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Our new strategy represents an evolution:
—
embracing the best from our past
while addressing new challenges and new opportunities for the future
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR SUSTAINED IMPACT

Sustained Impact

Sustained Behaviors and/or Service Utilization

External Factors

Sustained Service Delivery
Sustained Access
Sustained Demand

Sustained Resources
Sustained Capacity
Sustained Motivation
Sustained Linkages

Program Exit Strategies
GROWING CHALLENGES & THE NEED FOR NEW APPROACHES

- Conflict and unprecedented displacement
- Climate change impacts: drought, floods
NEW OPPORTUNITIES & REASONS FOR HOPE

• New flexibilities and new choice
  – Expanded basket of resources.

• Unprecedented global commitment
  – Working through country led systems
  – Working holistically – and collaboratively – to address root causes
Office of Food for Peace Strategic Results Framework

**Corporate Objective 1:** Leadership, Coordination & Partnerships Strengthened

**Corporate Objective 2:** Efficient & Accountable Resource Management Enhanced

**Corporate Objective 3:** Monitoring, Evaluation, Analysis & Applied Learning Improved

**Goal:** Food & Nutrition Security of Vulnerable Populations Improved & Sustained

**Strategic Objective 1:** Lives & Livelihoods Protected & Enhanced

**IR 1.1:** Life-Saving Food & Nutrition Needs Met

**IR 1.2:** Nutrition & WASH Practices Improved

**IR 1.3:** Natural Resource & Environmental Risk Management Capacities Improved

**IR 1.4:** On- & Off-Farm Livelihood Opportunities & Incomes Expanded

**Strategic Objective 2:** Communities & Institutions Transformed

**IR 2.1:** Social Protection Systems Strengthened

**IR 2.2:** Nutrition & Health Systems Strengthened

**IR 2.3:** Natural Resource & Environmental Risk Management Systems Strengthened

**IR 2.4:** Agricultural, Market & Financial Systems Strengthened

**Cross Cutting IR 1:** Gender Equity & Youth Opportunities Increased

**Cross Cutting IR 2:** Social Cohesion Enhanced

**Cross Cutting IR 3:** Social Accountability of Institutions Strengthened
FOOD FOR PEACE
GOAL AND STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Goal: Food & Nutrition Security of Vulnerable Populations Improved & Sustained

Strategic Objective 1: Lives & Livelihoods Protected & Enhanced

Strategic Objective 2: Communities & Institutions Transformed
FOOD FOR PEACE
INTERMEDIATE RESULTS

IR 1.1: Life saving food and nutrition needs met

IR 1.2: Nutrition and WASH practices improved

IR 1.3: Natural resource & environmental risk management capacities improved

IR 1.4: On & off-farm livelihood opportunities & incomes expanded

IR 2.1: Social protection systems strengthened

IR 2.2: Nutrition & health systems strengthened

IR 2.3: Natural resource & environmental risk management systems strengthened

IR 2.4: Agricultural, Market & Financial Systems Strengthened
Goal: Food & Nutrition Security of Vulnerable Populations Improved & Sustained

Corporate Objective 1: Leadership, Coordination & Partnerships Strengthened

Corporate Objective 2: Efficient & Accountable Resource Management Enhanced

Corporate Objective 3: Monitoring, Evaluation, Analysis & Applied Learning Improved

Strategic Objective 1: Lives & Livelihoods Protected & Enhanced

IR 1.1: Life-Saving Food & Nutrition Needs Met
IR 1.2: Nutrition & WASH Practices Improved
IR 1.3: Natural Resource & Environmental Risk Management Capacities Improved
IR 1.4: On- & Off-Farm Livelihood Opportunities & Incomes Expanded

Strategic Objective 2: Communities & Institutions Transformed

IR 2.1: Social Protection Systems Strengthened
IR 2.2: Nutrition & Health Systems Strengthened
IR 2.3: Natural Resource & Environmental Risk Management Systems Strengthened
IR 2.4: Agricultural, Market & Financial Systems Strengthened

Cross Cutting IR 1: Gender Equity & Youth Opportunities Increased
Cross Cutting IR 2: Social Cohesion Enhanced
Cross Cutting IR 3: Social Accountability of Institutions Strengthened
To access the strategy online:
www.usaid.gov/ffpstrategy

CONTACT:
Joan Whelan
Strategy and Learning Advisor
jwhelan@usaid.gov
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From Evidence to Impact: a researcher’s perspective

Craig McIntosh, UCSD & J-PAL
October 10, 2016
The Challenge of Using Evidence

Unlikely to be rigorous evaluation of the program policy makers want to introduce in exactly same location. How should we respond?

