



## Feed the Future Stakeholder Meeting

### Efforts to Enhance Resilience in the Horn of Africa

February 24, 2012

### Q & A Transcript

#### Presenters:

Nancy Lindborg, USAID Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance

Gregory C. Gottlieb, USAID Bureau for Food Security

Susan Fine, USAID Bureau for Africa

Jeff Hill, USAID Bureau for Food Security

#### Moderator:

Zachary Baquet, Knowledge Management Specialist, USAID Bureau for Food Security

#### Sponsor:

United States Agency for International Development

*Zachary Baquet:* Okay. I would just ask our speakers to come up front and we'll have a panel up front. I would just like to say that, we'll again say, when you have a question, bring the mic around to you, state your name and organization and we will alternate between our personal audience and our online audience. And with that, I open it up to the questions.

*Audience:* Hi. Good morning. Can everyone hear me? I'm Paul Macek with World Vision. Thank you very much for the presentation. I wanted to just pick up on a question that we sort of left off with in December at the summit and that was how do you measure resilience? I'd be very interested in hearing your thoughts and what's involved in terms of the joint planning work as well as your thinking on how we measure resilience in the Horn of Africa and then I also wanted to be sort of clear on the countries we're talking about. It seems like initially at least we were all focused on Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia and now hearing your discussions, you're referencing Tanzania and Uganda. I was wondering if you could just clarify that for me. Thank you.

*Nancy Lindborg:* So, thank you. I think those are all the right questions. The key focus is on Ethiopia and Kenya as the two countries that have been both most affected by the drought and have moved with their country frameworks to identify the different ways in which they will address the vulnerable populations. Unfortunately, Somalia's not there yet. But we hope that we – we had, just yesterday; there was a big meeting in London to try to move that set of solutions forward. I think in terms of how we measure resilience is what very much was on the table when the plans were being developed with the joint planning groups. And I'm gonna see if Greg and Susan want to discuss that more but one really important measure is simply next time a drought hits, will a huge population, once again, fall into the kind of serious crisis. Acute malnutrition, movements, all of those coping mechanisms and negative coping mechanisms that we see when populations become in a situation of really, really serious need. You know, almost half of the DCHA budget annually goes to the Horn of Africa plus Sudan. For years. And we collectively can do better than that, especially if we're working with other donors, in alignment with country plans, with policy changes and investment changes that those countries make. We know how to make a difference so that we don't do this over and over again. But there is a number of issues that we're looking at in terms of building resilience. Susan and Greg?

*Greg Gottlieb:* One thing I can say, Paul, our teams in the Horn – one of the things I had to grapple with was what kind of monitoring evaluation system do they want to build? So when I look at Feed the Future, when we first started, one of the first things we put in place when we began to develop was monitoring and evaluation systems. Something like 54 different measures, 8 key measures as part of those. So I think that's what the teams want to

do. For instance, if you look at Ethiopia from the previous drought, go back to 2008, so you develop – a safety net program was there. So one of the things we talked about – a lot of us talked about during this last one was – “Okay, who then, was accessing a relief and who wasn't?” So you could say, “Well, we're paying for these people to be on relief but the question we'll have to answer is 'What happened to their household assets?’” So I could see that as being one of those measures. What kind of assets do they have? What do they need to access in the future? What's the nutritional status of the people that we started with? What's the general access to water versus what it was before? I think that's one of the things we're gonna have to do is we're gonna have to develop a better baseline around what those are, what we're looking at and then develop the right kinds of measures. And I think that one of the things I didn't mention was in the conference, we are – we had this two-day conference. The first day's a ministerial, but the second day is devoted to talking with private sector and civil society. I think one of the big things that'll happen, as it happened with Feed the Future was, let's talk about what the monitoring system is. Because resilience is a general term. Okay, if something happens, then I can ride it out. Am I resilient? Okay. Am I more resilient? Well, I sold my animals, I had cash, I was able to access food better – so you could see a whole host of things that we'd want to measure. So it's a good question and I think this is what we're gonna have to do. This is what we're gonna work on.

