



FEED THE FUTURE

The U.S. Government's Global Hunger & Food Security Initiative



Feed the Future Innovation Lab For Food Security Policy

WORKPLAN

1 October 2017 – 30 June 2019

February 7, 2018



Contents

List of Acronyms	4
Introduction.....	5
Section 1. Continuing Activities from Year 4 and Task 1.....	7
1. Components 1/2: Collaborative Policy Research, Analysis and Capacity Building for West Africa ..	7
1.1. Introduction.....	7
1.2. Continuing Activities from Previous Year(s).....	7
1.3 Projected Outputs and Outcomes (by the end of Year 5).....	7
1.4. Data Management Plan.....	8
2. Component C1/C2 Asia	9
2.1 Introduction.....	9
2.2. Continuing Activities from Previous Year(s).....	9
2.3 Projected Outcomes (by the end of Year 5).....	10
2.4. Data Management Plan	11
3. Component C1/C2 Eastern and Southern Africa Malawi.....	12
3.1. Introduction.....	12
3.2. Continuing Activities from Previous Year(s).....	12
3.3 Projected Outcomes (by the end of Year 5).....	13
3.4. Data Management Plan	14
4. Component C1/C2 Eastern and Southern Africa – Tanzania and Other Countries.....	15
4.1. Introduction.....	15
4.2. Continuing Activities from Previous Year(s).....	15
4.3. Projected Outcomes (by the end of Year 5) (with continuing support through ASPIRES)	15
4.4. Data Management Plan	16
5. Component C1/C2 Eastern and Southern Africa – Zambia.....	17
5.1. Introduction.....	17
5.2. Continuing Activities from Previous Year	17
5.3. Final Push towards Policy Influence (Task 1).....	18
5.4 Projected Outcomes (by the end of 2018)	19
5.5. Data Management Plan	20
6. Component 3: Global Collaborative Research on Policy Process and Capacity	21
6.1 Introduction.....	21
6.2 Continuing Activities from Previous Year(s).....	21

6.3	Final Push towards Policy Influence (Task 1).....	21
6.4	Projected Outcomes (by the end of Year 5).....	26
6.5	Data Management Plan	28
7.	Component 4: Engagement on Global Policy Debates on Food Security.....	29
7.1.	4a. Agrifood System Transformation in the Upstream: Land Dynamics, Land Governance, Fertilizer and Soil Fertility, Mechanization and Implications for Rural Employment	29
7.1.1.	Introduction.....	29
7.1.2.	Continuing Activities from Previous Year(s)	29
7.1.3	Final Push towards Policy Influence (Task 1).....	32
7.1.4.	Projected Outcomes (by the end of Year 5).....	34
7.1.5.	Data Management Plan.....	35
7.2.	4b: Agrifood System Transformation in the Downstream and Implications for Linkages to the Upstream.....	37
7.2.1.	Introduction.....	37
7.2.2.	Continuing Activities from Previous Year (from carry forward funds).....	38
7.2.3.	Final Push towards Policy Influence (Task 1).....	39
7.2.4	Projected Outcomes (by the end of Year 5).....	40
7.2.5.	Data Management Plan.....	40
8.	Component 5: Strategic Analytical Agenda and Support to Donor Policy and Strategy	41
8.1.	Introduction.....	41
8.2	Continuing Activities from Previous Year	41
8.3	New Activities.....	44
9.	Management Support for Coordination, Communication, Compliance and Impact.....	47
9.1	Follow up on Internal/External Review Recommendations.....	47
9.2	Compliance with Open Data Management Plan	48
9.3	Grant Management, Reporting, and Monitoring and Evaluation	48
	Section 2. Other Priority Tasks and Activities for the Final Year	49
	Task 2: FSP Synthesis Document about Lessons Learned	49
	Task 3: Better communication of policy influence and people level impact	52
	Task 4: Final lessons/approaches on sustainable local policy research capacity	55
	Task 5: C4a and C4b joint findings/recommendations on implications of structural transformation from farm to fork.....	58
	Task 6: land related research findings/recommendations/policy actions.....	60

