

## Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS)

**SPS LOCATION:** Program Element EG.3.1: Agricultural Enabling Environment

**INITIATIVE AFFILIATION:** Global Food Security Strategy – CCIR 5: More effective governance, policy, and institutions

**INDICATOR TITLE:** EG.3.1-d Number of milestones in improved institutional architecture for food security policy achieved with USG support [Multi-Level]

### DEFINITION:

This performance indicator measures the *number of milestones in improved institutional architecture for food security policy reform*. **Institutional architecture** (IA) broadly refers to “the entities and processes for policy formulation and implementation”<sup>18</sup>. More specifically, this indicator refers to institutional architecture 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) and at different levels (e.g. regional, national, sub-national) as well as the processes through which these organizations interact towards a common food security goal (such as through inter-ministerial processes, scorecard reviews, or decentralization). A **milestone** 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. **Food security policy**, in this context, includes policies that affect food security, such as policies in agriculture, nutrition, social safety nets, etc.

Operating Units (OUs) will be the primary reporting unit for this indicator. The OU will be responsible for setting milestones and targets, specifying timing, and reporting achievements. OUs should report milestones completed across GFSS partners facilitated with USG funding. The milestones should align strategically with country or stakeholder priorities. Support or assistance for the IA achievement may be provided by the OU, through Implementing partners, or other USG support. OUs will use internal planning documents and work with IPs and other stakeholders (e.g. government) to set targets. Milestones will be reported through a separate template and will identify the type of USG support provided, how the milestone improves IA, stakeholders receiving support, successes and/or lessons learned, and will provide evidence supporting achievement of the milestone.

The indicator is designed to be inclusive at different levels, including sub-national, national, regional and international, in both institutions and processes to capture a wide variety of potential changes in the policy making and implementation process. The milestones specified should fit within one or more of the six core IA policy elements that have been defined as important for a robust food security policy institutional architecture<sup>19</sup>. Further descriptions of the Policy Elements are found in the attached document.

### IA Policy Elements

- **Policy Element 1: Predictability of the Guiding Policy Framework** –the effectiveness of the legislative process and the extent to which the relevant laws, regulations, and policies governing the policy development process are 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).

<sup>18</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>19</sup> Africa Lead. Institutional Architecture Assessment for Food Security Policy Change: Background Information. <https://www.africleadff.org/2016/05/24/guidelines-for-conducting-institutional-architecture-assessments/>

- 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>20 21</sup>. Data collected for this indicator across different levels will contribute to an improved understanding of the importance of policy 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.

**UNIT:**  
Number

**DISAGGREGATE BY:**  
Level: Subnational, national, regional, continental and international level

IA policy element: Predictability of the Guiding Policy Framework, Policy Development and Coordination, Inclusivity and Stakeholder Consultation, Evidence-based Analysis, Policy Implementation, Mutual Accountability

<sup>20</sup> Most recent arguments and evidence can be found in ‘Why Nations Fail?’ by D. Acemoglu and J. Robinson, Decker Edge, 2012.

<sup>21</sup> IFPRI. Global Food Policy Reports.

<i>TYPE: Outcome</i>	<i>DIRECTION OF CHANGE: N/A</i>
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES</b>	
➤ <i>LEVEL OF COLLECTION</i>	Various levels within an Operating Unit (e.g. national, sub-national, etc.)
➤ <i>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:</i>	Country Post staff
➤ <i>DATA SOURCE:</i>	Data will be collected by relevant OU officers engaged in the activities supporting the IA achievement. Supporting evidence for milestones will be submitted in a standard reporting template (to be provided prior to first year reporting).
➤ <i>FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:</i>	Annual
➤ <i>BASELINE INFO:</i>	Zero - assumes no achievements in base year.
<b>REPORTING NOTES</b>	
<p><i>FTFMS DATA ENTRY NOTES:</i></p> <p>This indicator requires documentation to be included in an OU IA template. The template will be submitted with the policy matrix for FTF target countries. Unique milestones can be disaggregated by more than one level and policy element. The total number of unique milestones should also be included in the disaggregate section of FTFMS.</p>	

<b>IA Policy Elements &amp; Illustrative Sub-elements</b>
<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.