*Susan Fine:*

Maybe just to add on to that, I think in addition to looking at incomes – because obviously, if you have income you're more able to deal with shocks but also health status and nutrition, yes, but I would argue that it's beyond nutrition. A person who is more healthy is fundamentally going to be able to withstand reduced food nutrition more easily. And with respect to the other – so the IGAD member countries are Ethiopia, Uganda, Kenya, Djibouti, Somalia. Not Tanzania. If I said Tanzania, that was a mistake. But the USAID in joint planning that we had been doing, for reasons that Nancy said, has been focused primarily on Ethiopia and Kenya at this point.

*Female:*

Country and region.

*Female:*

And the regional portfolio, yes.

*Male:*

If I could offer a little bit further clarification of that is that you know, the response in the IGAD region, it does include a number of these countries but there are really fundamentally two basic different sets of actions. In those countries that do actually have a national investment plan in place, the steps are being taken to move towards concrete program development. Those are the countries where we are actually focusing and concentrating to advance that agenda. In other countries, in South Sudan, there is

actually a movement to insure that they are putting in place a strategy and an investment plan. That process is under way. In Djibouti, that process is under way and the support to insure that that is taking place is being provided so that they're able to then address the issues. So the other countries that do not yet have the kind of architecture in place to address the fundamentals of the longer-term investments and have better coordination structure for that are being put into place. So it is a – there are different agendas that are being put in a place to respond to the differences.

*Female:* Just, also, it's important to clarify, that doesn't mean that we're not paying attention to resilience in places like South Sudan. We are.

*Zachary Baquet:* We have a question from online.

*Female:* This is a question from Bruce White of Catholic Relief Services in Washington, D.C. He asks, “Many of the good Feed the Future examples for resiliency were actually Title 2 development programs. What is the role of private voluntary organizations and local partners in design and implementation of this new strategy and through what funding mechanism?”

*Jeff Hill:* I would never prejudge what the funding mechanism is. I'd be a fool to do that. I think Bruce's point is a good one. That a lot of the Title 2 programs have been ones that we have been able to build on over the years. I think as Nancy pointed out, those programs have been adapting and changing. Somalia's a great example this year of moving money electronically. People can access it with their cell phones. These are huge innovations for us, ones that take advantage of the markets. So yeah, I would agree with Bruce in that. In terms of what will happen. As I said, we're gonna start this process by having a full day with civil society to begin to discuss the framework that donors are looking at and to talk about what it means to have a donor group and to, I think, really begin to examine what we are trying to do between emergencies and development. Obviously, many of the civil society groups have great ideas around that. Many of you have been lynchpins in that so I can see a very productive discussion on that. I'll let Nancy jump right in.

*Nancy Lindborg:* Yeah Bruce, thanks for the question. Actually, as I mentioned, I just got back last night from the Sahel and actually visited in Burkina Faso program that we actually stopped supporting two years ago. It was a CRS implemented Food for Peace development program and a number of the women that I met are fully supporting families of 10 to 15 people off the earnings of their dry season irrigated vegetable fields. And I thought it was brilliant that the team put together for me a site visit where we'd stop funding two years ago. And as we're looking at a really dry season and

many failed harvests right now, because of that program that has continued on, these women are much more resilient. And they made the comment to me that they had chose onions to grow because if the pump that they had purchased failed, the onions were resilient enough to last days or up to a week without any water. And then they started calling themselves just like the onions.

Which is just to underscore that you know, the goal of truly building resilience is that we bring together our programs that we do during these chronic emergencies. We, year after year, have been pumping humanitarian funding into a lot of these countries. We need to look at how, with those programs, they build resilience even as you address the needs of the most vulnerable. And we saw this with some of the programs in Kenya, the arid – the Arch Arid Lands Recovery consortium and the Rain program in Ethiopia and the crisis modifiers approach in Ethiopia and the productive food safety net – these are all programs that are done through OFTA and Food for Peace. And the goal of the joint planning groups was really to enable those to be connected up either by layering, by fully integrating – which is the crisis modifier approach – or by sequencing so that when those programs come to an end, that they are – there's connective tissue with them and what comes as a follow on for longer-term programming.