Task 7: Synthesizing policy findings and lessons on cross-cutting themes (gender, nutrition, climate resilience, and youth employment).....	62
ANNEX 1: List of Ongoing and Prospective Buy-Ins and Associate Awards	63
ANNEX 2: FSP Component 5: Request Form.....	64
ANNEX 3: Matrix of Country Level Activities Funded Under the FTF Innovation Lab for Food Security Policy Research as of September 2016.....	65

List of Acronyms

CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CDAIS	Capacity Development in Agricultural Innovation System
CGE	computable general equilibrium
CILSS	Comité permanent Inter-Etats de Lutte contre la Sécheresse dans le Sahel
CPS	Cellule de Planification et de Statistique. Mali
DAPS	Ministry of Agriculture, Directorate for Analysis, Forecasting and Statistics. Senegal
DARD	Directorate of Agriculture and Rural Development, ECOWAS
ECOSIM	ECOWAS Simulation Model
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
ECOWAP	ECOWAS Investment Plan
ESA	Eastern and Southern Africa
FSP	Feed The Future Innovation Lab for Food Security Policy
FTF	Feed the Future
GISAIA	Guiding Investments in Sustainable Agricultural Intensification in Africa
GoT	Government of Tanzania
ICRISAT	International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
IER	Institut d'Economie Rurale. Mali
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
INSTAT	Institut national de la statistique. Mali
IPR	Institut Polytechnique Rural. Mali
IRs	Intermediate results
ISRA	Institute for Agricultural Research. Senegal
JSR	joint sector review
LGA	Local Government Authority
LGAF	Land Governance Accountability Framework
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MAFS	Modernizing African Food Systems
MaSSP	Malawi Strategy Support Program
MDRI	Myanmar Development Research Institute
MLFRD	Ministry of Livestock, Fisheries, and Rural Development (Burma)
MSU	Michigan State University
NAIP	National Agriculture Investment Plans
RAIP	Regional Agriculture Investment Plan
ReNAPRI	Regional Network of Agricultural Policy Research Institutes
ReSAKSS	Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System
SAKSS	Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System
UP	University of Pretoria
WA	West Africa

Introduction

The Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Food Security Policy (FSP) was awarded to a consortium comprised of Michigan State University (MSU), the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and the University of Pretoria on July 15, 2013. This is the final workplan encompassing the period October 1, 2017 to June 30, 2019.

FSP Goal and Objectives

The overall goal of the FSP program is to promote inclusive agricultural productivity growth, improved nutritional outcomes, and enhanced livelihood resilience for men and women through improved policy environments. FSP focuses on two integrated objectives:

- *Objective 1:* Address critical evidence gaps for informed policy debate and formulation at country, regional and global levels. FSP will generate, synthesize and disseminate new knowledge on targeted policy issues for which the current evidence base is insufficient or inadequately understood to permit confident formulation and implementation of effective policies at country, regional and global levels.
- *Objective 2:* Foster credible, inclusive, transparent and sustainable policy processes at country level. The FSP will strengthen the building blocks for national policy systems in their regional contexts, promote inclusion of and dialogue among all stakeholders around critical policy issues, and disseminate globally sourced examples of successful innovation and best practice in policy system capacity building.

As FSP accomplishes these two complementary objectives, improved policies will accelerate and deepen the FTF-wide intermediate results (IRs) of increased agriculture productivity, improved market access, increased public and private investment, new rural farm and non-farm employment, and improved resilience.

FSP Approach

FSP considers the agrifood chain as a complex system of interactions between a variety of input dealers, farmers, traders, transporters, processors, retailers, and others that link farmers to consumers. FSP addresses transformations that impact the entire agrifood system. Collaboration with and between stakeholders in host countries is essential. Scientists and research organizations, policy-makers, private sector, food production groups, and media are involved with the food security policy process. The scale is local, national, regional or global.

FSP project is organized around three types of activities: policy-relevant agrifood system research, policy system analysis, and country level support for policy change. These topics interact and inform each other. They are articulated with major cross-cutting themes: climate change, gender, nutrition and youth employment.

FSP Workplan Structure

This final FSP workplan is organized in two major Sections. Section 1 includes description of continuing activities from Year 4 funded from carryforward funds and new activities under Task 1 (Final push towards policy influence). This Section is organized by Components 1 to 5. Section 2 includes a description of new tasks and activities to be accomplished from January to December 2018. The workplan is developed by blended teams from all three consortium members (Table 1).

