

## Additional Guidelines for Reporting on Feed the Future Indicator

### EG.3.1-d: Milestones in improved institutional architecture for food security policy achieved with USG support [Multi-Level]

#### Purpose of the Document

This document was prepared to provide additional information on the Feed the Future indicator **EG.3.1-d Milestones in improved institutional architecture for food security policy achieved with USG support**, a new Feed the Future indicator introduced to capture actionable, forward steps towards achieving policy objectives under the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS).

**EG.3.1-d Milestones in improved institutional architecture for food security policy achieved with USG support** is an annual indicator required for USAID Operating Units (OUs) that are active in the policy sphere (see the Performance Indicator Reference Sheet for this indicator in Annex 1). OUs are responsible for identifying milestones achieved or pursued during the reporting year from relevant sources, collecting the required information about these milestones, and filling out the reporting table for submission into FTFMS. Hence, the data collection and reporting requirements of this indicator differ from other annual indicators and will require additional time and coordination for OUs to fulfill them.

This document presents three different ways a Mission can go about identifying milestones and collecting the required information to report for this indicator. It also clarifies the relationship between this indicator and the policy matrices for GFSS Target Missions.

#### An Overview of the Indicator

Two concepts are framing this indicator and should be defined. The **Institutional Architecture** refers to a country's (or other meaningful entity) capacities and processes to undertake policy formulation and implementation<sup>1</sup>. A **milestone** is defined as a 'positive change' that marks a significant achievement in the development of better performing, more effective policy systems and describes how the change contributes to improved policies on agriculture, nutrition, resilience and other related areas that affect food security. This change should be achieved with significant, concerted USG support.

---

<sup>1</sup> For more information of what institutional architecture is within the context of the Global Food Security Strategy, see the Policy Technical Guidance document, on Agrilinks: <https://www.agrilinks.org/post/guidance-and-tools-global-food-security-programs>.

Because this indicator is about the capacity and processes to advance specific policy objectives and promotes policy alignment around sector priorities and investments, it has a solid programmatic foundation and can lend itself to annual monitoring and reporting. However, the indicator cannot be quantitative as merely reporting on the number of actions would be meaningless: some actions can take a lot of time to accomplish, while others are quicker to complete while requiring similar amount of attention and resources. And the context matters a great deal. So the indicator is 'descriptive' rather than quantitative. However, to maintain its intrinsic value as an indicator, EG.3.1-d requires information that is concise, standardized, and time-bound. To help with the collection and reporting of this information, a template table was developed. This template is available on the FTFMS Resource page<sup>2</sup>.

The Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS), found in Annex 1<sup>3</sup>, provides definitions and more details on the reporting requirements of this indicator (the reporting template also provides some information on the information requested in the form of comments linked to the column headings). In particular, drawing from a methodology developed to conduct assessments of the institutional architecture in a country, milestones can contribute to one or more of six domains – or policy elements – that are key for an effective policy institutional architecture. These six elements are: 1. Predictability of a Guiding Framework; 2. Policy Development and Coordination; 3. Inclusivity and Stakeholder Consultation; 4. Evidence-based Analysis; 5. Policy Implementation; 6. Mutual Accountability. More details of what these six domains are, including a list of sub-elements that can be expected under each domain, can be found in Annex 2 of this document.

## Proposed Approaches to Identifying Milestones and Collecting Data

There are several approaches to identifying IA milestones; three approaches are described here: 1. Strategic analysis of the agri-food policy system; 2. IA changes to support prioritized policies and policy agenda (e.g. policy matrix); 3. IA changes at the local or sector-specific level.

### **1. Strategic analysis of the AFS Policy System.**

Ideally milestones emerge from a systematic analysis of the agri-food system (AFS) policy process in the country or area where the USG is working. The analysis would include a landscape or mapping of stakeholders and an analysis of their capacity to perform their role and function in the policy system. For example, institutional architecture assessments (IAAs) were designed to map and assess the policy system in FTF countries.<sup>4</sup> Other types of analytical frameworks can be useful in providing an assessment, such as the Political Economy Analysis

---

<sup>2</sup> The FTFMS resource page for FY19 is located at: <https://www.agrilinks.org/ftfms>

<sup>3</sup> The PIRS for indicator EG.3.1-d is included in the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook, available on Agrilinks (<https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook>)

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.agrilinks.org/post/institutional-architecture-assessment-food-security-policy-change>

(PEA) framework<sup>5</sup> and the Institutional Architecture Assessment, Prioritization and Planning Toolkit (IA-APP Toolkit), which has been used recently for a self-assessment of the policy system in Tanzania, Uganda, Kenya and Senegal<sup>6</sup>.