And the one challenge that I would put to those of you who work on the humanitarian side is that I think we can do a better job of working on some clear indicators and it goes to the question of how are we measuring resilience. And I want to put this challenge back to the partners that there be these clear indicators that you can peg to across a lot of different programs because it's understanding what have all our efforts added up to so that you can build on that and scale on that and understand which of those strategies were most successful. And that was one of the goals of our December workshop and the arc here is we're going from that December workshop to the even that we'll be having in March out in Nairobi to really try to move this forward in a connected way so that it's all of the funding streams working towards this common agenda.

*Audience:* Hello? Okay. My name is Maria Throuhedjro, I'm from [CaliCons]. Along the same question of the measurement. Where are the systems? None of you have mentioned FEWS or the use of FEWS because if you don't have systems, then you won't be able to have institutional memory. What happened here? How did we measure it? What happened 10 years later? How did we measure it? So where are the systems in all these pictures?

*Nancy Lindborg:* So if we didn't mention FEWS, it's not for lack of looking at FEWS data probably every day. And I think the investments that USAID made in

FEWS over the last decade have been extraordinarily instrumental in helping us understand you know, both the importance of positioning action and in the case of the Horn of Africa, we were able to position food supplies in the region as early as August 2010. And it's enabled us to really track market indicators, production, the climactic impacts, nutritional status. In Somalia, we were able to link it to the FSNAU data. This has been critical and that will help us to take those measures that will feed into how we understand progress. And that links to improved systems at the country levels as well. Now that's all different, I think, then the kind of monitoring and evaluation that Greg mentioned in that we all need to think of how to put in place better \_\_\_ to link what we do in the early stage with the longer term. But without question, that's been – that's changed how we understand what we need to do, when.

*Greg Gottlieb:*

What I would – one thing I can add as a former Chief of Party of FEWS, is that the difference over the years, I think, is that FEWS' voice is louder now. When I was Chief of Party back in the '90s, we were larger just a – we gathered information and we supplied it. We didn't really offer a lot of opinions because that's not what our masters wanted at the time. FEWS is a very different organization now in the sense of FEWS offers, I think, a more concrete outlook on what will happen and I think what the result of that has been that we have acted earlier. I think that's really a big improvement. There's always – we can always be criticized for “we should have acted more, done this” but the fact is that FEWS and the other components of those early warning systems through FAO and WFP and others, they actually have helped us to start earlier and to get a little bit more innovative in how we start out. So yeah, we really are making much more use of that system now.

*Male:*

We have a question from online.

*Female:*

This is a question from Swahh Karanja, senior director of institutional business development at Heifer International in Little Rock, Arkansas. “Given the importance of crop livestock integration and building resilience and sustainable livelihoods, will Feed the Future and other US government procurements include livestock as an integral part of rural value chains in agricultural development?”

*Male:*

Yes. You know, I think that's a – I mean, that's – a really, really simple answer is yes, that we really are recognizing and respecting what is really important to local economies and the livelihoods of how they are sustaining themselves and actually stimulating some of the broader economic growth. And in the dry land areas, the single most dominant economic effort is around livestock systems. And so that looking at how to effectively address those technical and trade and support services that are needed for that to function effectively and play its role is a critical part

of the common framework that is coming from the countries in the region in setting the agendas. So I think that a very large strategic “yes” is the response.

