Policy Priorities: Reporting on Policy Change Webinar, October 30, 2018
Introduction and Overview

Chris Shepherd-Pratt, BFS/ARP Policy Lead
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Overview & Introduction
Importance of Policy to GFSS-FTF Objectives and Past Performance
Measuring Country Policy Performance
Monitoring Performance of the Country Policy System (Institutional Architecture)
Importance of Policy for GFSS-FTF
Components of Successful Policy Change

Policy = Laws, regulations, treaties, statements, administrative actions and funding decisions

Global Food Security Strategy Policy Elements

- Country-led
- Evidence-based
- Effective national investments
- Improved enabling environment

Prioritized Agenda

Institutional Architecture

- Inclusive Dialogue
- Predictable policy making
- Strengthened policy institutions

Mutual Accountability

- Transparent
- Regular review
- Multi-stakeholder
Policy in the GFSS Framework

GOAL: Sustainably reduce global hunger, malnutrition and poverty

OBJECTIVE 1
Inclusive and sustainable agriculture-led economic growth

OBJECTIVE 2
Strengthened resilience among people and systems

OBJECTIVE 3
A well-nourished population especially among women and children

CC IR 5 More effective governance, policy, and institutions

Policy Goal: Implementation of Improved National, Regional and Global Policies that Enable the Transformation of Food Systems

Policy IR 1:
Institutional Architecture Transformed

Policy IR 2:
Significant Changes in Prioritized Policies

Policy IR 3:
Continuous Policy Improvement and Responsiveness through Mutual Accountability Systems

Policy IR 4:
Foresighting, Thought Leadership and Service Delivery

=> Contribution to sustainable development through more stable, transparent and inclusive systems
Importance of Policy to Feed the Future Objectives

INCLUSIVE AGRICULTURAL GROWTH IS THE MOST EFFECTIVE PATHWAY TO REDUCE POVERTY

- Significant contributions to resilience, nutritional outcomes, and other top-line FTF goals
- Strengthening policy systems and policy implementation remain the primary catalyst for accelerating agricultural growth and transformation in Feed the Future countries.

POLICY IS ESSENTIAL TO NATIONAL LEVEL CHANGE AT SCALE

- Key element of A/AID Self-Reliance: a country’s “ability to plan, implement, finance” own development
- Impact beyond Zone of Influence (want significant level of change - scaling up...)
- Private Sector Engagement Policy: Policy/EE essential to attract private finance
- Systems change/sustainability (sustainable development requires EE conditions)
Agriculture and Food Security Transformation and Role of Policy

WHAT IS AGRICULTURAL TRANSFORMATION? Change in nature of ag and broader economy
- *share* of agriculture in economy *declines* (despite continued absolute growth)
- *off-farm activities* (inputs, marketing, processing, convenience food) increase in importance
- agri-food system expands: *non-production sectors growing* as proportion of total AFS (FTFMS performance indicator $\text{AgGDP}^+$ designed to reflect transformation of AFS system)

PATHWAYS/OUTCOMES OF TRANSFORMATION DEPEND ON POLICY CHOICES:
1. Public sector investment choices across ag research, infrastructure, education, etc.
2. Government policy toward creating an enabling environment for the private sector and incentivizing investment
3. Choices around social protection, safety nets, managing risk, etc.
Why is Policy Important?

Top-tier CAADP countries accelerated their agricultural growth and their agriculture sectors are now 3 times the size of other African countries.
Policy for Self-Reliance

=> Everyone contributes to strengthening policy systems to deliver on behavioral change and people-level impact:

1. Across sectors - agriculture, nutrition, resilience, governance, water, etc.
2. National- and sub-national level policy development, reform and implementation
3. ZOI level policy implementation as demonstration and problem solving
4. Engagement of citizens in policy process - inclusive systems

- Policy change takes time => specifying intermediate policy steps is helpful for monitoring and reporting progress.
- Some policies are less likely to change => is there broad stakeholder agreement on the priority policies and are the goals realistic? Is the institutional environment conducive to implementation?
Measuring Country Policy Performance

James Oehmke, BFS/ARP/Policy
How will we measure or track Policy Change in GFSS?