• Wait to act until more rigorous evidence exists?
• Always do new RCT before introducing in new context?
• Only use less rigorous local evidence?
• Use results from study conducted in another context?
• Only use evidence from other countries if at least X replications or if replicated in a similar enough context?
Globally Informed, Locally Grounded

• In seeking to scale effective, evidence-informed programs and policies, local understanding and general lessons about behavior complement each other

• Theories of change must account for:
  – Local conditions (including needs)
  – General human behaviors
  – Local implementation (including formal & informal institutions)

• Combining theory, descriptive evidence, and results of rigorous impact evaluations can answer:
  – Whether results from one context are likely to replicate in another
  – When we need more evaluation and when we can rely on / adapt existing evidence
Scaling up, Scaling down.

• **Clean evaluation studies are often easiest to perform with small/NGO implementers.**
  – But these are not the actors who have the ability to scale programs.
  – Moving to scale often means moving to a different implementer (governments) who have the ability to operate nationally.
  – Recent meta-study shows government-implemented programs often have lower impacts than NGO-implemented versions of the same program (Vivalt).
  – Recent studies (Bold et al.) showing that programs that were effective when run at small scale by NGO was not effective when operated at scale by the Kenyan government.

• **Major advantage of rigorous research is ability to show what doesn’t work.**
  – Just as important to drive funding away from failure as towards success.
  – Effective evidenced-based policymaking isn’t just counting scale-ups.
The Research Pipeline vs. Implementation:

• **Timing of research pipeline versus implementation schedule**
  
  – Rigorous evaluations take often 4 or 5 years from conception to results.
  – Uptake/adoption is quick and easy to study, fundamental impacts much slower.
  – Need to rely on extant evidence base to made decisions now.
  – Need to be asking tomorrow’s questions today.
  – Think carefully about what to evaluate, where to evaluate so that a realistic timeframe for evidence generation meshes with strategic objectives.
From “What Works?”
to “What’s Working for Millions”

The Case of Seasonal Migration in Bangladesh,
Evidence Action Beta

Katrin Verclas, Evidence Action
October 10, 2016
Evidence Action: Scaling What Works
Identifying Promising Evidence
Identifying Promising Evidence

Migration rates: +61%
Income: +86%
Caloric intake: +750 kcal

Cost-Effectiveness

Increased Income per 1 BDT

IGVGD (Food) 1.89
FSVGD (Food + Cash) 2.13
FFA (Food + Cash) 0.37
RMP (Cash) 1.01
No Lean Season (No recovery) 2.71
No Lean Season (Recovery) 5.05

*This figure reflects 2015 USD estimates and does not reflect recent changes in our budget. As we continue to scale-up, we will continue to learn more about the true cost of the program.
**Cost-Effectiveness**

**Increased calories consumed per 1 USD**

- IGVGD (Food): 1,918
- FSVGD (Food + Cash): 2,813
- FFA (Food + Cash): 980
- RMP (Cash): 1,492
- No Lean Season (No recovery): 7,137
- No Lean Season (Recovery): 13,288

*This figure reflects 2015 USD estimates and does not reflect recent changes in our budget. As we continue to scale-up, we will continue to learn more about the true cost of the program.*
Identifying Promising Evidence

Inputs

Subsidies offered

Outputs

Subsidies accepted

Outcomes

Migration induced

Impact

Earnings and consumption increased

✅ Rigorous evidence

✅ Big impact

✅ Low cost per beneficiary

✅ Widespread issue
Pressure Testing

Inputs
- Subsidies offered

Outputs
- Subsidies accepted

Outcomes
- Migration induced

Impact
- Earnings and consumption increased

? ?
The Road to Scale

- **Inputs**: Subsidies offered
- **Outputs**: Subsidies accepted
- **Outcomes**: Migration induced
- **Impact**: Earnings and consumption increased

✅ Scalable Program Design
✅ Implementation Capacity
✅ Conducive Policy Environment
✅ Sustainable Funding Plan
The Road to Scale

