\*\* |
|  | (0.023) | (0.002) | | (0.023) | (0.002) | (0.023) | (0.023) |
| Predicted Sales | 0.380 | 0.642\*\*\* | | 0.380 | 0.642\*\*\* | -0.441 | 0.380 |
|  | (1.415) | (0.112) | | (1.415) | (0.112) | (1.453) | (1.415) |
| Days without rain | -0.729 | -0.456 | |  |  |  |  |
|  | (4.395) | (0.347) | |  |  |  |  |
| Precipitation | -397.965\*\*\* | -10.717 | |  |  |  |  |
|  | (148.269) | (11.707) | |  |  |  |  |
| Precipitation Squared | 0.181\*\*\* | 0.005 | |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.067) | (0.005) | |  |  |  |  |
| First Day of Rain | -19.590\*\*\* | -0.462 | |  |  |  |  |
|  | (7.505) | (0.593) | |  |  |  |  |
| Mean Temperature | -236.697\*\*\* | -12.639\* | |  |  |  |  |
|  | (83.165) | (6.567) | |  |  |  |  |
| SAFEX Price | 0.084 | -0.005 | | 0.084 | -0.005 | 0.048 | 0.084 |
|  | (0.083) | (0.007) | | (0.083) | (0.007) | (0.087) | (0.083) |
| Price Lag |  |  | |  |  | -0.109\* | -0.139\*\* |
|  |  |  | |  |  | (0.058) | (0.063) |
| N | 2304 | 2304 | | 2304 | 2304 | 2232 | 2232 |
| R2 | 0.821 | 0.214 | | 0.823 | 0.221 | 0.825 | 0.218 |