### 1.1 Examples of Milestones

- Steps toward the development, refresh, or improvement of a National Agriculture Investment Plan, including:
  - Participation of the private sector in the NAIP review process
  - Finance Ministry review of the NAIP budget
  - Government budgeting for NAIP refresh
- Developing the capacity of executive or legislative branches to understand AFS context and issues, including:
  - Parliamentary staff briefings and trainings
  - Agriculture/livestock/fisheries Ministry monitoring and evaluation trainings
- Establishing mechanisms to promote AFS regulatory harmonization, including:
  - Regulatory body coordination for Sanitary, Phytosanitary Standards (SPS), biotechnology, or seeds systems
- Improving the functionality of donor working groups or dialogue between the USG and country government ministries and offices or other stakeholders
- Building knowledge platforms across three regulatory agencies operating in the food safety arena
- Training journalists in reporting on agriculture and food policy
- Establishing implementing partner policy dialogue groups, partnerships, or policy management platforms to facilitate improved coordination across policy stakeholders

### 1.2 Proposed Steps to identify Milestones under Approach 1

- Look for recent AFS assessments (e.g. enabling environment studies, Doing Business, IAAs, AFS PEAs, etc.) and consider efforts in agriculture, nutrition, resilience, etc. to address capacity and commitment objectives set forth in CDCSs, Democracy and Governance programs, etc.;
- Support a national IAA, PEA, or the equivalent if there has not been a recent assessment of AFS policy processes;
- Draw together resources (people and documents) from Activities with a food security policy component (agriculture, nutrition, water, governance, environment and climate smart agriculture, land, natural resource management, trade, or multisectoral Activities);
- Consider the six elements identified for policy institutional architecture to determine if you are investing in change in any of these areas;

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/applied-political-economy-analysis-pea-reference-materials>

<sup>6</sup> [https://www.africleadftf.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/IA\\_APP-Toolkit-Brief-4-26-19.pdf](https://www.africleadftf.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/IA_APP-Toolkit-Brief-4-26-19.pdf)

- Identify milestones achieved or pursued during the reporting year and fill the IA Indicator Template.

## **2. IA changes to support Prioritized Policies**

Milestones can be, or might have been, identified through a strategic exercise to prioritize and describe policy results, such as the GFSS policy matrices. In Feed the Future phase one, focus countries developed policy matrices, many of which were refreshed or newly developed for GFSS target countries. Interagency policy teams are tasked to review the policy priorities and identify how the policy system will be or might need to be strengthened in order to achieve the policy results.

Most current policy matrices have explicit results identified under Policy Area 7: *Institutional Architecture and Mutual Accountability*, which should include prioritized improvements for the policy system. Reporting under indicator EG.3.1-d would reflect policy results and actions in Policy Area 7 for countries with policy matrices, as these actions, necessary to achieve results, are clearly milestones toward changes in the food security policy system. For example, priorities identified for Policy Area 7 often include the successful development of a National Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (NAIP), a multisectoral nutrition plan, or the development of effective data systems.

GFSS aligned countries may not have a policy matrix, but may have a document outlining their main policy objectives and priorities. If a Mission has a policy document, it would be an obvious place to start identifying IA milestones as intermediary steps achieved or being pursued towards effecting food security policy system changes.

