Peer Review Plan

Preliminary Title: Productivity Growth and the Revival of Russian Agriculture

Type of Report (ERR, EIB, EB, TB, SOR): ERR

Agency Contact: Cindy Nickerson, cnickerson@ers.usda.gov

Subject of Review: Russia’s agricultural growth fell during the transition that began in the early 1990s from a planned to a market economy, but has rebounded strongly since the late 1990s. The production increase was a driving force behind Russia reducing its large imports of meat and other livestock products and becoming a major grain exporter. By the 2011-14 period, Russia was supplying 12 percent of world wheat exports. Yet the causes of the resumed growth are unclear. Has the revival of Russia’s agricultural growth been due to the adoption of new agricultural technologies and practices, stimulating growth in total factor productivity (TFP)? If so, which districts are driving national TFP growth, and in which commodities are they specializing? To answer these questions, the report examines Russia’s agricultural productive efficiency. Specifically, it evaluates agricultural output, input, and TFP growth trends at the national and district levels. Because Russia’s districts have responded in different ways to the new agricultural opportunities following the transition to a market economy, a sub-national evaluation of productivity growth is critical to understanding Russia’s agricultural revival.

Purpose of Review: The purpose of the review is to ensure the high-quality of the economic analysis, transparent explanation of methods, objective interpretation of results, and effective communication to the intended audience.

Type of Review: [X] Individual Reviewers

Timing of Review (Est.): Start: 07/25/16 End: X/X/16 Withdrawn: X/X/16

Number of Reviewers: [X] 4 to 10

Primary Disciplines/Types of Expertise Needed for Review: Economists

Opportunities for Public Comment? [X] Yes
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How:

When:

Peer Reviewers Provided with Public Comments? [X] No
Public Nominations Requested for Review Panel? [ ] Yes [X] No