1. Previously: 5 stages of policy change (indicator now retired)

2. Policy Progress Indicator: performance in prioritized policy achievements (new measurement, based on policy matrices)

3. Changes in the policy system (Institutional Architecture, new indicator)
GOAL: Sustainably reduce global hunger, malnutrition and poverty

OBJECTIVE 1
Inclusive and sustainable agriculture-led economic growth

OBJECTIVE 2
Strengthened resilience among people and systems

OBJECTIVE 3
A well-nourished population especially among women and children

CC IR 5 More effective governance, policy, and institutions

Policy Goal: Implementation of Improved National, Regional and Global Policies that Enable the Transformation of Food Systems

Policy IR 1: Institutional Architecture Transformed

Policy IR 2: Significant Changes in Prioritized Policies

Policy IR 3: Continuous Policy Improvement and Responsiveness through Mutual Accountability Systems

Policy IR 4: Foresighting, Thought Leadership and Service Delivery

= Contribution to sustainable development through more stable, transparent and inclusive systems
The Policy Matrix ⇒ a graphic depiction of the priority policy agenda results and actions that are necessary to achieve FTF-GFSS agriculture and food security objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Policy Sub-Area</th>
<th>Desired Partner Country Result</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Which GFSS result does this support (Obj/IR)</th>
<th>Specific USG actions to support the policy change with indicators, targets, and completion dates</th>
<th>Significance/level of policy action</th>
<th>Targets/Time lines/indicators</th>
<th>USAID activity contributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you need policy related assistance from Washington for any of the policy areas?
Policy Matrices as Part of Ongoing Performance Measurement

- Policy Performance Indicator: A scaled measure of progress on policy priorities, with 'credit' for taking on more difficult challenges

- Anticipated future quantitative/qualitative measure of importance of policy priorities for ag & food system performance in country / ZOI
Policy Progress Indicator (in development): 2015 Prototype

Policy Progress based on annual performance reported in Policy Matrices.

--- A statistical measurement (Rasch model) of the probability by country and across policy areas of performance. The score is based on the number of policy actions, the status of each action, and the difficulty of each action.

**Policy Progress Indicator:**
This approach calculates the likelihood that a country will make progress on policy actions - the set of Results and Actions each mission has identified as critical for the achievement of GFSS/FTF objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Region</th>
<th>Policy Progress Score (2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>-.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Regional</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa Regional</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Region</th>
<th>Policy Progress Score (2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa Regional</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa Regional</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America Regional</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Progress Indicator Deployment

- Pilot on FTF policy matrices for 2015/16, 2016/17 and 2017/18 data sets
- Results are based on all data across all matrices
- Results can change annually
- First analysis for GFSS will be based on 2019 Reporting
Monitoring Performance of the Policy System

Kristy Cook, BFS/ARP/Policy
GOAL: Sustainably reduce global hunger, malnutrition and poverty

OBJECTIVE 1
Inclusive and sustainable agriculture-led economic growth

OBJECTIVE 2
Strengthened resilience among people and systems

OBJECTIVE 3
A well-nourished population especially among women and children

CC IR 5 More effective governance, policy, and institutions

Policy Goal: Implementation of Improved National, Regional and Global Policies that Enable the Transformation of Food Systems

Policy IR 1: Institutional Architecture Transformed
Policy IR 2: Significant Changes in Prioritized Policies
Policy IR 3: Continuous Policy Improvement and Responsiveness through Mutual Accountability Systems
Policy IR 4: Foresighting, Thought Leadership and Service Delivery

=> Contribution to sustainable development through more stable, transparent and inclusive systems
EG.3.1-d Number of milestones in improved institutional architecture for food security policy achieved with USG support [Multi-level]

- Strong Institutional Architecture - the institutions and processes that support and lead to good policy outcomes - is critical for countries to become self-reliant

- IA milestones will capture improvements in food security policy governance contributing to GFSS topline objectives
  → ag-led growth, resilience, nutrition

- Milestones should originate from and align strategically with country and stakeholder priorities
Milestones toward a well functioning policy system

FTF Institutional Architecture Assessments showed (lack of) capacity inhibits policy reform in all FTF countries
Why Monitor IA Milestones?

- Policy change has a long time horizon so need to plan incremental steps
- Policy change is complex; cuts across organizational boundaries
- Need to improve core competencies related to policy management and stakeholder engagement
Aim is to capture [USG-supported] improvements in the foundational capabilities and building blocks of a well-functioning policy system.