### **2.1 Examples of Milestones**

- To achieve the policy result “The Ministry of Agriculture implements a successful and transparent budget process”, the following milestones could be pursued:
  - Train the Ministry budget officers in accounting software
  - Support coordination meetings between officers developing work plans and the Ministry accounting staff
  - Facilitate adoption of new accounting software
- To achieve the policy result “Improved compliance with Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standards”, the following milestone could be pursued:
  - Broaden participation in public dialogue through public forums on SPS standards
- To achieve the policy result “Fertilizer regulations implemented and enforced”, the following milestone could be pursued:
  - Support the development of a forum for national fertilizer stakeholders, such as the National Fertilizer Council, National Fertilizer Advisory committee, and national farmer associations

### **2.2 Proposed Steps to identify Milestones under Approach 2**

- Organize a meeting bringing together the Interagency Policy Team involved in the policy matrix development or any other strategic policy document guiding the policy engagement of the Country Team and any partners involved in supporting the achievement of these results;
- Review the priority policy results identified in the document (related to Policy Area 7 in particular) and consider the intermediate actions or changes that were achieved or are being actively pursued in support of this result;
- Identify milestones achieved or pursued during the reporting year and fill the IA Indicator Template.

### **3. IA changes at the local or sector-specific level**

Institutional architecture at the local level can be critical in the policy system landscape. Weak local government capacity in service provision, for instance, can hinder field activities such as value chain interventions that are operating at the local level. Therefore, these activities often include a “policy” component to address these constraints. Results under these policy components embedded in an agriculture, nutrition, market systems, or resilience project are important sources of milestones that are often overlooked. Other GFSS activities are tasked to build the capacity of organizations (public or private) involved in the development or implementation of policy, regulations, or certification (of particular importance for land, natural resource management, sanitary-phytosanitary standards, or export certifications). Their work plans will typically identify milestones or intermediate steps that are used to track progress or their M&E plan will include a custom indicator to report on results. Hence work plans or quarterly and annual reports from these implementing partners can be sources of information to identify IA milestones achieved or pursued in the past year.

#### **3.1 Examples of Milestones**

- Providing training to a provincial government on improving their tax collection system
- Supporting the establishment of an M&E system at the district level
- Supporting the computerization of a licensing process
- Providing training to local land councils on land dispute resolution
- Supporting the establishment of a coordination structure for stakeholders in vulnerable or conflict areas

#### **3.2 Proposed Steps to identify Milestones under Approach 3**

- Bring together AORs/CORs and their Implementing Partners of Activities that have a “policy component” as part of their strategy, or are supporting institutional or organizational capacity;
- Explain what IA and milestones are and what the indicator is intended to capture;

- Solicit input on their policy actions of the past fiscal year and agree on what can be considered milestones achieved or pursued;
- Collect the required information to fill in the IA Indicator Template.

## Reporting through the Feed the Future Monitoring System (FTFMS)

Indicator 3.1-d should be reported on by **Operating Units** (Missions and BFS/RFS units) and not by Implementing Mechanisms (IMs). This decision was made to capture the broad set of USAID investments towards improving the institutional architecture, obtain a ‘curated’ set of milestones that represent priority actions, and avoid duplicate entries.

The following describes recommended steps for reporting on this Indicator in the Feed the Future Monitoring System (FTFMS).

1. Log on to your FTFMS account and go to the “Enter Indicator Data” page. Select your OU and under the “Implementing Mechanism” drop down menu, select “High-level indicators”. Click on the Go button.

The screenshot shows the FTFMS interface. At the top, there's a blue header with the logo and navigation links. Below the header, there's a navigation menu with 'Enter Indicator Data' highlighted. The main content area has several sections: '+ Search', '+ Special Instructions', '- Screen Instructions', and '+ Export/Print'. The '- Current Selection' section contains dropdown menus for 'Reporting Organization: USAID', 'Bureau: Africa', 'Operating unit: Senegal', 'Prime Partner: All', and 'Implementing Mechanism: High-level indicators - Senegal'. The 'Implementing Mechanism' dropdown is highlighted with a green box and a downward arrow. A 'Go' button is highlighted with a green box and a right-pointing arrow.

2. Select “EG.3.1-d: Milestones in improved institutional architecture for food security policy achieved with USG support” from the “Indicator” drop down menu. Enter 1 if you are uploading a table with the required information and 0 otherwise.