*Audience:* Blake Selzer with CARE. Two quick questions. One, dealt with what Susan mentioned that we've gone through this before and the Greater Horn incident talked about insufficient resources being paid to conflict areas. So one of the things I was curious about was how Somalia plays into this? I know that not much has been talked about this today but clearly, that was the one area that had famine so how this effort on linking resources for development and emergency, how Somalia plays in that especially with the issue of governance, I think. And then second, related to we've gone through this before. We don't want to reinvent the wheel. How much is this effort looking at other efforts such as DIFID or other folks who are doing similar efforts? When I was in the Horn, I saw a lot of things that DIFID was doing so I don't know if we're coordinated with them as much or not. Thanks.

*Female:* Great. Thanks, Blake. You know, Somalia, I think, is probably the poster child for why to have a bureau called Democracy Conflict and Humanitarian Assessment. And I think AID deserves a lot of credit for understanding those linkages that it's the absence of inclusive, effective, legitimate democracies. It's that absence that results in conflict spiraling into the 20-year problem that Somalia has and therefore requires the continual huge mobilization of humanitarian assistance. So in response, we also understand that people are really resilient even in environments that are really almost horrible beyond imagining. And what we've done in our response to Somalia – and again, thanks to many of you who have been involved with that response with very courageous teams and a lot of innovation. You know, we've had a response that is focused on probably some of the most innovative humanitarian responses ever in terms of focus on cash, on vouchers, on really enabling families to insure that they get their crops in, being very sensitive to markets and this is where FEWS net and FSNAU have been so important. They've enabled us to monitor very closely prices in the markets and to calibrate responses that look at both demand and supply side. So as a result, I think that has contributed to the DARE harvest being very successful and enabling us to say that famine has abated in Somalia even though I think everyone understands that it is still seriously fragile and it's not time to take our attention away. But so we have built resilience. There's not the opportunity to link it to the plans, the investment strategies and the development that one can do in a country that actually has a government that is fully moving forward on a development agenda. I would also just say, I met with the DIFID guys yesterday. I think that Jeff was there last week –

*Male:* This week.

*Female:* This week and Tom Beck, our colleague was so we talk to them all the time, it's that point and we're very conscious of working closely not just with DIFID but with our other donor colleagues. That's the point of this March 28<sup>th</sup> conference is insuring that we really do move forward on a harmonization and alignment among the donors and with country plans so that we can try to have that impact.

*Female:* Maybe just to add. Obviously, dealing with a conflict in Somalia is first and foremost a political issue and as Nancy mentioned, the United Kingdom just hosted yesterday a high-level conference on the political situation in Somalia. Secretary Clinton was there. I think this demonstrates the commitment of the United States and other – the UK and other countries – to really work with the various constituencies in Somalia to try and make progress on the political front to move towards a more stable and sustainable governance structure. So that has to be the first way of addressing that. And obviously, other than humanitarian assistance, we have a number of restrictions on our ability to do development work in certain parts of Somalia. We can and are working in Somaliland, \_\_\_ and certain other places with development activities – stabilization and development activities. And I would also note that even though we cannot work in South Central Somalia at this time, the regional trade and livestock activities that our regional mission in East Africa is working on benefit the pastoralists in South Central Somalia.

*Male:* Question from online.

*Female:* This is a question from Lukasz Czerwinski from Landesa in Seattle. “I notice the importance of secure land rights was not mentioned in the discussion which is a key component of the success of FTF and ties into many of the objectives. I was wondering if Greg could talk about how secure land tenure is being taken into account as we link relief to the development. I was also curious to know if secure land rights had been taken into account during the development of the framework of resilience Nancy mentioned.”

*Greg Gottlieb:* Thanks for that question. I will say that in Ethiopia, one of our key programs there has to do with land tenure. We developed a pilot that looked at trying to determine what land people owned and then to basically give them, if it's not outright ownership, it's a certificate that allows them then to improve that land without reservation. And the government has just asked us to expand that into a full-blown program. They like the way that we've gone about it with our partners and so we look at that as a very key element in trying to increase ag production in Ethiopia.

