The Feed the Future Knowledge-Driven Agricultural Development project, implemented by Insight Systems Corp., cultivates engaged learning communities that generate knowledge, information and innovations to support improved development outcomes at scale. It also builds capacity of USAID staff and implementing partners to achieve Feed the Future goals.
## DAY 2 - May 12th

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8:30 am | **Opening Session** - FTF Priorities and Focus for the next 18 months, and the importance of improved host country policy commitments  
Richard Greene, Acting AA and Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Food Security |
| 9:00 am | **2.1 Mutual Accountability**  
Dan Charette, Africa Lead Project, DAI  
Jim Oehmke, Policy Team, BFS/USAID |
| 12:00 pm| Lunch                                                                  |
| 1:00 pm | **2.2 Institutional Architecture**  
Kathy Alison, Africa Lead Project, DAI  
David Quinn, Fintrac Inc.  
Courtney Buck, Policy Team, BFS/USAID |
| 4:30 pm | **Wrap up and Closing**                                                |
Institutional Architecture Assessment Process

USAID ADVANCED TOPICS IN AGRICULTURE: AGRICULTURE POLICY Course
USAID DC Learning Center
May 12, 2015
Food Security Policy System

Policy Agenda

Guiding Food Security Policy towards Impact & Scale-up

Institutional Architecture

Mutual Accountability
Presentation Overview

- Overview: What is an IAA and how does it work

- Highlights from *Institutional Architecture for Food Security Policy Change: Cross Country Study*

- Country Examples: How missions have used IAAs to reform a country’s agriculture and food security policies
IAA – what is it?

- Short Process – 1-2 weeks
- Identifies partner-country procedures and processes required for
  - policy development
  - data collection and analysis
  - consultation and dialogue
  - implementation
  - enforcement
- Useful for individual policies
- Identifies *real systems changes* needed to support a country’s policy change process
Institutional Architecture Process

Part 1
- Maps
  - key systems
  - processes
  - relationships that influence food security policy development
Part 2: Assesses country’s readiness to change -- based on 6 key policy elements

1. Predictability of the Guiding Policy Framework
2. Policy Development & Coordination
3. Inclusivity & Stakeholder Consultation
4. Evidence-based Analysis
5. Policy Implementation
6. Mutual Accountability
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity of Policy Change Indicators</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Element 1:</strong> Predictability of the Guiding Policy Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Element 2:</strong> Policy Development &amp; Coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Element 3:</strong> Inclusivity and Stakeholder Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Element 4:</strong> Evidence-based Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Element 5:</strong> Policy Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Element 6:</strong> Mutual Accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Readiness to Change: Assessment Framework

Red: requires significant attention to ensure the component is achieved.

Yellow: Progress is mixed. The conditions required to achieve the component are partially achieved, but additional attention is required.

Green: The component is realized to a sufficient degree, and additional attention to this area is not required at this time.
Part 3: Recommendations

- draws conclusions based on findings
- outlines recommendations for future priorities and action
- should be supported by findings from the IAA analysis
Part 4: Validation Workshop

- Donors/Development Partners
- Trade Associations
- Ministries
- Consumers
- Civil Society Organizations
- Academics and Research Institutions
- Agribusiness Leaders
- CAADP / Regional Economic Communities
- Small Holder Farmers (esp. women, youth)
Results:

• Maps relationships-- public, private, civil society

• Identifies key institutions pivotal to making change happen

• Targets need for additional assessments

• Benchmark
Institutional Architecture

Uses:

• Identifies constraints and positive impacts

• Maps complex system in a simplified manner

• Helps inform Mission engagement strategy / set reform priorities

• Can help assess readiness to initiate specific policy efforts, and identify specific systems changes needed

• Great starting point for discussion on required reforms
THANK YOU !

Discussion
May 2015
David Quinn, Industry Analyst
Panel

- Country Examples: How missions have used IAAs to reform a country’s agriculture and food security policies
Panel Chair & Members

- Chair: David Atwood (TBC)
Questions for panelists (10 min summaries)

- What was the focus of the IAA – system wide or individual policy focus?
- How did you use the results of the IAA?
- What was the reaction of the country decision makers and stakeholders?
- Did the process make a difference (or not) in addressing barriers to agriculture policy reform?
- Would you use the process again? Why / why not?
Table Discussion

- Reflect on the session and identify the opportunities and constraints that an IAA process (either system wide or specific policy focused) would face in your country.