- Current Selection

Reporting Organization: USAID  
 Bureau: Africa  
 Operating unit: Senegal  
 Prime Partner: All  
 Implementing Mechanism: High-level indicators - Senegal

Go

---

High-level indicator data

Indicator: EG.3.1-d: Milestones in improved institutional architecture for food security policy achieved with USG support [MT] Calculate totals  
 << Go to Previous Indicator Save

Indicator / Disaggregation	2019 Deviation Narrative	2019 Comment	Baseline Year	Baseline Value	2019		2020	2021	2022
					Target	Actual	Target	Target	Target
EG.3.1-d: Milestones in improved institutional architecture for food security policy achieved with USG support [MT-level] <small>This indicator does not have a quantitative component. It is reported via a standard table with the required information, as described in the PIRS, concerning the milestones achieved during the reporting year. A template table can be downloaded from https://www.agrilinks.org/firms (see bottom right under the 'Templates &amp; Instructions' section). Upload the completed table under 'Other Reporting Documents' on the 'Enter or View Narratives' screen, along with additional documentation and supporting evidence. On this screen, enter '1' if a table is uploaded, to alert reviewers to go to 'Other Reporting Documents' to download the information.</small>	Add	Add							
Have you uploaded a table with milestone information? If yes, enter '1'; If no, enter '0'.				1 or 0					

- To upload a table, go to “Enter or View Narrative” from the main menu, click on the “Other Reporting Documents” tab, and then on the “Upload file” link on the left hand side. Follow the prompts to upload the table.

FEED THE FUTURE Feed the Future Monitoring System Help | About | Log Out

Welcome, [User Name]

**Enter or View Narratives**

+ Search

- Screen Instructions  
 For more information on entering or viewing narratives, please reference page 26 of the 'Screenshot Instructions' manual.

+ Export/Print

- Current Selection

Reporting Organization: USAID  
 Bureau: Africa  
 Operating unit: Senegal  
 Prime Partner: All  
 Implementing Mechanism: High-level indicators - Senegal

Go

Performance Narratives | Planning Narratives | **Other Reporting Documents**

Name	Last Modified On	Last Modified By
<b>Upload File</b>		

## Annex 1: Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS)

<b>SPS LOCATION:</b> Program Element EG.3.1: Agricultural Enabling Environment <b>INITIATIVE AFFILIATION:</b> Global Food Security Strategy – CCIR 5: More effective governance, policy, and institutions
<b>INDICATOR TITLE:</b> EG.3.1-d Milestones in improved institutional architecture for food security policy achieved with USG support [Multi-Level]
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b></p> <p>This performance indicator reports on <i>milestones in improved institutional architecture for food security policy achieved</i>. <b>Institutional architecture</b> (IA) broadly refers to “the entities and processes for policy formulation and implementation”<sup>7</sup>, and more specifically in this case to those for food security policy. IA for food security policy reflects both the capacity of specific types of organizations (such as ministries, policy think tanks, citizen interest groups and district governments) operating at different levels (international, regional, national, or sub-national) and the processes through which these organizations interact towards a common food security goal (such as through inter-ministerial processes, scorecard reviews, or decentralization). A <b>milestone</b> is a ‘positive change’ that marks a significant achievement in the development of better performing, more effective policy systems and describes how the change contributes to improved policies and policy outcomes within a GFSS country or regional plan. <b>Food security policy</b> is multi-sectoral and interdisciplinary, and includes policies on agriculture, nutrition, resilience, and other related areas that affect food security.</p> <p>Operating Units (OUs) are the primary reporting unit for this indicator. OUs should report milestones achieved during the past fiscal year with USG funding. OUs are responsible for identifying the relevant milestones achieved working with their implementing partners, donor coordination groups, inter-agency committees, and other stakeholder fora. The milestones should align strategically with country or stakeholder priorities.</p> <p>A milestone can relate to changes in organizations and processes leading to improved policy making and implementation at various levels: sub-national or local, national, regional, or international. It is expected that Washington-based OUs will report on milestones that are at the international, regional, or national levels; regional OUs will report on milestones that are at the regional or national levels; and bilateral OUs will report on milestones that are at the national or sub-national levels; although there can be exceptions.</p> <p>There are six core IA policy elements that are considered key for a robust food security policy institutional architecture<sup>8</sup>. These core IA policy elements are described below and in more detail in annex 1. The milestones reported should fit in one or more of these policy elements. These elements are not mutually exclusive and some overlap exists between them.</p> <p>Milestones should be reported annually in a table (see template on Agrilinks), with the following information provided in a concise way for each milestone achieved: brief description of the milestone; the timeline i.e., the fiscal year the milestone is achieved; the level of implementation (see paragraph above); what primary and secondary (if more than one) IA policy element the milestone can be associated with; where does the milestone fit within USG strategic objectives; what was the role of the USG support; what stakeholders were supported in achieving the milestone; and what source(s) of information is available to document the milestone. Although this indicator reports milestones achieved in the past year, the template allows some flexibility to also list milestones the OU is actively working on but are yet to be achieved. In this case, the timeline column should reflect the fiscal year when the OU expects the milestone to be achieved. These milestones should be recorded year after year in the annual reporting table until they are achieved. If a milestone was dropped, a quick explanation as to why it was dropped should be provided in the “Notes” column.</p> <p><b>IA Policy Elements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Policy Element 1: Predictability of the Guiding Policy Framework</b> –the effectiveness of the legislative process and the extent to which the relevant laws, regulations, and policies governing the policy development process are</li></ul>