In terms of, you know, we didn't talk specifically about land tenure but I think it's one of those issues we understand is key. It's a – when we look at the pastoralist areas, land tenure is a key issue around traditional land holdings because it's an area as agriculturalists – as the population of agriculturalists increases and pushes into sort of marginal grazing lands, it impinges on traditional grazing. So we – and it causes conflict with the community. So we understand that a lot of those rights have to be worked on so that communities can retain rights to their traditional grazing lands and so that is something that we have worked on over the years and we realize that as we approach our programs in the Horn that we'll have to take that into consideration.

*Jeff Hill:*

This is Jeff Hill. Let me just speak to that for a moment. I think that the priority and the issue of land is obviously extremely important as well as other you know, resources such as water, right? And the rights to those resources are extremely important in being able to develop sustainable solutions to the kind of issues that are being tackled. That is clearly recognized, right, within the different country plans that have been put together. There are not simple solutions to this and so that it is – there isn't a standard approach a panacea to kind of deal with. Is it a recognized as an extremely important issue? Yes. And there are a number of efforts that have been taken to try to begin to inform some of the options. You know, the AU policy on pastoralism clearly identifies a set of actions that can and should be taken by countries to create the space for shared and trans boundary resource management in advancing this agenda. Translating that into different countries so that those options are very much a part of the agenda so that it can address the land issues. It is a tough issue and is going to take a good deal of time to deal with.

*Audience:*

Hi, I'm Lily Flowers of Fintrac. One of the tools that USAID used on this effort this time which we never really seen before was the big public campaign called the Forward Campaign. And so I'm really curious about your perspective on it, whether you thought it was a worthwhile effort and how campaigns like that to raise awareness, how that fits into the other technical components that you use in the response.

*Female:*

Yes, this was probably the first time that AID has put together that kind of public awareness campaign and it really stemmed from the – I think very low response by the American public to the crisis in the Horn, especially as compared to the response that we saw in other countries. And you know, it was not because that's not what we do – a fund-raising campaign. But we did work with a number of partners, specifically interaction, but a lot of the organizations – probably here and online – who were able to able to provide feedback to us on the degree to which it had impact on their either fund-raising or their constituents. You know, when you've got the combination of a long term chronic crisis and there's conflict and there's a

famine declaration, it's too compli – and it's 13 million people which is a number that people absolutely cannot comprehend. We need to tell a coherent, collective story that helps people get inside that very complicated narrative.

And so the campaign was designed to have graphic packs. The most vivid of which was a block that showed the number of people affected by Haiti, the number of people affected by the tsunami and the number of people affected by the Horn of Africa and try to represent, in simple graphic terms, how important this was and that we needed to really grapple with some solutions. And so the graphic packs were meant to be used by all the partners in their campaigns so that you began to get this bounce, this echo, that helped put this into public awareness coupled with PSA campaigns. And hopefully everybody saw, around the Super Bowl, the NFL players who have really picked this issue up. And there were some other celebrities, a celebrity chef and to couple that with some real data that was generated by FEWS Net and create maps that could also be shared. We are in the process now of working with partners to evaluate what impact it had and we look forward to the comments and feedback from those of you who partnered with us on it. But what I think is powerful and important about it is an effort that tries to create that joint narrative at a very macro level that can be amplified and echoed across the United States.

*Female:*

Maybe just to add for – in terms of the role of that campaign or something like that in the future is something that we're really – it hasn't been worked out yet. It's very much something we're starting to talk about. But I think one of the things that if we can figure out a way to do it would be to use a campaign like that to change the narrative around Africa and around these kinds of crisis and to start talking more about resilience and how there are solutions. And that there is a way that if we build resilience, if we make these investments – particularly beyond the humanitarian investments – but continue to make the development investments, then we can get to a place where in the future, there will be fewer people who are in need of urgent humanitarian assistance. Because I think it's that – the difficulty in these kind of things is sustaining – I mean, it can be difficult to mobilize support for the immediate crisis, but I think it's even harder to mobilize public support and hence, political support to sustain those investments. And that's really what is if necessary, if we're really going to build resilience in the future. So that's some of the things that we're talking about, is how to do that with the public.