- Discuss how an IAA might support your policy reform efforts and

- How would you introduce the concept in your office and with your partners?
Wrap up / Reflections

- Ask for several examples from the table discussions - what were some key take-aways / most important aspect of the IAAs for your situation

- Quick summary of session / highlight any support available from BFS for additional IAAs (Jeff or David or facilitator)
Introduction to Institutional Architecture:

- Low cost and rapid assessment.
- Provides a framework for analyzing a country’s capacity to undertake agriculture and food security policy change.
- Goal to provide USAID and other stakeholders with constraints that could stymie effective policy change and highlight areas to improve capacity and performance.
- Examines six components: Guiding Policy Framework, Policy Development and Coordination, Inclusivity and Stakeholder Consultation, Evidence-based Analysis, Policy Implementation, and Mutual Accountability.
Objectives of this presentation:

- Based on a cross-country analysis of Institutional Architecture assessments in sixteen Feed the Future countries (and Kyrgyz Republic), the objectives of this presentation are to:

  1. Outline common constraints across countries and their root causes.

  2. Highlight best practice examples of countries that have been able to effectively improve their policy reform process.

  3. Challenge whether these findings match your understanding of the key constraints in your country.
Overview of results:

Countries studied:

- Bangladesh
- Rwanda
- Uganda
- Ethiopia
- Guatemala
- Nepal
- Zambia
- Kyrgyz Rep.
- Cambodia
- Malawi
- Mozambique
- Ghana
- Tanzania
- Senegal
- DR Congo
- Liberia

Total indicator scores:

1. Predictability of the Guiding Policy Framework
2. Policy Development & Coordination
3. Inclusivity & Stakeholder Consultation
4. Evidence-based Analysis
5. Policy Implementation
6. Mutual Accountability
Breaking down these results.

- Question for the audience: Are these results surprising? If so, why?

- We will now breakdown these results, taking the key policy issues across each of our six policy components:
  1. Guiding Policy Framework
  2. Policy Development and Coordination
  3. Inclusivity and Stakeholder Consultation
  4. Evidence-based analysis
  5. Policy Implementation
  6. Mutual accountability
1. Every country has an approved food security strategy…

- Highest performing indicator in study.
- 63 percent of countries scored strong in this policy element, 37 percent of countries scored average, and no country scored weak.
- African countries have been particularly successful in developing investment plans.
... yet these strategies suffer from a lack of prioritization and realism in activities.

- Only 19 percent of countries scored strong in the indicator on the development of priorities.
- Many food security strategies and investment plans lack political appetite for hard dialogue.
- As a result, they lack practical application and implementation.
2. Most countries suffer from lack of technical capacity to develop policy.

- 37 percent of countries scored weak, 56 percent of countries scored average, and one country scored strong.
- Major of policy planning and analysis units understaffed and under-resourced.
- Donor-funded independent consultants often fill this capacity vacuum, potentially leading to a lack of ministry ownership in the process.
Case study: Bangladesh’s Food Policy Monitoring Unit.

- There is a well developed system for the development and coordination of food security policy.
- Food Policy Monitoring Unit provides overall technical and administrative support to the policy reform process.
- It is supported by a dedicated project, the National Food Policy Capacity Strengthening Programme, which is supported by USAID.
- But I’ll leave it to our colleagues from USAID/Bangladesh to provide more details…
3. Non-state actors require capacity building to engage constructively in policymaking.

Only 19 percent of countries scored strong for private sector capacity and 6 percent scored strong for civil society capacity.
4. Despite growing commitments, evidence-based policy making remains limited.

RECAP FROM YESTERDAY’S PRESENTATION

- 31 percent of countries scored weak and 69 scored average. One of only three indicators across all policy elements where no country scored strong.

- Evidence-based data is constrained not only by the availability of timely and reliable data, but also the systems that allow access to this data.
5a. All countries lack administrative and technical capacity for policy implementation.

- Policy implementation posed a challenge in every country studies.
- 75 percent of countries scored weak, 25 percent scored average, and no country scored strong – the worst scores of any indicator.
- Common issues included insufficient numbers of staff, poor staff retention, inadequate training in basic project management, and lack of resources.
5b. Cross-sectoral policy coordination requires sufficient enforcement power.

- Poor progress in translating coordination in strategies to coordination in practice.
- Only 19 percent of countries scored strong, 56 percent scored average, and 25 percent scored weak.
- Where mechanisms are in place, effectiveness depends not only on the degree of political power and financial resources, but also the mandate of the body.
6. Mutual accountability structures are in place, but constrained by administrative capacity.

- Joint highest performing indicator across all policy elements.
- 63 percent of countries scored strong and 31 percent of countries scored weak. African countries scored better on average than the rest of the world.
- Effectiveness is constrained by the administrative capacity of the secretariat and the frequency of meetings.
Case study: A strong secretariat is needed to support mutual accountability mechanisms.