<sup>7</sup> GFSS Implementation Guidance for Policy Programming  
([https://feedthefuture.gov/sites/default/files/resource/files/GFSS\\_TechnicalGuidance\\_Policy.pdf](https://feedthefuture.gov/sites/default/files/resource/files/GFSS_TechnicalGuidance_Policy.pdf))

<sup>8</sup> Additional background information and resources are available on the Feed the Future website:  
<https://www.feedthefuture.gov/resource/global-food-security-strategy-technical-guidance-on-policy-programming/>

transparent, predictable and consistently applied.

- Illustrative Milestones: Establishment of parliamentary access to food security expertise; Comment period for draft law established; Citizen groups have regular and reliable access legislative processes and documentation.
- Policy Element 2: Policy Development and Coordination – the capacity and effectiveness of the organizations and entities to initiate and develop food security policy and the strengthening of the relationships among these entities.
  - Illustrative Milestones: Facilitation of the formation of a joint sector food security committee in the Prime Minister's office (national); a regional protocol for coordinating staple food data (regional level); Planned schedule of meetings between Planning, Finance and Agriculture Ministries; Intergovernmental coordination forum established and operational (e.g. meets regularly, shares information, takes decisions).
- Policy Element 3: Inclusivity and Stakeholder Consultation – the degree of inclusivity in consultation with key groups critical to the food security sector and the extent to which the different groups are engaged, including groups across government, the private sector and among non-governmental organizations.
  - Illustrative Milestones: Concerted efforts resulting in farmer association membership in an apex society (sub-national level), support to a representative civil society association focused on food security priorities (sub-national/national); Civil society and producer group platform for input to agricultural policy and program development; Joint sector review (JSR) committee established; inclusive policy dialogues formalized.
- Policy Element 4: Evidence-based Analysis – the capacity and effectiveness of the organizations, processes, and fora responsible for collecting and analyzing data, and the extent to which evidence is used to inform or revise policy change.
  - Illustrative Milestones: Improved dissemination of agricultural data across multiple Ministries; Improved timeliness and availability of food security-related surveys and survey analysis; Public access to data on performance of the agriculture and food security sectors (e.g. dashboard monitoring systems; website data publication).
- Policy Element 5: Policy Implementation – the detail of implementation plans, alignment with line ministry and agency responsibilities, adequate funding, and quality of monitoring and evaluation plans
  - Illustrative Milestones: Improved budget justification for policy implementation; resources allocated for programs commensurate with objectives; Capacity of local government authorities to implement programs strengthened; Monitoring system for program and policy impacts established.
- Policy Element 6: Mutual Accountability – the effectiveness of the process by which multiple partners (such as government, donors, private sector and civil society organizations) agree to be held responsible for the commitments that they have voluntarily made to each other. It relies on trust and partnership around shared agendas. Mutual accountability is supported by evidence that is collected and shared among all partners. The principle of mutual accountability is expected to stimulate and broaden the practice of benchmarking, mutual learning and harmonization of national development efforts, while encouraging a greater level of trans-boundary cooperation and regional integration.
  - Illustrative Milestones: CAADP Joint Sector Review successfully completed; Donor mapping tool providing input on donor investments available; Joint metrics established for monitoring food security performance.