*Male:*

Do we have an online question?

*Female:*

This is a question from Maina King'ori with World Vision who is listening in from Nairobi, Kenya. “In Kenya, the famine or early warning systems network is probably the most reputable system for early warning and in

2010 predicted the La Nina situation well in advance. The link between early warning and early action needs to be emphasized. Will USAID and Feed the Future work more closely with governments to enhance early action?"

*Nancy Lindborg:* Yes. And more important even than early action is the whole agenda of building resilience so that there doesn't need to be massive mobilization of early humanitarian assistance because communities and families will already have the ability to be more resilient in the face of the next drought. So that is the fundamental underpinning of the vision here.

Yeah, and I would – as I mentioned in the beginning of my comments – there is an unprecedented coming together right now of donors and affected countries and civil society in the Sahel where FEWS Net data as well as local country data is indicating that we're having a very dry season. We've had many failed harvests, rising food prices exacerbated by conflict in the Sahel. And so there has been a pledge to connect those early warnings with early action and I actually was in Nujair with both Helen Clarke and Valerie Amos as a really symbol of bringing it together with this resilient agenda again and understanding that we need to link early action with building resilience and long term development solutions.

*Male:* I just want to add that in the current agenda, what is a clear recognition, the disaster/risk management is not an emergency issue. It is actually a long-term set of investments to insure that the capacities in the systems do exist to be able to forecast and respond in a well-organized fashion so that there is not the emergency situation. So simply recognizing that it is not simply an emergency response to have disaster/risk management capacities developed is a critically important – is a change in terms of the way that we're actually approaching this agenda.

*Audience:* Bill Fiebig from Mercy Corps on the TOPS team. In all the discussions about resiliency in the Horn and what not, how often does – in my opinion, the reality of climate change and how to integrate the implications of climate change in resiliency type programming designs and implementation?

*Male:* Well, what I can say is that there is a very large recognition, the concern for you know, better understanding of the natural resources and the climate in the dry land areas that are taking place. As part of this planning process, as part of the program design efforts, there is a large significant effort for being able to recognize the changes that are taking place and begin to look at the different technical options that might exist for adaptation and being able to respond to that. And so that drills into different issues of strategies for water management. Drills into different resource in a management of both fertility and herds and the whole range

of sets of issues around that. So it is actually a larger set of analysis that's helping to inform that discussion and so it is not a side issue. It is very much front and center to inform both the short and long-term actions that are coming online.

*Male:* Online question?

*Female:* This question is from Frank Williams at World Vision. "Extraordinary capital flows are coming into East Africa. For all of Africa, estimates of \$220 billion for 2011 growing at 45 percent per year from just China and India, not including Saudi Arabia, Russia, Brazil, Sovereign wealth funds and health hedge funds, fueling jobs, strengthened value chains, GDP acceleration for the two major investment countries, China and India. What efforts are being made to bring them into policy and framework discussions in East Africa?"

*Male:* Yes. I think that – two parts of that discussion. One of them is the architecture for being able to more effectively look at the private sector investment that is complimentary to the kind of public sector investment to address this issue. And in that regard there is, you know, built around – in Kenya, there is an active process taking place as well as in Ethiopia right now, you know, really digging in with the private sector to look at how these investments can be now brought together. There is an agenda that is being called Grow Africa that is helping to insure that the linkages between private sector investment and the public sector investment to advance these issues is taking place and there is active examination of investment opportunities taking place right now. And that they would be brought into this discussion.

Second is with regard to the integration, the linkages with India and China. You know, part of the actual developments of infrastructure that has been taking place in both of those countries has you know, very much been engaging China in terms of how to you know, work and improve alignment between the investments and infrastructure that are critical, actually, in the Azaleas, in those areas. It is a very much an ongoing set of discussions. We have had numerous engagements with China and India about the work in East Africa, but more broadly, in Africa as a whole and that there is an active dialogue taking place, especially with regard to the Horn area and those countries.