Table 1. Overview of proposed workplan for year 5 and involvement of consortium partners

Component	Region/Country/sub-component	Involvement of team members from		
		MSU	IFPRI	UP
Section 1: Continuing activities from Year 4 (C) and Final Push towards Policy Change - Task 1 (T1)\a				
C1: Country-Level Collaborative Research (on Farms, Firms, and Markets) and Formulation/Analysis of Policy Options	West Africa –Mali	C		
	Asia – Burma	C	C	
C2: Country-Level Capacity-Building for Policy (Data, Analysis, Advocacy, Formulation, Consultation, Coordination, and Implementation)	East and Southern Africa: Malawi			C
	East and Southern Africa: Zambia	C & T1		
C3: Global Collaborative Research on Support to the Policy Process and Policy Capacity		C & T1	C & T1	C & T1
C4: Engagement in Global Policy Debates on Food and Nutrition Security	Upstream work	C & T1	C & T1	C & T1
	Downstream work	C & T1	C & T1	
C5: Strategic Analytical Agenda and Support to Donor Policy and Strategy			C & T1	C & T1
Section 2: Other priority tasks and activities for the final year (X)				
Task 2. End of project/lessons learned/synthesis document		X	X	X
Task 3: Better communication of policy influence and people level impact		X		X
Task 4: Final lessons/approaches on sustainable local policy research capacity		X	X	X
Task 5: C4(a) and C4(b) joint findings/recommendations (implications of structural transformation from farm to fork)		X	X	X
Task 6: C4(a) land related research findings / recommendations / policy actions		X	X	
Task 7: Synthesizing policy findings and lessons on gender, nutrition, and other cross-cutting themes		X		
Task 8. Follow up on external evaluation recommendations related to coordination and M&E		X	X	X

\a We expect to use the final year of FSP to push for policy influence all along the continuum from changing perceptions to actually leveraging changes and implementation in policy. This is our priority task #1 and is included In Section 1 under Component specific workplan.

Section 1. Continuing Activities from Year 4 and Task 1

1. Components 1/2: Collaborative Policy Research, Analysis and Capacity Building for West Africa

1.1. Introduction

FSP will continue to provide core funding to support the long-term program of policy research and capacity building in Mali (FSP Workplan Activity 5 from Year 4). This year will be the final year of commitment of core funding to complement the activities planned under a five-year associate award from USAID/Mali. The Projet de Recherche sur les Politiques Sécurité Alimentaire (PRPoSAM) includes a program of applied policy research, outreach and capacity building focusing on policy issues important to the Malian government and to USAID/Mali.

1.2. Continuing Activities from Previous Year(s)

<p>Activity #5. Support to national programs: Mali MSU team members (Haggblade, Thériault, Smale, Koné and Traoré) are working closely with three local institutions – the Institut d’Economie Rurale (IER), Institut Polytechnique Rural (IPR) and Cellule de Planification et de Statistiques du Secteur Développement Rural (CPS/SDR) -- on a program of collaborative policy research and capacity building.</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analysis of soil fertility: variability and variable access by gender and age 2. Impact of domestic trade barriers on urban food prices <hr/> <p>Outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improved understanding of national agricultural policies and policy options 2. Increased national capacity to conduct policy research at local institutions
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.3 Projected Outputs and Outcomes (by the end of Year 5)

Outputs

Projected over the calendar year 2018

1. Publications: 6 working papers, 4 policy briefs, 3 journal articles
2. Data sets: 1 farm household survey in 2 agro-ecological zones of Mali
3. Knowledge dissemination:
 - a. 3 policy workshops
 - b. 3 radio broadcasts
 - c. 2 private sector stakeholder dialogues (herbicides, fertilizer)
4. Policy analysis:
 - a. Soil fertility: gender differences in land allocation
 - b. Impact of domestic trade barriers on urban food prices
 - c. Impact of fertilizer subsidies on rice, cotton, maize and millet on area planted, fertilizer use, farm output and household income
 - d. Differences in fertilizer subsidy mechanisms: paper vouchers vs e-vouchers

- e. Remaining topics to be identified in consultation with PREPOSAM's local collaborators
- 5. Capacity building:
 - a. IPR student thesis research support (5 students mentored)
 - b. Short-term training in economic research and policy analysis methods (IER, IPR, CPS, etc.); topics to be determined in consultation with local collaborators
 - c. 1 Ph.D. student

