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Presentation roadmap: how are we doing in relation to....

- Goal & Objectives
- Approach
  - Partnerships
  - Program component synergies
  - Cross-cutting issues
- Country-level policy programs
- Global policy research & engagement
- Measuring Results and Progress
To promote inclusive agricultural productivity growth, improved nutritional outcomes, and enhanced livelihood resilience through improved policy environments.
Objectives

1. Address critical evidence gaps for informed policy debate and formulation at country, regional and global levels.

2. Foster credible, inclusive, transparent and sustainable policy processes at country level.
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Partnership approach

• USAID Bureau of Food Security
  – Resources, framing, coordination, dissemination

• Consortium partners
  – IFPRI Strategy and Governance Division
  – University of Pretoria Ag Econ
  – MSU Ag, Food and Resource Econ Dept
  – > each brings access to internal partners

• Feed The Future partners
  – Innovation Labs, Africa Rising, MEAS
  – Africa Lead, Rutgers consortium

• Regional and Country partners
  – AU, RECs, Re-SAKSS
  – Ministries, think tanks, universities, civil society
Country level support for policy change

Field-level collaborative research and policy analysis

Capacity building for policy

Focus countries: Burma, Malawi, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal, Tanzania

Policy systems analysis

Global research on policy processes & capacity

Policy research and engagement

Engage in global policy debates (land, inputs, food system transformation)

Strategic analytical support to USAID
Cross-cutting issues

• Nutrition
  – Specific focus of policy system analytics (case studies of nutrition policy change)
• Gender
  – Gendered analysis all studies
  – Specific gender component to nutrition case studies
• Climate change
  – Proposed collaboration with IFPRI EPTD Impact 3 model at country level yet to be realized

Need a structured peer review process of research outputs to assess whether incorporating X-cutting issues effectively
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Country mission funded programs

• Field support
  – Mali, Tanzania, West Africa

• Associate Awards
  – Burma, Malawi (2014)
  – Senegal, Nigeria, Great Lakes Coffee (2015)
  – Mali (2016)

• Under preparation
  – Tanzania buy in

• Under discussion
  – Zambia, Mozambique, Malawi (phase 2)
Country Level organizational models

• Project office with linkages
  – Mali, Nigeria, Mozambique
  – NARO / university / Ministry linkages

• Think Tank embedded
  – Burma, Zambia, Mozambique
  – Host institute national champion lead

• Ministry embedded
  – Tanzania, Malawi, Senegal
  – Trusted national as TA lead
  – Ministry leadership in setting policy agenda
Country level capacity building

• Building up: partner capacity
  – In house courses (Zambia, Burma)
  – One on one mentoring

• Building out: system capacity
  – University capacity (Tanzania, Mozambique, Nigeria)
  – Civil society (Burma, Malawi)
  – Journalists (Malawi, Tanzania)

• Strengthening regional connectivity (peer learning)
  – Re-SAKSS, Agrodep, ReNAPRI
Country level outputs, outcomes, success stories

Two questions to consider:

1. What is most useful format for documenting country level achievements for external evaluation?
   - accessible and informative format
   - useful to broad range of stakeholders
   - manageable burden for country teams

2. Engagement strategy with next generation CAADP investment plans and Malabo targets?
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Understanding policy system constraints and capacity building strategies

• Kaleidoscope Model for analysis of policy drivers

• Country case studies of policy implementation
  • Nutrition policy; Fertilizer subsidy policies

• Toolkit for practitioners
  • Policy chronologies; Stakeholder mapping

• Maputo meeting of country and global research teams and next steps
Prioritizing policy research and engagement in a structural transformation lens

1. Food price increases and instability (driven by demographics, income and climate change) pose risk to the poor, who often spend over 50% of income on food.

2. Youth employment: in Africa 20 million new jobseekers will enter the workforce annually while growing land pressure limits farm employment opportunities.
Key evidence gaps to inform policy to mitigate food price/employment risks

• Understanding upstream transformation
  – Land access and farm size transformation
  – Input policies and sustainable intensification

• Understanding downstream transformation
  – Urbanization and diet change
  – Food processing and employment linkages

  – > implications for productivity and employment?
  – > implications for policy change to enhance +ve or mitigate –ve trends?
  – > yet to be addressed are trade policy implications
Arriving in your inbox soon...(1)

• Land studies
  – Malawi in final draft for circulation and national seminar planned for April (data accessible August 2016)
  – Mozambique data cleaned and three papers identified for preparation (data accessible January 2017)
  – Preparatory field for land study in Tanzania under way in collaboration SUA
  – Senegal land study in planning phase
Arriving in your inbox soon...(2)

- **Downstream transformation studies**
  - Urbanization and food security roundtable in DC
  - Fourth Policy Research Brief (this from Nigeria) on processed foods inventories (2 in Tanz, 1 Moz)
  - **Retail surveys** in Tanzania and Mozambique hitting the ground this quarter, followed by **processor surveys**
  - **Poultry and feed mill surveys** in Nigeria over next two quarters
  - At least four multi-country thematic papers linking diet change to employment, nutritional outcomes, retail transformation
  - Active country outreach to inform policies and strategies to encourage agribusiness development in Moz and Tanz
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Why measure results?