**FOUR YEAR SCALING PLAN**

- # HHs reached: **9,000**
- **Year 1: Program design**
  - Targeting
  - Offer
  - Disbursement
  - Migration
  - Monitoring & Reporting

**NCE & FOOD SECURITY CONFERENCE**
Confirming Impact at Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies offered</td>
<td>Subsidies accepted</td>
<td>Migration induced</td>
<td>Earnings and consumption increased</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Earnings and consumption increased
Confirming Impact at Scale

**Four Year Scaling Plan**

- **# HHs Reached:**
  - 9,000 (Year 1: Program Design)
  - 40,000 (Year 2: RCT at-scale)

- Branch Offices:
  - 15 Branch Offices (Year 1)
  - 50 Branch Offices (Year 2)
Process & Performance Monitoring

**Four Year Scaling Plan**

- **# HHs Reached:**
  - 9,000 (Year 1: Program Design)
  - 40,000 (Year 2: RCT at-scale)
  - 96,000 (Year 3-4: Scaled Implementation)
  - 165,000

- **Branch Offices:**
  - Year 1: 15 Branch Offices
  - Year 2: 50 Branch Offices
  - Year 3-4: 60 Branch Offices
  - Year 4: 110 Branch Offices

---

**FOOD SECURITY CONFERENCE**
Scaling to New Countries
Thank you.
Using evidence from RCTs

The experience of CRS in using research evidence to lift vulnerable people out of poverty.

Mary Hennigan, Catholic Relief Services
October 10, 2016
The examples:

- Using Title II as a delivery channel to prevent stunting
  - The 2008 LANCET SERIES on maternal and child nutrition
  - Food for Peace (FFP) Prevention of under 2 Malnutrition Approach (PM2A) - 2009
  - Tubaramure: FFP funded DFAP in Burundi (2009 to 2014)

- Using a fee-for-service, Private Service Providers (PSP) delivery channel to sustainably reach scale for Savings and Internal Lending Communities (SILC)
  - Successful track record of fee-for-service SILC scale up in multiple countries, well beyond project lifetime.
  - Proven use of project paid Field Agents to start up SILC, but which was not sustainable after the end of project.
Building the case for evidence:

- Using Title II to prevent stunting

  *Globally recognized evidence-based interventions* but.....
  
  *Could a Title II project prevent stunting? Do food rations have an effect on a child's nutritional status? What types and quantities are most effective? How long should they be provided for?*

- Using PSPs to sustainably reach scale for SILC outcomes

  Previous success of project dependent on paid agents and in a limited number of countries volunteers to support SILC groups but.....
  
  *Would communities accept to pay someone to learn how to create and manage a savings group? Would this lead to effective and sustainable results? Would the PSP model be an effective delivery mechanism?*
Generating the evidence:

- **Using Title II as a delivery channel to prevent stunting**
  - FFP (donor) contracted IFPRI to do a cluster randomized trial.
  - Trial ran from 1st day of project to the final day of the five-year *project in Burundi*.
  - Trial included four research arms.

- **Using PSPs to sustainably reach scale for SILC outcomes**
  - CRS (implementer) contracted an independent research team to do a randomized control trial (RCT)
  - Trial included 2 cohorts of 12 months each, across three countries (*Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania*) within the SILC Innovation project.
  - Project funded by The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
Using research evidence:

Using Title II as a delivery channel to prevent stunting

- An initial published finding from IFPRI: *for the first time to our knowledge, that a food-assisted MCHN program had a positive impact on anemia and hemoglobin in both mothers and children.*

- Final research to be released in 2017

Using PSPs to sustainably reach scale for SILC outcomes

- PSP supported SILCs out performed paid agent supported SILC on all financial indicators (savings, loans, dividends, & return on savings at share-out)

- The PSP model has been taken to scale reaching over 1.5 million SILC members

- PSPs are supported by communities, which value paid services over free services

- PSP average earnings in Africa are USD 100-125 per month but vary due to personal outreach and time commitment factors
Publications:

• Preventing Under 2 malnutrition

FANTA III website:
http://www.fantaproject.org/research/impact-cost-effectiveness-PM2A

Final study to be released in 2017

• Using PSPs sustainably reach scale for SILC outcomes

http://www.crs.org/our-work-overseas/research-publications/agent-productivity-fee-service-savings-groups

Video: CRS's PSP-SILC program.