Sustainable Improvements in Food Security Policy and Policy Systems for Feed The Future focus countries

Duncan Boughton, Xinshen Diao and Mywish Maredia
Presentation roadmap

• Goal & Objectives
• Approach
• Country-level policy programs
• Global policy research & engagement
• Measuring Results and Progress
• Discussion
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
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Country mission funded programs

• Field support
  – Mali, **Tanzania**, West Africa

• Associate Awards
  – Burma, **Malawi** (Oct 2014)
  – **Senegal, Nigeria** (expected mid-2015)
  – Great Lakes Coffee (expected mid-2015)
  – Mali, **Tanzania** (expected late 2015)

• FSIII Legacy Associate Awards
  – Zambia, **Mozambique**
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
Examples of early country results

Tanzania: evidence-based formulation of specific policy reform proposals for stakeholder review

• New Alliance commitment to reduce or abolish local government taxes on crop sales
• Proposal met with strong resistance from local government authorities (LGAs)
• Study of revenue collection in sample of 25% of LGAs revealed:
  – Wide variation in rates across districts -> distortion in trader purchasing behavior
  – Low and variable efficiency of collection
  – Crop income uncertainty for farmers
• Proposal to reduce, standardize, and improve efficiency of tax collection meeting with stakeholder consensus
Examples of early country results (2)

**Malawi: building capacity for accelerating New Alliance policy formulation, consultation and implementation**

- Government agreed to wide range of reforms to encourage private sector investment in 2013
- Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation allocated responsibility for 24 reforms
- Establishment of a joint FSP/DAPS team to guide stakeholder consultation in 2014
- Following key policies and strategies in active mode:
  - First National Agricultural Policy drafted with broad stakeholder consultation (57 groups 800+ individuals)
  - National Nutrition Policy and Strategy
  - National seed policy and strategic plan
  - Contract Farming Strategy
  - FISP reform policy brief requested by Minister
Examples of early country results (3)

Burma: promoting smallholder crop and livelihood diversification options

• Since independence a history of government pre-occupation with keeping rice prices low for civil servants and military
  – Farmers obliged to grow paddy rice and, until recently, sell quotas at subsidized prices or risk land confiscation
  – Rice became a low profitability – low productivity trap
• Undertook a series of studies to show that smallholder diversification into high value activities need not compete with rice:
  – Pulses became largest crop export following liberalization in 1990s with further potential to grow
  – Study of aquaculture showed that fish farming is fastest growing source of fish protein with insignificant loss of rice production potential
  – Regional study of land and agribusiness to demonstrate that smallholder plantations and/or outgrower schemes are a more effective development strategy than large land concessions
• Mon State regional government has agreed to a household livelihoods study to inform a state level rural economic development strategy
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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
Understanding policy system constraints and capacity building strategies

• Kaleidoscope Model - Multidisciplinary conceptual framework for analysis of policy drivers (see brief)
• Model recognizes policy architecture is country specific, issue specific and dynamic
• Also underway
  – Country case studies of policy implementation
    • Nutrition policy
    • Fertilizer subsidy policies
  – Toolkit for practitioners (to be presented next week)
    • Policy chronologies
    • Stakeholder mapping
Prioritizing policy research and engagement: key risks to Feed The Future objectives

1. Food price increases (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?
Upstream food system transformation: example of emerging findings

- Rural populations highly concentrated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>top 1%</th>
<th>top 5%</th>
<th>top 10%</th>
<th>top 20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East/Central</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- with rural populations continuing to grow options are:
  - intensification
  - Increased share of non-farm income
  - Migration (rural – urban; rural – rural)
Only 25% of unexploited and unforest ed land can be *profitably* exploited by smallholders when access constraints accounted for (Chamberlain et al, 2014)
## Area under control of medium-scale farmers growing faster than small-scale farmers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Large scale</th>
<th>Medium-scale (5-100 ha)</th>
<th>Small-scale (0-5 ha)</th>
<th>Total land controlled</th>
<th>Potentially available cropland remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>= 12.37</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>= 4.16</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>= 6.67</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Jayne et al. 2014 (JIA)
Downstream food system transformation: example of emerging findings