- Cambodia has a strong mutual accountability framework for agriculture and food security.
- Dialogue between the government and development partners occurs at three levels: The Cambodia Development Forum, the Government-Donor Coordination Committee, and the Technical Working Groups.
- Comparison of functioning of the Technical Working Groups shows that effectiveness is determined by the administrative capacity of the secretariat, a clear mandate, and financial support.
### Summary of findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Policy Framework</th>
<th>Every country has a food security strategy, yet these strategies suffer from a lack of realism and prioritization in reforms.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Development and Coordination</td>
<td>Most countries suffer from lack of technical capacity to develop policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusivity and Stakeholder Consultation</td>
<td>Non-state actors require capacity building to engage constructively in policymaking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence-based analysis</th>
<th>Despite growing commitments, evidence-based policy making remains limited.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Implementation</td>
<td>All countries lack administrative and technical capacity for policy implementation. Cross-sectoral policy coordination requires sufficient enforcement power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual accountability</td>
<td>Mutual accountability structures are in place, but constrained by administrative capacity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-State Actor Commitments to Agriculture Sector Development

Dan Charette (DAI, Africa Lead Program)
USAID Food Security Policy Training
May 12, 2015
Who are Non-State Actors?

- Companies
- Private Sector Associations
- Farmer Groups
- NGOs
- Media
- Think Tanks
- Civil Society Organizations
  - CBOs
  - Women’s Groups
  - Faith-based Groups
  - Youth Groups
What do NSA commitments to agriculture look like?

- **Companies and associations**: G-8 New Alliance Cooperation Agreements in 10 countries, Grow Africa initiatives in 12 countries

- **Farmer groups and CBOs**: bulk input purchases for cost savings, ROSCAs, group lending models

- **Media**: basic reporting + investigative journalism on agriculture sector issues

- **Think tanks**: cost-benefit analysis of existing or proposed agriculture sector policies → informing the debate
Sample NSA Commitments--Company

Who: Agrica/Kilombero Plantations Ltd. (KPL), Tanzania.

Commitment: Invest $30 million by end of 2016 in order to (1) expand number of KPL smallholders from 1,500 to 5,000; (2) complete KPL’s irrigation system to cover 5,000 HA; and (3) construct biomass power plant to generate 3 megawatts of power.

Results: (1) goal to expand to 5,000 smallholder outgrowers exceeded with 6,500 smallholders now engaged. (2) Irrigation expansion slow with only 215 HA covered to-date. (3) No progress to report on biomass power plant construction.
Sample NSA Commitments--Association

**Who:** Tanzania Horticulture Association

**Commitment:** (1) Map horticulture activities in priority clusters and across SAGCOT; (2) represent SAGCOT at horticultural conferences and events; (3) serve as first contact for domestic and international investors with interest in horticulture sector investment.

**Results:** (1) Played central role in lifting ban on export of flowers through Kenya; (2) negotiated waiver on “cumbersome procedures” required for horticulture producers to import fertilizer → continuing to negotiate flat rate import tax on fertilizer for horticulture producers; (3) Lobbed Gov’t of Tanzania to commit 1.7 billion Tz Schillings for infrastructure investment in rural areas; (4) Lobbied Global Gap to translate its safety standards into Swahili for easy access to and use by Tanzanian smallholders.
Sample NSA Commitments—One Acre Fund and Farmer Groups/CBOs

Who: One Acre Fund in Kenya provides to community-based organizations (CBO) high quality farming inputs, crop storage technology, training on input use and storage techniques, and assistance in brokering sales of CBOs harvested crops.

Commitment: CBO commits to repaying One Acre Fund for credit-based inputs with profits from the sale of harvested crops.
Sample NSA Commitments—Farmer Group

**Who:** Ghana National Association of Farmers.

**Commitments:** (1) stronger participation in public-private dialogue; (2) capacity building of smallholder farmers to participate in policy formulation, design, and implementation process; and (3) produce and disseminate research results.