*Male:* I can add that we've – one aspect that Feed the Future is to work with some of our critical partners and India is one of those. And so one of the programs that we've tried to develop is trying to use – both have African agriculturalists and livestock people go to India to look at their technology and to try to bring some of that technology back to Africa. The Indians

have been particularly good at – adept at certain dry land agriculture techniques so we've also got that level of collaboration going on.

*Female:* I would just add – remind us all also that at the high level dialogue on aid effectiveness in Bussan this December that one of the real critical differences of that dialogue was the inclusion not just of civil society but of the private sector, who were very much represented. And it was an acknowledgment that as the world looks at development effectiveness that absolutely the private sector has to be engaged, it has to be a part of it and there have to be the connector points within the frameworks to take advantage of those investments.

*Audience:* Good morning. James Creole, ASME. I was curious; within your programs, how much collaboration you have with professional engineers or engineer organizations? Thank you.

*Male:* Well, when – I think that you know, we're looking for the right answer on that. And I think the reality of it is that when we're talking about infrastructure programs or programs that do actually require the engagement with the structural engineers and other types of engineers, there is a very close collaboration on a set of those discussions. So they're – I mean, practically, I think where we're taking on a technical issue you know, we do seek to actually build a partnership with those skills and agencies relevant to that. We think that that's true on a number of areas and in different engineering we do have activities that are operating in Easter Africa with some of the different local agencies that are coordinating efforts on infrastructure and civil engineers, structural engineers in that regard.

*Female:* Yeah, but I think the reality's in terms of USAID's investments, we're not going to have the kind of resource levels that would enable us to make significant investments in infrastructure, per se. Maybe small local level infrastructure but not – we're not talking roads and bridges.

*Audience:* Francesco Bageeni, World Relief. I have a question regarding changing the discussion. Work for the World just recently released a report around the renewal of the farm bill, which made a lot of recommendation in terms of international farm policy. One of them was ending monetization. And I'm curious whether USAID's gonna do any public advocacy in relationship to those, specifically on that issue. Thank you.

*Female:* Public advocacy –

*Audience:* That you mentioned in the earlier discussion about the difficulty of changing the discussion and I guess, basically, are you guys gonna

publically take a position on those recommendations in the way that you tried to change the discussion around the Horn of Africa?

*Female:* Well, the Horn of Africa was really a much different kind of narrative, which is – I think Susan's point was an important one to just engage the American public in a conversation about “What are solutions?” These aren't hopeless basket cases but that there are ways that you can move forward and create the resilience. The farm bill is a far different issue and you know, I think we're all aware of the GAO report and we'll be looking closely at the farm bill in the weeks ahead.

*Audience:* So there's no official stance right now from USAID in terms of those recommendations?

*Female:* The bread – no.

*Male:* We have an online question.

*Female:* This question is from Whitney Kipps from Lutheran World Relief. “Based on lessons learned from USAID's response in the Horn and your knowledge of the growing crisis in the Sahel, how can we best insure that gender is integrated throughout the response to the development spectrum?”

*Female:* So, I want to appreciate all the questioners who have enabled us to insure that we remember some of our – the importance of FEWS Net, the importance of land rights, the importance of understanding the devastation that conflict can – and women, I actually have a note on my paper to make sure that we underscore what we know is at the heart of any successful effort and that is enabling women. And I made the note at the time that we were talking about land rights because it's so important to understand that women have that kind of security to move solutions forward. I can just assure you that this administration and AID puts women very much at the heart. We have a new gender policy. We are very engaged with women in conflict initiative. Every program that I visited in the Horn and in the Sahel had a serious focus on women and we know that that understanding how to help women, find the ways to support their families, is absolutely key to success to this.

*Male:* Just to agree with that.

*Female:* But thank you for the question. We get to underscore it.

