

# Final Narrative

## Global Development

Use this form to provide your final update to your foundation program officer regarding the results achieved for the entire project. In addition, please provide your perspective on key lessons learned or takeaways and input on the foundation's support of your work to ensure that we can capture and share learnings as appropriate both internally and externally.

The Final Narrative must be submitted in Word, as PDFs will not be accepted.

### General Information

Investment Title	Guiding Investments in Sustainable Agricultural Markets in Africa (GISAMA)		
Grantee/Vendor	Michigan State University, Department of Agricultural, Food, and Resource Economics, Food Security Group		
Primary Contact	Thom Jayne,	Investment Start Date	10/1/2008
Feedback Contact <sup>1</sup>	Thom Jayne	Investment End Date	9/30/2013
Feedback Email <sup>1</sup>	jayne@anr.msu.edu	Reporting Period Start Date	1/1/2012
Program Officer	Greg Traxler	Reporting Period End Date	9/30/2013
Program Coordinator	Randy Shigetani	Reporting Due Date	12/31/2013
Investment Total	\$4,450,484	Opportunity/Contract ID	OPP51352
Scheduled Payment Amount (If applicable)	\$ NA		

<sup>1</sup> Feedback Contact/Email: The full name and email of the contact whom foundation staff queries for various surveys.

### Submission Information

Date Submitted	January 31, 2013	Submitted by Contact Name	Dr. Thom Jayne
		Submitted by Contact Title	Professor, International Development, Lead GISAMA P.I.
		Submitted by Contact Email	jayne@anr.msu.edu
		Submitted by Contact Phone	(517) 432-9802

## Progress and Results

### 1. Final Progress Details

Provide information regarding the entire investment's progress towards achieving the investment outputs and outcomes. In addition, submit the Results Tracker with actual results as requested.

See attached file: "GISAMA milestones-final Jan 2014.xlsx"

### 2. Location of Work

Provide the final list of countries and regions/states where this work has been performed and associated dollar amounts. If location of work includes the United States, indicate city and state. Add more locations as needed.

Location	Foundation Funding (U.S.\$)
USA	2,415,509
Zambia	934,114

Mali	378,459
Kenya	253,262
Mozambique	137,310
Malawi	73,346
South Africa	65,015
Senegal	48,927
Burkina	38,395
Zimbabwe	32,150
Rwanda	14,079
Brazil	11,359
Tanzania	9,506
Uganda	7,214
Ethiopia	6,517
France	2,139
Angola	2,137
Chad	634
Benin	634
Beijing	593
<b>Total Grant Amount</b>	<b>\$4,431,300</b>

### 3. Geographic Areas to be Served

Provide the final list of countries and regions/states that has benefitted from this work and associated dollar amounts. If areas to be served include the United States, indicate city and state. Add more locations as needed.

Location	Foundation Funding (U.S.\$)
Southern Africa	1,862,643
Eastern Africa	1,085,932
West Africa	322,089
Zambia	332,232
Kenya	356,564
Malawi	106,813
Mozambique	233,238
Mali	131,790
<b>Total Grant Amount</b>	<b>\$4,431,300</b>

#### 4. Lessons Learned

Describe the top one to three takeaways or lessons learned from this project.

Substantive takeaways:

- Market access conditions for smallholder farmers are considerably better now than they were 10 years ago. Most smallholder farmers sell their surplus production to traders who come directly to their farms to buy the product.
- Smallholders' low surplus production (for most) is due to insufficient productive assets and insufficient management ability to produce a surplus, hence continuation of a semi-subsistence situation and low incomes from farming.
- A very small proportion of small-scale farmers are successful breaking out of the barriers of semi-subsistence agriculture and graduating into medium-scale farming stature. This should not represent inherent limitations of smallholder farmers but rather the limited public sector support for smallholder farmers in terms of enabling policies and public expenditures to agriculture, which are often captured largely by medium-scale and large-scale farmers.
- Market information system success does not depend on whether the system is based in a private or public sector institution so much as it depends on incentives of the staff members and capacity to innovate.
- Many current private sector initiatives are still donor funded and sustainability remains a key question.
- In Mozambique, maize farmers gain higher prices when reliable and regular price information is available and returns to MIS investments are high, due to low marginal costs of operation.
- In Mali, women traders retail and local wholesale market for potatoes and tubers (82% of traders) as well as horticultural markets (73% of traders), while participating strongly in fish markets (53%).
- Word of mouth dominates sources of current information for all traders in Mali in the perishables sectors evaluated, although cellphones are mentioned; radios are the main source of weekly information.
- Women traders in perishables in Mali are particularly interested in getting more information on transport facilities and prices and quantities in other markets; male traders are more interested than women in storage facilities and regional trade information; and all traders needing more information on credit opportunities.

Policy engagement process takeaways:

- Incorporating African analysts and African institutional collaboration into the design of research activities from the very beginning increase policy makers' receptivity to the findings.
- Putting the African institutions in the front of research and outreach activities, with international researchers playing a supportive background role also increases the likelihood of policy impact
- There may not be a large number of concrete policy changes that we can point to from GISAMA, but the one or two that we have documented are estimated to have resulted in private investment in the agricultural systems of Africa that exceed the amount of funding under the GISAMA grant by over 40-fold.