- Extensive analysis of LSMS data sets for Africa shows rapid growth in share of food expenditure on perishable and processed products
  - Rural and urban areas
  - Low income levels as well as middle/high
- Rapid assessment in Dar Es Salaam indicates majority of processed made locally (60%) and a further 20% from neighboring countries (see brief)
- But typical patterns in Asia indicate initial boom in SME’s followed by consolidation as economies of scale in processing and distribution emerge
- Raises questions about employment profile of the processed food sector as demand expands
Policy questions related to downstream food system transformation

• Implications for raw material supply (food safety, crop diversification)
• Implications for dietary impacts (more fat, salt versus more protein and micronutrients)
• What policies can facilitate employment growth in sector without jeopardizing competitiveness?
• Implications for Feed The Future country value chain investments?
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Why measure results?

• Build evidence base
• Accountability
• Learning: Improvement of policies / implementation
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

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
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)
Measuring progress along the pathway

• 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
Measuring Strategic Results of FSP (i.e., Outputs)

Examples of indicators:
1. Published outputs
   - Research papers/policy briefs
   - Data sets
2. Direct engagement with decision makers and stakeholders
   - Briefings
   - Presentations
   - Newspaper articles
3. Review and analysis of policies and programs
4. Capacity building events, activities, engagements
   - Workshops, webinars, internships, training
Measuring Sub-intermediate Results of FSP (i.e., short-term outcomes)

Institutional **CAPACITY** development
- Institutions where trained individuals are applying new practices
- Private sector and civil society organizations assisted to participate in policy formulation process

Evidence of **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 **CHANGE** in processes, behavior and actions by decision makers
- Public-private policy and enabling environment consultations held
- Programs established/discontinued/modified
- Laws and regulations developed/modified
- Strengthening, coordination and inclusiveness of policy processes
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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](http://fsg.afre.msu.edu/fsp/index.htm)
ANNEX: Operationalization of 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
## Metrics for measuring FSP’s output indicators (Examples)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Number of policy research and best practice papers generated</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quantitative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Venue of publication (to assess reliability, credibility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Content (type of information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Applicability (number/scale of decisions or decision makers to which the information is applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Qualitative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Venue or type of audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Content (type of information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Applicability (number/scale of decisions or decision makers to which the information is applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Number of stakeholder learning forums (national or regional) held where findings/best practices are presented</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quantitative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Venue or type of audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Content (type of information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Applicability (number/scale of decisions or decision makers to which the information is applicable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Metrics for measuring FSP’s intermediate outcome indicators (Examples)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Examples of metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Qualitative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Numbers of new legal frameworks/Regulations/ Administrative Procedures/institutional systems developed or existing frameworks/procedures/systems revised to promote policy change agenda</td>
<td>Number of times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Type of policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Level and type of anticipated impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Number of demonstrated uses by policy makers of findings and other outputs generated through USG support in policy, strategy, or program documents</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Type of demonstrated use (i.e., documents of policy deliberations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Type of decision makers influenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Degree of influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number/scale/magnitude of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number/scale/size of population to be potentially impacted by the change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Examples of metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Index (or scorecard) of enabling policy environment</td>
<td><strong>Average score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(as measured by stakeholder evaluation and representative surveys)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using a standard instrument to capture stakeholder perspective on policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment, and level of satisfaction and confidence in the implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of policy changes)</td>
<td>This is a <em>qualitative</em> metric that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relies on semantic ratings based on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>observation and judgment of individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>representing major stakeholder groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It captures individual’s perspective on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>policy environment, and level of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>satisfaction and confidence in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strengthening, coordination and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inclusiveness of policy processes and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the implementation of policy changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>