*Male:* Yeah, it's something that we – I think the whole Feed the Future strategy – all those strategies – we've built into that. Broaden gender policies to try to get that right. We realize what it means for women to be productive in

the household, to have access to the kinds of kitchen gardens and to use that as both nutrition for their children and for cash that enables them to do other things for their kids, and it's not hard for us to integrate these. The secretary's been very clear that she looks at this as one of her main policy goals both for us and for state and for all the projects we do. Whether we have looked at higher education for women, reinstating those types of programs, or making sure the communities that we target really focus on women and their needs and the needs of their children.

*Female:* I would just throw the challenge somewhat back to you all because you're the ones who are doing these things on the ground. And I think what is so important is to share your experiences and the approaches that you've used that have been effective in engaging women and empowering women in these kinds of programs, so I mean, that's really important. But the commitment is certainly there at the policy level and at the planning level to integrate these kind of approaches but it's really – the hard part is making it work on the ground and so it's important for you all to be part of that conversation.

*Male:* We have time for one more question in person.

*Audience:* Great, thanks. My name is Ina Schimberg. I'm with URC and I know that with respect to resiliency, the strength in life and flexibilities of livelihoods, markets and other structures and players usually focus and that's really what you've focused on now. But when looking at broader resiliency, the strength of health systems to scale up nutritional or epidemic services, scale them up, scale them down, and be linked with appropriate monitoring services, is also important as Susan mentioned earlier. How are they gonna be included in this broader strategy that you're talking about and for example, are you going to have health reps at the Ministerial meeting?

*Female:* I'll start out on that one because yes, the short answer is yes. Health, beyond nutrition, will be part of the overall response to building resilience because we do recognize that that's important. In addition to the Feed the Future investments, our Ethiopia and Kenya missions have identified other investments that are part of their portfolio including health system development and health service delivery that in these – in the same areas that will complement the investments of Feed the Future. It's interesting that you picked up on the fact that on the Ministerial – currently the way the invitation that has gone out to the IGAD ministers does not include the Ministers of Health, but that's something that we've actually been talking about. Maybe going back to IGAD and suggesting that they might want to expand that invitation to include Ministers of Health and maybe local government as well.

*Female:*

Yeah, I would just add to that that ultimately, like any good strategy, it has to be particular to the context and I was really struck – sorry to keep bringing this up – but in Burkina Faso, for example, really the number one killer of young children is malaria. And so as we put together joint planning groups, the goal is that you want to be looking very carefully at what is the evidence tell you are some of the key barriers to increased resilience. And then bring to bear the tools, the approaches and the funding streams that we have available that really enable us to build the kind of resilience that keeps these communities from the chronic crisis that we are seeing where they are completely unable to withstand the shocks that come at them. Whether it's a food price hike or a bad harvest.

*Zachary Baquet:*

Any other comments? Well, with that, I'd like to thank our speakers today for joining us and sharing their insights. The transcripts and recordings of this event will go up on Agrilinks. Agrilinks.org in about a weeks' time. Everyone who has RSVP'd for this event will get an email notification letting them know when those resources are available. I would just like to note, also, that the resilience workshop that happened in December that Nancy mentioned is actually – the video recordings of the presentation's from that event are also up on Agrilinks. You can go to the Agrilinks blog and find a post of it or if you can do a search for resilience on the site as well. I would just like to note, also, that for those in person, there were evaluation sheets on your chairs. Please take a moment to fill those out. It's a great help to us in planning a future event and then for you online, we'll send you a link so if you could fill that out as well. We do appreciate your input and we take those quite seriously.

I would also just note our next event is the Ag Sector Council. It will happen on February 29<sup>th</sup>. It's gonna be about public investments in the ag sector. We'll have the director of USDA's agricultural research services offices of international research programs Ibrahim Shaqir speaking about this. So look forward to that as well. And with that, thank you very much. You have an excellent day.

*[End of Audio]*