**RATIONALE:**

A country's capacity to undertake transparent, inclusive, predictable, and evidence-based policy change is fundamental to improving food security outcomes. Investing in strengthening a country's IA for food security policy is a GFSS priority as it provides a foundation for building the systemic capacities for managing a multi-sectoral food security program. The importance of good governance and accountable institutions in delivering on predictable and transparent policy change is widely recognized<sup>9, 10</sup>. Data collected for this indicator will contribute to an improved understanding of the importance of policy

<sup>9</sup> Most recent arguments and evidence can be found in 'Why Nations Fail?' by D. Acemoglu and J. Robinson, Decker Edge, 2012.

<sup>10</sup> IFPRI. Global Food Policy Reports.

IA and will be used in conjunction with other policy-related GFSS data to identify relationships between the policy system and policy changes. This indicator provides an opportunity to track the types of milestones and achievements OUs are delivering to improve systems, processes, and relationships that influence food security policy. This indicator is linked CCIR 5: More effective governance, policy, and institutions of the Global Food Security Strategy.

<p><b>UNIT:</b></p> <p>1/0 (if a table is available or not)</p>	<p><i>DISAGGREGATE BY (disaggregates on table only; not on indicator screen)</i></p> <p><u>Level:</u> Sub-national; national; regional; and international</p> <p>IA policy element: Predictability of the Guiding Policy Framework; Policy Development and Coordination; Inclusivity and Stakeholder Consultation; Evidence-based Analysis; Policy Implementation; Mutual Accountability</p>
---	--

<p><i>TYPE: Outcome</i></p>	<p><i>DIRECTION OF CHANGE: N/A</i></p>
-----------------------------	--

**MEASUREMENT NOTES**

<p>&gt; <i>LEVEL OF COLLECTION</i></p>	<p>Sub-national, national, regional, or international</p>
<p>&gt; <i>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:</i></p>	<p>Country Post staff and BFS</p>
<p>&gt; <i>DATA SOURCE:</i></p>	<p>Data will be collected by relevant OU/Country Post/BFS officers engaged in activities supporting IA achievements</p>
<p>&gt; <i>FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:</i></p>	<p>Annual</p>
<p>&gt; <i>BASELINE INFO:</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>

**REPORTING NOTES**

**FTFMS DATA ENTRY NOTES:**

This indicator does not have a quantitative component. It is reported via a standard table with the required information concerning the milestones achieved during the reporting year. A template table can be downloaded from Agrilinks or from the indicator data entry screen in FTFMS. The completed table should be uploaded in FTFMS under “Other Reporting Documents” on the “Enter or View Narratives” screen. Additional documentation and supporting evidence should also be uploaded under “Other Reporting Documents”. In the data entry screen, OU should enter 1 if a table was uploaded and 0 if not, to alert reviewers to look into “Other Reporting Documents” to download the information.