Outcomes

1. Enhanced institutional capacity
 - a. Institut d'Economie Rurale (IER): Collaborative research, equipment and short-term in-service training in research methods and policy analysis
 - b. Institut Polytechnique Rural (IPR): support for student research and policy analysis; equipment and short-term in-service training in research methods and policy analysis
2. Improved policy processes
 - a. Stakeholder diagnostic and prescriptions for improving two major observed deficiencies in the policy system: • limited private sector engagement; • poor implementation.
3. Policy engagement
 - a. Fertilizer subsidies
 - b. Herbicide policy: domestic and regional implications
 - c. Domestic trade barriers for staple foods
 - d. Agribusiness investment opportunities and policy implications

1.4. Data Management Plan

	Dataset Type	Brief description	Anticipated time frame for a scholarly output based on this dataset?	When will it be registered in DDL?
1	Farm household survey in Sudan savanna of Mali, 2014/15	Household survey featuring asset summaries and plot-level information on land allocation, cropping, input use, soil fertility and outputs	April 2016	December 2016 (submitted)
2	Inventory of processed foods, 2016	Inventory of processed dairy and cereal products produced and sold in Mali	July 2017	January 2018 (submitted)
3	M&E Policy System Baseline Indices	Baseline survey of Mali policy system and processes.	July 2017	February 2018 (to be submitted)
4	Farm household survey in two agro-ecological zones, 2017/18	Household survey featuring asset summaries and plot-level information on land allocation, cropping, input use and outputs	December 2018	February 2019 (to be submitted)

2. Component C1/C2 Asia

2.1 Introduction

FSP core support in Asia is focused on Burma. At the beginning of April 2016 a new government took office in Burma under the leadership of Aung Sang Suu Kyi, head of the National League for Democracy (NLD). Agricultural development was a top priority in the NLD election manifesto. Now in office, the government is seeking to facilitate rapid, smallholder-led agricultural growth for inclusive rural economic growth. The challenges are formidable after more than five decades of top-down socialist management of the economy, and almost three decades of international isolation. With the new government in place USAID Burma considers that the country has now entered a “transition” phase. All remaining sanctions against Burma were lifted with effect from October 7, 2016.

Previous FSP core support to Burma focused on laying the foundation for evidence-based policy analysis through key pieces of empirical research on agricultural value chains and rural livelihoods and putting in place essential missing elements in policy architecture. In Year 4 of FSP core support, the focus shifted to working closely with Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Irrigation (MOALI) Department of Planning, where a new Agricultural Policy Unit (APU) was established in response to an FSP proposal developed by IFPRI and MSU in July 2016. The APU serves as a critical entry point for introducing evidence-based policy analysis, prioritizing public investment, and support the MOALI’s functional transition to a facilitator/enabler of the private sector.

A top priority for MOALI is to develop an improved irrigation strategy. Irrigation is critical to achieving increased smallholder productivity and diversification into high value enterprises, while at the same time adapting to climate change. Historically, large investments have been made in dams but smallholder access to irrigation water, and technical support for diversification and productivity gains, remains underdeveloped. Burma has been identified as one of the most vulnerable countries in the world to climate change and hence irrigation strategy is key to improved livelihood resilience. Complementary investments are needed to enhance access to improved varieties, extension, and financial services.

2.2. Continuing Activities from Previous Year(s)

<p>Activity # 4 Research study on “Strategic Planning for Irrigation Development in Myanmar” to assess the current irrigation status and potential for development to enhance the agriculture sector of Myanmar, and to examine the effectiveness of alternative agricultural policies on water resources. This activity is led by Mark Rosegrant from IFPRI.</p>	<p>Outputs: 1. Working Paper 2. Multi-stakeholder workshop</p> <p>Outcomes: 1. Increased effectiveness of public investment in irrigation 2. Increased resilience of agricultural systems to climate change</p>
<p>Activity # 6 Capacity strengthening for new Agricultural Policy Unit in Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Irrigation</p>	<p>Outputs: 1. Identification of Agricultural Policy Unit training needs and plan 2. Provision of training materials on priority topics</p>