#### 5. Feedback for the Foundation

Provide one to three ways the foundation successfully enabled your work during this project. Provide one to three ways the foundation can improve.

The BMGF has been a highly supportive and constructive partner under GISAMA. The project has seen three managers over its life (Sherry-Lee Abrahams, Ellen McCullough, and Greg Traxler. All three have been an absolute pleasure to work with – supportive, engaged, committed, and often providing constructive guidance and ideas that have contributed to the effectiveness of the grant.

The reporting requirements are also just about right in our view – not excessive or stifling and yet sufficient for our grant managers to have a good handle on the progress, challenges, limitations, and achievements of our activity. The protocol that we established to have monthly management calls for periodic updates was also very useful from our standpoint. Half-way through the grant, the frequency of these management calls with the BMGF managers transitioned to once every 2 months as the challenges transitioned from planning and design to implementation.

#### 6. Subgrants

If your grant agreement (not applicable to contracts) is subject to expenditure responsibility and permits you to make subgrants to organizations that are not U.S. public charities or government agencies/instrumentalities, please complete the [Subgrantee Checklist](#) and attach a copy with this progress narrative for each such subgrantee.

**Note to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation: See the attached files:**

- "Subgrantee Checklist COMESA\_final.docx"
- "Subgrantee Checklist GRAF\_final.docx"
- "Subgrantee Checklist IFPRI\_final.docx"
- "Subgrantee Checklist IIAM\_final.docx"
- "Subgrantee Checklist Purdue\_final.docx"

## 7. Updated Budget Template

Unless otherwise directed by foundation staff, please use the Actual Costs & Expected Funding tab on the budget template to report total expenditures against the most recent foundation-approved budget. Provide the requested information regarding payments received, interest earned on grant funds, expenditure of interest earned, and unexpended balance. Also, provide updated information on the Geography & FX Estimates tab in the Reporting & Reforecasting section of the budget template for Location of Work, Geography Served, and Currencies. Please follow the instructions in the budget template carefully and let your program officer know if you have any questions.

Note: If you received your grant prior to July 2010 or used our old budget template to create your grant budget, please use the Total Budget page of the final budget spreadsheet provided in your proposal to specify actual expenditures for the period for each line item. Please insert a column for actual expenditures, variance, and percentage. For variances that exceed 10 percent in either direction in the Total Cost category (i.e. Total Personnel, Total Supplies, Total Equipment), please describe these in Section Seven of the narrative report.

**Note to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation: See table and explanations below in 9. Budget Variances.**

Also, please update the geographic information for your work using the [Grantee Geography Reporting Request](#).

**Note to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation: Please see the attached file: "grantee\_geography\_reporting\_request GISAMA Jan 31 2014.docx"**

## 8. General Budget Progress

**Describe the general progress of meeting budget expectations, including where the project progressed as forecasted (or reforecasted) and where it did not.**

There were several extensions of the grant period beyond its original date. There was also a funding supplement in 2012 to carry out new work that was closely allied to (and identified in the course of carrying out) the scope of work of the main GISAMA activities.

These modifications obviously required some modifications of the budget as time frames changed and new scopes of work were added. In Year 1, expenditures were substantially lower than budgeted, mostly due to the time lags in setting up sub-agreements, and the time that it took to work out details of implementation for each activity. We appreciated the Foundation's flexibility in allowing MSU to extend its activities over a longer time period to adapt to the Year 1 delays.

I offer a few reflections as the main GISAMA Principal Investigator (Jayne) which may or may not necessarily reflect the views of the wider GISAMA team. First, the grant resulted in quite a number of insights about the ways in which African farmers relate to markets, what is working well, what isn't and why. These insights have been picked up by other researchers in Africa and (I believe) are influencing in many indirect ways how African agricultural development challenges are being understood by African researchers and policy makers. Second, we can point to few aspects in which agricultural policies have been concretely changed as a result of the GISAMA grant. However, policy impact may occur due to GISAMA in the future as its research findings and outreach activities have influenced thinking (we would like to believe), and hence indirectly contribute to positive changes that may occur (or the avoidance of adverse policy actions that might otherwise have been taken). I am heartened by the extent to which GISAMA-funded research has found its way into citation lists of African scholars who are directly advising African governments. In such indirect ways, GISAMA may have important influences on agricultural policies in the years to come, though documentation may be difficult to trace through existing impact assessment methodologies. Third, wherever possible, it would be advantageous to ensure as much African ownership as possible in the implementation of grants to achieve "policy impact". However, international organizations involved in the research can both help build capacity of collaborating African organizations, and play an important quality control role in the analysis. Finally, we are aware of potential self-censorship issues arising among African policy institutes, who may feel pressure from governments not to be "critical" of their actions. There are various ways in which governments can and do exert pressure on fledgling local policy institutes. These need to be recognized and addressed in order for African policy institutes to effectively play their envisaged roles.