**Results:** TBD.
What’s next for NSA commitments?

- Training/capacity building of NSA groups to develop commitments and engage in process of prioritization, agenda setting, and dialogue

- New NAFSIPs: formal and clear articulation of NSA commitments along with government and donor commitments

- Following lead of New Alliance and Grow Africa, close monitoring and mutual accountability for progress on NSA commitments through JSR and other mechanisms
Appreciating and Strengthening Devolved Governance:
Working together to realize the objectives of devolution

Kisumu City, Kisumu County
21st to 23rd April, 2015
**Kenya Devolution - Background**

- **2010 - Kenya’s new constitution**
  - Devolved authority and responsibilities to counties

- **2013 - Devolved country governments operationalized**
  - 47 counties
  - 27 counties -- USAID Feed the Future counties
Annual Devolution Conferences

- Take stock and benchmark gains and challenges encountered throughout the year

- 2nd Annual Devolution Conference (April 2015)
  - Opportunity to reflect on improving performance in agriculture and other enabling sectors
USAID/Africa Lead Support

- Council of Governors Country Executive Committee – April 2015
  - 470 CEC members

- 2nd Annual Devolution Conference - April 2015
  - @6000 attendees
  - Kenya President, Governors, Senators, Members of Parliament, Cabinet Secretaries, top leaders, development partners
Plenum 6: Managing Change for Food Security

Session Objective

• Provide a comprehensive overview of Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition status in the country.

• Highlight challenges and opportunities presented by devolution
  • how transformative leadership is critical in promoting food and nutrition security nationally and in the Counties.

• 2 hour session
USAID/Africa Lead role

- Africa Lead facilitated 2 Food Security sessions
  - The Status of Food Security in Kenya and Emerging Policy Issues under Devolution
  - Transformative Leadership
    - Current food security situation/ crisis
    - Created a sense of urgency & need for change among leaders

- Exhibition stand/booth with USAID/Kenya
  - @ 300 top county leaders & delegates engaged in 1on1 discussions -- Africa Lead Kenya program
  - Other county specific USAID programming
Outcomes & Next Steps

Begin leadership training in Bomet County this week

May – Sept
• Training in 27 counties
• 5 day course
• @ 60 participants -- Country leaders and staff – agr, other sectors

• Africa Lead Facilitators
Launch of Lake Region Economic Blueprint

- President Kenyatta launched Economic Blueprint following Devolution Conference
- Block of 13 counties in Kenya’s lake region -- aimed at catalyzing the region’s economic development through targeted joint investments
- Consultative process by the county governments, including public.
- Coordinated by Deloitte East Africa
Launch of
Lake Region Economic Blueprint

- One-stop shop for investors seeking opportunities in the region
  - Includes Agriculture, Tourism, Education, Health, ICT, Financial Services and Infrastructure
  - Each will have flagship project implemented in region.
  - Western Ag Investment Platform -- Ag commodities exchange

- USAID, Ford Foundation, DFID, DANIDA, World Bank, SIDA, UNDP, JICA, UN Women and Governors from Western Kenya region

- BIDCO – mega Kenyan food processing company interested in investing in rice / other value chains
Commitments to Western Agriculture Investment Platform (WAIP)

- Governors of 13 counties adopted WAIP to facilitate coordination & roll out agriculture pillar of the Econ Blueprint
- County ministers of agriculture & trade organizing meeting to plan implementation roadmap for Ag pillar (May 27-28)
- Development partners committed money to kick start implementation / fund secretariat
- WAIP invited to Durban World Economic Forum 2015 to showcase agricultural investment cases from EBD
Key take aways

- National government needs to address number of agriculture policy issues
  - as county governments continue to develop their policies

- Improved coordination needed to make agriculture transformation a reality
  - Among national and county governments and other national agricultural institutions

- Delegates emphasized need to build **Transformative Leadership** capacity

"The tragedy in Africa is a leadership deficit, the poverty of leadership."
13 counties form major economic bloc

By BT CORRESPONDENT
Tuesday April 21, 2015

KISUMU - President Uhuru Kenyatta today launched a new roadmap by 10 counties in the Lake Victoria basin aimed at catalysing the region’s economic development through targeted joint investments.

The Lake Region Economic Blueprint is expected to act as a one-stop shop for investors seeking opportunities in the region. It identifies seven strategic intervention areas namely: Agriculture, Tourism, Education, Health, ICT, Financial Services and Infrastructure.
Introducing Mutual Accountability and Joint Sector Reviews

Presentation prepared by James Oehmke (USAID) and Dan Charette (Africa Lead Program)
USAID Food Security Policy Training
May 12, 2015
Session Overview

- 9:00-10:30---Introduction of MA/JSR and session worksheet
- 10:30-10:45---Break
- 10:45-11:30---Role of commitments in MA/JSR
- 11:30-12:00---Finish worksheet
Session Objectives

- Demonstrate familiarity with the concepts, practices, and benefits of MA and JSRs
- Understand the status of country uptake of the strengthened JSR model
- Benchmark the agriculture sector review process in your country against a best practice model of the JSR
- Develop preliminary plans for enhancing USAID Missions’ role in JSRs as both a Development Partner and as an agent of strengthening MA/JSR in partner countries
1. Background on MA/JSR