- Accountability
- Learning: Improvement of policies / implementation
- Build evidence base
Measuring Results of FSP

- USAID’s Feed the Future Results Framework serves as the cornerstone of FSP’s approach to measuring its success, and monitoring its progress along the impact pathway.
FSP’s Results Framework

Sub-Intermediate Results

Outcome: Implementation and enforcement of new policies, programs, regulations

Sub IR 1.3: Better policy environment

Sub-Sub IR 1.3: Better policy formulation process

Sub-IR 1.1: Enhanced institutional capacity development

Strategic Results (Outputs)

SR1: New information, knowledge, and practices
SR2: New datasets
SR3: Knowledge dissemination and learning events
SR4: Policies, programs, and regulations reviewed and analyzed
SR5: Human resource capacity building

FSP Activities (Input)
FSP’s Results Framework

Overall goal and first level objectives

FLO 1: INCLUSIVE AGRICULTURAL GROWTH
FLO 2: IMPROVED NUTRITIONAL OUTCOMES
ENHANCED LIVELIHOOD RESILIENCE FOR MEN AND WOMEN

Intermediate Results

IR1: Increased agricultural productivity
IR2: Improved market access and trade
IR3: Increased public and private investment
IR4: New rural non-farm and farm employment
IR5: Improved smallholder resilience

Sub-Intermediate Results

Outcome: Implementation and enforcement of new policies, programs, regulations

Sub-IR 1.3: Better policy environment

Sub-Sub IR 1.3: Better policy formulation process

Sub-IR 1.1: Enhanced institutional capacity development
The Results Framework serves as a basis to identify different types of indicators to monitor progress along the continuum in achieving two objectives of FSP:

- Improved capacity
- Improved policy
FSP’s M&E plan

- Each of the output and outcome indicators has multiple dimensions (i.e., quantitative and qualitative) in which it is being measured quarterly (but reported annually)
- The FSP Leader award has identified 16 customized and FTF indicators which are tracked and monitored along both these dimensions (quantitative and qualitative)
- A sub-set of these indicators are also tracked at the country level (i.e., Associate Awards), including the index indicators that measure the quality of policy processes and institutional architecture through stakeholder surveys
Measuring Strategic Results of FSP (i.e., Outputs)

Examples of indicators:
1. Published outputs
   - Research papers/policy briefs (39)
   - Data sets (12)
2. Capacity building events, activities, engagements (44)
   - Workshops, webinars, internships, training (12)
3. Institutional CAPACITY development
   -- Institutions where trained individuals are applying new practices (7)
   -- Private sector and civil society organizations assisted to participate in policy formulation process (8)
3. Direct engagement with decision makers and stakeholders (i.e., ministries, parliament) (2)
   -- Briefings
   -- Presentations
4. Review and analysis of policies and programs (9)
Measuring Sub-intermediate Results of FSP (i.e., short-term outcomes)

Evidence of \textbf{USE} of information by decision makers (\(?)\)

- Citation and reference to research outputs by decision makers in policy debates, board meetings, legislative assemblies, etc. and in materials generated from such deliberations
- Personal testimonies and subjective assessment of decision makers on the value and influence of specific project output in his/her decision making

Evidence of \textbf{CHANGE} in processes, behavior and actions by decision makers (\(1\))

- Public-private policy and enabling environment consultations held
- Programs established/discontinued/modified
- Laws and regulations developed/modified
- Strengthening, coordination and inclusiveness of policy processes
Review the monitoring data? Why bother? We're going fine.

Remember M&E information is useful only if it is used!
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Food Security Policy: Contact Information

USAID Activity Manager:
David Atwood
Bureau for Food Security
US Agency for International Development
Washington, DC
datwood@usaid.gov
Phone: 202-712-4496
www.feedthefuture.gov

Food Security Policy Program Director:
Duncan Boughton
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI
boughton@msu.edu
Phone: 517-432-6659

Food Security Policy Program Deputy Director:
Xinshen Diao
International Food Policy Research Institute
Washington, D.C.
xdiao@cgiar.org
Phone: 202-862-5600

The University of Pretoria Program Leaders:
Sheryl Hendriks and Johann Kirsten
sheryl.hendriks@up.ac.za
johann.kirsten@up.ac.za
Phone: +27 12420 3811/3248

Project web site:
http://fsg.afre.msu.edu/fsp/index.htm