## Annex 2: Institutional Architecture Policy Elements & Illustrative Sub-Elements

<b>Policy Element 1: Predictability of the Guiding Policy Framework</b>
<b>Clearly Defined and Consistent Policy Framework:</b> The policy framework impacting food security policy-making is clearly defined, and consistently applied and enforced from year to year.
<b>Predictability and Transparency of the Policy Making process:</b> The policy development process is transparent in accordance with the rules contained within the country's constitution, basic law, and elsewhere in the formal legal framework.
<b>Clear and Functional Legislative System:</b> There is a legislative capacity to deal with food security change, and the legislative requirements are clearly defined and predictable.
<b>Appropriate Dispute Resolution Process/Judicial Framework:</b> The judicial system is perceived as fair and effective, and there is an appropriate system for dispute resolution where conflicts arise relating to food security policy.
<b>Clearly defined Institutional Responsibilities:</b> Institutional responsibilities are clearly defined, consistently applied, and predictable from year to year.
<b>Policy Element 2: Policy Development &amp; Coordination</b>
<b>Approved Food Security Strategy/Investment Plan:</b> There is an approved/official multi-sectoral, multi-year food security plan developed, which specifies priorities and objectives, and addresses the roles of various contributors, including across government, the private sector, and CSOs. The vision and strategy to improve food security is clear.
<b>Predictable Policy Agenda and Priorities Developed:</b> The policy items required to achieve the national food strategy have been identified and documented, i.e., specific policy objectives exist.
<b>Annual Work Plans:</b> There is an annual work plan that identifies objectives and activities in regard to policy development.
<b>Coordination Process:</b> There is an entity, such as a coordination unit or task force, that has defined membership and meets regularly to discuss, develop and coordinate food security policy development (and oversee cross-sector coordination).
<b>Secretariat/Administrative Support Function:</b> There is an adequate staff capability to perform required support processes, including coordination, meeting management, communication, and document management. This may be a stand-alone secretariat, or a responsibility within an existing entity.
<b>Technical Capacity:</b> There are work groups, or technical committees, that have the authority and capacity to perform the following functions: identify policy and technical challenges/issues, develop sector- or project-specific policies/strategies, consult within the sector and draft funding proposals. There should be active participation by the private sector and CSOs on the technical work groups (as appropriate).
<b>Political Support and Approval:</b> There is a line of authority/participation by high-level decision-makers above the ministerial level so as to enable efficient political support for the passage and development of new policies, e.g. involvement of prime minister's office (especially for policies that cut across sectors, e.g. trade and agriculture).
<b>Engagement of Parliament/Legislative Body:</b> There is engagement from the country's legislative entity to debate and engage on food security issues, and to sponsor and advocate for the required legal/policy changes.
<b>Policy Element 3: Inclusivity and Stakeholder Consultation</b>
<b>Inclusive Participation within the Policy Coordination Management Entity:</b> The main coordination entity has: a) clear goals and participation from key government ministries (beyond just Ministry of Agriculture) and; b) some representation from non-government entities, particularly from donors.
<b>Outreach and Communications:</b> There is a process for interacting with stakeholders and sharing information. This could include regular public "forums", a website of key information and other mechanisms.
<b>Private Sector Participation – Opportunity/Space:</b> The private sector is provided meaningful opportunity to participate in policy formulation and strategy discussions. This could be through participation in the management/steering committee, in technical work groups and/or through other forums. Communications and interactions should be two-way, and access to key information should be readily available.
<b>Private Sector Participation – Capacity to Participate:</b> Some organizations representing the private sector have the capacity to participate in government-led discussions on food policy. This is to say they are able to represent their members, they are able to articulate and communicate policy positions, and they are able to provide some level of evidence-based analysis to support their viewpoints.
<b>Participation of CSOs – Opportunity/Space:</b> The CSO sector, including representation from women's associations and farmers associations, is provided meaningful opportunity to participate in policy formulation and strategy discussions. This could be through participation in the management/steering committee, in technical work groups and/or through other forums. Communications and interactions should be two-way, and access to key information should be readily available.
<b>Participation of CSOs – Capacity to Participate:</b> Some organizations representing civil society, including representation from women's associations and farmers associations, have the capacity to participate in government-led discussions on food policy. This is to say they are able to represent their members, they are able to articulate and communicate policy positions, and they are able to provide some level of evidence-based analysis to support their viewpoints.
<b>Policy Element 4: Evidence-based Analysis</b>
<b>Economic and Financial Analysis Completed as a Component of Planning:</b> National food security priority policy initiatives/investment plans are based on economic and financial analysis, including independent policy analysis. The analysis is available for public review.
<b>Performance Monitoring Measures and Targets Developed:</b> The national food security policies/plans include specific objectives, performance indicators, and targets exist to monitor the accomplishment of the objectives.
<b>Quality Data Exists for Policy Monitoring:</b> There is a database of quality statistics that is used to routinely report and analyze progress in achieving objectives. (Analysis to be conducted by USDA – and not as part of this assessment framework.)
<b>Quality Data is Available for Policy Making:</b> Data on the performance of the agriculture sector and the food security are publically available and