1. **Mutual Accountability:** One of the 5 key principles contained in 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness

2. **CAADP adoption of MA with 2011 CAADP Mutual Accountability Framework**

3. **Renewed CAADP commitment to MA in 2014**
   - CAADP at 10 Years and AU Year of Agriculture
   - AU Heads of State **Malabo Declaration:** July 2014
1. Background on MA/JSR

1. The JSR: a structure, a process, a report, and a conference

2. Centrality of “Commitments” to JSR
   - NAFSIPs, CAADP Compacts, New Alliance Commitments
   - Multi-sector inclusivity essential: Government, Donor Partners, Private Sector, Civil Society

3. The JSR Tool is not new to African Countries

4. The “Strong JSR Model” as a guide for JSR strengthening or JSR creation
1. Background on MA/JSR

The Strong JSR Model provides guidance on:

1. **JSR Structure**: Steering Committee, Secretariat
2. **JSR Process**: TOR development, resource mobilization, multi-sector stakeholder contributions
3. **JSR Report**: 5 sections, strong reliable evidence needed
4. **JSR Conference**: 2-3 day event based on JSR Report with strong multi-sector stakeholder representation and involvement
1. Background on MA/JSR: Who is involved in a JSR?

- Donors/Funders
- Ministries
- Consumers
- Civil Society Organizations
- Private Sector
- Women’s Groups
- Others?
1. Background on MA/JSR: A Strengthened JSR Process

- Set up JSR steering committee (chaired by Ministry of Agriculture)
- Establish JSR secretariat
- Develop JSR terms of reference
- Mobilize resources (human and financial)
- Constitute review teams
- Undertake technical studies
- Organize the JSR meeting
- Draw implementation and follow-up plans based on recommendations from the JSR
1. Background on MA/JSR: A Strengthened JSR Process

**Month 1** (start of FY)
- High-level call for mutual accountability
  - **Sensitize** the JSR process
  - **Inventory** existing information
  - **Assess** gaps and needs
  - **Plan** the JSR: inclusiveness, evidence-base, transparency, commitment

**Months 1-10**
- Prepare for the JSR annual forum
  - **Engage** non-state actors
  - **Determine** information needs
  - **Generate** data and information
  - **Analyze** data to determine what was effective, how to accelerate impact
  - **Publish** results and findings

**Month 10** (adjust to budget cycle)
- Hold the JSR annual forum
  - **Include** non-state actors
  - **Measure** commitments, progress and impact
  - **Report** on findings
    - Commitment reports
    - Impact reports
    - Special topics reports

**Months 10-12**
- Follow analysis with action
  - **Government** budget actions
  - **Donor** budget actions
  - **Policy** actions
  - **Private** sector actions
  - **Civil Society** actions
  - **Review** the JSR for lessons learned and call for the next JSR
1. Background on MA/JSR

Suggested 5 Sections of JSR Report

1. Development results
2. Agricultural sector performance
3. Financial and non-financial commitments
4. Policies, programs, institutions, and implementation processes
5. Linkages, enabling environment, and assumptions

Recent Malawi Report Structure: (1) Policy Context + Institutional Context; (2) Commitments; (3) Ag Sector Perf.
2. AL II Work on MA/JSR in 2014

Kicked off by AU Correspondence

1. Partnership with IFPRI/ReSAKSS on JSR Assessment in 7 Countries

2. 7 countries comprise 7 of 10 New Alliance Countries

3. IFPRI/ReSAKSS Role: Design assessment TOR and assist countries on completing assessment report

4. AL II Role: prepare for and facilitate JSR Assessment Workshops, including action plan generation for JSR strengthening (did not cover Moz)
2. AL II Work on MA/JSR in 2014

Sample JSR Strengthening Action Plan from Malawi (see handout)

1. 12 Steps to Setting Up and Operating JSR

2. Malawi’s status on each of 12 steps

3. Statement of required action to strengthen Malawian JSR practices in line with “Strong JSR”
3. AL II Plans on MA/JSR in 2015/2016

1. Assist 7 JSR Assessment Countries from 2014 with implementing JSR strengthening action plans
   – Special AL II focus on NSA engagement to improve their JSR involvement, including establishment of commitments

2. JSR Assessment in 11 new countries and ECOWAS
   – East Africa: Uganda, DRC, Burundi, Kenya
   – Southern Africa: Zambia and Swaziland
   – West Africa: Togo, Benin, Mali, Niger, and Cote D’Ivoire

3. As needed, deliver training to sensitize multi-sector stakeholders to Strong JSR