Concerned with policy governance → quality & connectivity of the institutional environment and extent to which it is “fit for purpose” to achieve FS reform
  - Recognizes that quality can be context-specific / situational, defined in terms of particular goals

Links capacity interventions with the system-level changes they seek to affect
Illustrative IA Milestones

• Establishment of parliamentary access to food security expertise
• Citizen groups have regular and reliable access to legislative processes and documentation
• A regional protocol for coordinating staple food data (regional level)
• Intergovernmental coordination forum established and operational (e.g. meets regularly, shares information, takes decisions)
• Civil society and producer group platform for input to agricultural policy and program development
• Improved timeliness and availability of food security-related surveys and survey analysis
• Resources allocated for programs commensurate with objectives
• See PIRS for more examples….

How can you identify milestones to target?

→ through consultation with country partners & alignment with sector priorities!

• National Ag&FS Investment Plans & Biennial Reviews
• Institutional Architecture Assessments
• Country Agriculture and Food Security Planning Processes (look to Mission CDCS, PMP)
• Ag Sector Working Groups
• Implementing Partners and Activities
Examples Of IA Milestones

Example 1: Objective: Agriculture Joint Sector Review (JSR) leads to agreements toward improved enabling environment policies

Milestone 1: Inclusivity of JSR increases with Private sector participation
Milestone 2: Private sector takes lead role in the JSR developing common platform
Milestone 3: Private sector and government reach agreement on priority policies

Example 2: Objective: Increased participation by rural women in policy making process

Milestone 1: Pilot Women in Agriculture Platform in District X linking to other districts
Milestone 2: Women in Agriculture Platforms established across 28 districts to enable women to engage with their government officials and actively influence decision making in local governance and ag sector development.
Milestone 3: Platforms become the formal structure for women to voice their concerns to government.
**Example 3: Objective: More efficient use of donor resources:** Donors anticipate that improved planning and reporting alignment will contribute to closing of NAIP financing gap, from 28% gap to 15%.

**Milestone 1:** Donor-mapping of all donor investments in the agricultural sector for the Agriculture Donor Group and the Resilience Donor Group.

**Milestone 2:** Donor mapping leads to adoption of harmonized M&E framework among donors.

**Milestone 3:** Improved donor alignment with national sector priorities enable accurate projections of financing gaps.

**Milestone 4:** Improved donor transparency contributes to greater trust and commitment by other stakeholders closing the financing gap.
Tips for Setting Milestones

1. Defining milestones
Establish milestones that are significant for you and your country partners. Milestones should be clear - so that you will all know when you reach them. An important attribute of this indicator is that it can be designated at different levels [Multi-level Indicator]: National, regional, subnational

2. Timing milestones
Milestones are intended to be short-term (~12 months), but they aim toward longer-term objectives. They should signal whether results are trending in the “right” direction

3. FY19 Reporting: Focus on Build-Measure-Learn Feedback
This is first year with a new, first-ever multi-level indicator → set your targets with the objective of learning over the year.

Remember: You are working toward milestones because we achieve sustainable policy change step by step!

FEEDFUTURE
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Institutional Architecture Milestones are an Opportunity!

We are trying to capture systems change that will lead to better policies leading to improvements in hunger, nutrition and poverty.

This is a chance for many of you working on changing the food security policy system -- how food security policy is made and implemented -- to set targets, let us know what you will be doing and then report on your progress.

We look forward to this journey in FY2019! We look forward to your feedback.
FTFMS Instructions

Katie West, BFS/SPPM/MEL
FTFMS Instructions and tips

**Operating Units**

1. FTF focus countries OUs have been assigned this indicator
2. OUs need to assign this to IMs as requested or as appropriate
3. Users will need to:
   a. Enter unique number of milestones in top row
   b. List same milestones disaggregated by Level and Policy element
   c. List out specific name of milestone in Indicator comment
4. OUs will need to review IM reporting, then,
5. Add together the ‘unique’ IM targets and their own targets for a final target
6. OUs need to upload any documentation that will ‘justify’ the significance of the milestone (and subsequently for reporting ‘verify’ the achievement)