shared in a timely manner. This information is available for others to use and analyze.
<b>Inclusion of Analysis in the Policy Development Process:</b> Evidence-based analysis is considered and used to develop policy priorities/policy proposals.
<b>Capacity to Monitor Policy Implementation and Results:</b> The government has the ability to review data on policy performance and produce an analysis of the policy's effectiveness. A policy analysis function/unit exists and has adequate and skilled staff, and is sufficiently funded. If required, specific analysis can be outsourced to specialized firms or consultants as needed (case-by-case).
<b>Annual Performance Measurement Report Produced and Reviewed:</b> Evidence-based analysis is produced to review policy effectiveness (for implemented policies). A formal review session is held, and includes key development partners (including principal donors and multilateral partners, such as FAO and IFPRI). Recommendations are developed as a result of the review and incorporated into subsequent plans.
<b>Independent Analysis Capacity Exists:</b> There exists an independent capacity to analyze food security data and use the analysis to make policy recommendations and engage in policy discussion and advocacy. Such an analysis could be conducted by a research institute, university or similar non-governmental/objective organization. This capacity should be engaged in the government's policy development and review process as, for example, through papers, forums or participation introduced in official policy review and discussion meetings.
<b>Policy Element 5: Policy Implementation</b>
<b>Implementation Plans Developed:</b> The overall food security strategy has been broken down into programs and projects that have: a) a sufficient level of detail to permit implementation; b) have been "packaged" into priority projects that can be managed by ministerial units; and 3) "packaged" priorities can be translated into funding proposals to gain support for projects/programs from development partners (to address financing gaps).
<b>System in Place to Analyze Implementation Capacity Constraints:</b> An analysis of institutional, workforce, system and financial constraints is conducted. Critical implementation constraints are identified; a work plan is developed to address constraints; and implementation actions are moved forward (and periodically reviewed).
<b>Food Security Policy Priorities Aligned with Work Plans of Line Ministries:</b> The priority policy and associated objectives of the national food security strategy are broken down into specific programs and projects (with a sufficient level of detail) so that policy actions can be implemented by line ministries. The plans of individual ministries, and units within ministries, align with overall national strategy and its policy objectives.
<b>Policy Implementation Budget Committed by Host Country:</b> Resources are committed by the host country to implement the identified policy agenda. Over time, the country's budget is adjusted to provide adequate financing for the implementation of actions required to implement policy priorities. Budget documents, including budget proposals, are released fully and in a timely manner.
<b>Supplemental Implementation Funds Secured:</b> Proposals can be submitted, and funds secured, to address financing gaps. Funds may come from multilateral funds (such as GAFSP), regional organizations, bilateral donors and the private sector.
<b>Monitoring and Evaluation:</b> Capacity exists within the public sector, private sector, or civil society to review the effectiveness and impact of policy changes. Sector reviews are performed and other research evidence is collected. There is a system to share, store, and access the findings from these reviews.
<b>Policy Element 6: Mutual Accountability</b>
<b>A Forum Exists for Regularly Scheduled Donor-Government Meetings:</b> These meetings discuss policy and programs and set priorities. Meetings may include, for example, Joint Sector Reviews, sector working groups or other similar arrangements.
<b>Joint Policy Priorities Developed:</b> A document exists that articulates the shared policy objectives between the government and the donor community.
<b>Monitoring System Exists:</b> Performance measures exist (for the performance commitments of the government and for the performance commitments of the donors). There is a schedule for reviewing and documenting progress – at least on an annual basis.
<b>Donor Coordination – Alignment and Harmonization:</b> There is a process for donor participation in the food security policy process and for aligning government and donor objectives and priorities. Donor programs should contribute directly to host country strategies, plans, and objectives. This may include the signing of cooperation frameworks that indicate a joint commitment to specific policy change goals.
<b>Private Sector Accountability:</b> The government provides feedback to the private sector on the performance of the food security program (including the private sector's role) and provides an opportunity for dialogue on the program and its performance.
<b>CSO Sector Accountability:</b> The government provides feedback to the CSO sector on the performance of the food security program (including the role of CSOs) and provides an opportunity for dialogue on the program and its performance.