**Implementing Mechanisms**

1. IMs can choose to report on this indicator
2. IMs can request through their AOR/COR
3. Users will need to:
   a. Enter unique number of milestones in top row
   b. List same milestones disaggregated by Level and Policy element
   c. List out specific name of milestone in Indicator comment
4. IMs need to upload any documentation that will ‘justify’ the significance of the milestone (and subsequently for reporting ‘verify’ the achievement)
**STEP 1 and 2:** Enter indicator results and targets in FTFMS

EG 3.1-d: Number of milestones in improved institutional architecture for food security policy achieved with USG support [MT-level]

This indicator can be reported on at both the IM and OU level. For reporting by individual IMs, the results & targets should be for milestones achieved by that specific IM’s work. OUs reporting on this indicator should aggregate all IM-specific reporting (removing any double-counting) plus add any milestones achieved through OUs efforts outside of any specific IM (i.e., “other USG support”), and then report the overall OU total in their “High-level indicators” column IM. IMs were instructed to tally the unique milestones being reported on in the 2018 Indicator comment on this screen, as well as upload supporting documentation on the “Other Reporting Odd” tab on the “Enter or View Narrative” screen. See PRRs for details of what to include. When uploading supporting documentation, please reference the milestone number (if reporting on more than one milestone) in the document title (e.g., “Milestone #1 Supporting Documentation”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator / Disaggregation</th>
<th>2018 Deviation</th>
<th>2018 Comment</th>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>2018 Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unique number of milestones achieved this reporting year (no double-counting)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level (double-counting allowed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subnational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaggregates Not Available (for level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA Policy Element (double-counting allowed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Element 1: Predictability of the Guiding Policy Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Element 2: Policy Development and Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Element 3: Inclusivity and Stakeholder Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Element 4: Evidence-based Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Element 5: Policy Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Element 6: Mutual Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaggregates Not Available (for IA Policy Element)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEP 3: List out unique milestones in the Indicator Comment, using this format:

**MILESTONES ACHIEVED FY18:**
(1) xxxx
(2) xxxx
(3) xxxx

**TARGETED MILESTONES FY19:**
(1) xxxx
(2) xxxx
(3) xxxx
STEP 4: Where to enter your documentation on the reported milestones
Thank you!

Q & A
Additional Slides for Reference
All countries faced issues around insufficient numbers of staff, poor staff retention, inadequate training in basic project management, and lack of resources. In Ethiopia, for example, the capacity of staff to undertake budgetary planning and process management seriously constrained policy implementation. In Cambodia, the technical departments, who are the key implementers of agriculture and food security projects, lacked basic training in project and budgetary management, and performance monitoring. Every country assessment reported similar findings.

Even Bangladesh, with its consistently strong performance in policy development, coordination, and mutual accountability, shows a considerable skills gap at the project implementation level. Departments lack basic project management skills, as well as the capacity to examine the cost of proposed projects, which results in substantial budgetary inflation (stakeholders interviewed reported as high as 40 percent for agricultural projects).
Measuring Policy Performance: Why is CAADP Successful? Country Ownership of the Food Security Agenda!

1. Achieving CAADP milestones

![Graph showing progress from 2007 to 2015]

- Signed compact
- Signed compact plus NAIP
- Signed compact plus NAIP plus one external funding source
- Signed compact plus NAIP plus more than one external funding source

Country commitment to the CAADP process has accelerated since 2008, with 42 of 55 African countries now having signed a compact, and seven countries have achieved ‘top tier’ status.

2. Strengthening Institutional Architecture

The CAADP 2030 Implementation Roadmap emphasizes strengthening systemic capacity to accelerate agricultural transformation, including strengthening institutional architecture.

3. Establishing mutual accountability processes

The African Union’s Biennial Review contains each country’s report on its progress on agricultural growth and food security. 30 member states are “on track” to deliver enhanced mutual accountability systems for actions and results.
FTFMS Instructions

• FTF focus country OUs are required to set targets this year
• Implementing mechanisms (IMs) can choose to set targets and should request their AOR/COR to assign the indicator
• Enter unique number of milestones and disaggregate by the six IA components discussed above and by the level (national, regional, sub-national)
• OUs will aggregate across IMs and add in their unique targets
• OUs and IMs need to upload any documentation that will ‘justify’ the significance of the milestone (and subsequently for reporting ‘verify’ the achievement)
• Detailed Instructions are available!!