	<p>Outcomes:</p> <p>1. MOALI capacity to evaluate alternative policies and public investments enhanced</p>
<p>Activity # 7</p> <p>Assessing Trade Comparative Advantage among Myanmar’s Neighboring Countries: Challenges and Opportunities for Myanmar’s Agricultural Exports</p> <p>(Key researcher: Kevin Chen, IFPRI)</p> <p>1. The trade comparative advantage analysis will focus on the commodities that Myanmar has interests to promote for exports, which are also major exporting commodities by some neighboring countries, and it will assess the potential for Myanmar to compete with these countries or participate in exports along with these countries.</p> <p>2. A forward-looking assessment for Myanmar’s trade relationship with China. China is Myanmar’s main agricultural trading partner and likely to remain so. This assessment will be done through a close engagement with Dr. Zaw Oo. The possible joint research with Dr. Zaw Oo on policy oriented option analysis will be further developed through such engagement.</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <p>1. A draft report based on the comparative advantage analysis</p> <p>Outcomes:</p> <p>1. Increased understanding on Myanmar’s comparative advantage in regional trade;</p> <p>2. Increased competitiveness of Myanmar in regional and international trade</p>

2.3 Projected Outcomes (by the end of Year 5)

- Sub IR 1.3 Support to MOALI in implementation of government’s new agricultural policy and strategy through evidence-based policy analysis, public investment portfolio and functional analysis. The initial focus will be on accelerating technology transfer through increased investment in and effectiveness of agricultural research and extension services.
- Sub-Sub IR 1.3: Establishment and strengthening of policy analysis capacity in MOALI Department of Planning. Subject to recruitment of staff for the new unit, up to twelve analysts will receive formal short course training on policy analysis as well as on the job training. An analysis of rice markets and implications for rice pricing policy will be used as an example.
- Sub-Sub IR 1.3 Incorporation of evidence-based analysis in implementation of subsector specific policies and strategies. Analysis of the implications of climate change for irrigation investments will be used as an example.

2.4. Data Management Plan

	Dataset Type	Brief description	Anticipated time frame for a scholarly output to be completed based on this dataset?	When will it be registered in DDL?
1	Mon State Rural Livelihoods Survey	Household Data Set	March 2017	December 2018
2	Myanmar Agri-Aquaculture Survey	Household Data Set	June 2017	September 2018
3	Rural Economy and Agriculture in the Dry Zone	Household Data Set	May 2018	June 2018
4	Dry Zone Seed System Survey	Household Data Set	February 2019	March 2019

3. Component C1/C2 Eastern and Southern Africa Malawi

3.1. Introduction

The activities of FSP in Malawi in FY2017 were primarily carried out using funding through an Associate Award from USAID/Malawi for the New Alliance Policy Acceleration Support: Malawi (NAPAS:Malawi) project. Under NAPAS:Malawi, the FSP partners support the government of Malawi as it works to implement the policy reform agenda to which it committed in late- 2013 under the New Alliance Country Cooperation Framework for Malawi. In addition, the University of Pretoria (UP), using FSP resources, led a training of journalists in Malawi as a Component 2 activity. Overall, only limited core resources from the global FSP project were used in FY 2017 to support FSP Components 1 and 2 activities in Malawi.

In FY2017, FSP resources were primarily used to build capacity in partial equilibrium modeling at the Centre for Agricultural Research and Development (CARD). This activity is projected to be completed in Year 5.

3.2. Continuing Activities from Previous Year(s)

<p>Activity 3: Capacity building in PE modeling methods</p> <p>In FY2017, staff from the University of Pretoria will use FSP funding to provide training in the use of partial equilibrium (PE) modeling methods for policy analyses and national and regional crop market outlook projections to researchers affiliated with the Centre for Agricultural Research and Development (CARD). CARD is a policy research institution associated with the Lilongwe University of Agriculture & Natural Resources, Bunda, Malawi and is a member of the Regional Network of Agricultural Policy Research Institutes (ReNAPRI).</p> <p>This activity will be led by Richard Kachule from CARD and Ferdi Meyer and Tracy Davids of UP. Mr. Kachule has received basic training in PE modeling and, using PE techniques, produced ReNAPRI’s 10-year outlook for the maize sector in Malawi. The approach to PE modeling that will be employed in this training is a middle approach to doing policy analysis that is easier to understand and to use and considerably less data-intensive than computable general equilibrium (CGE) modeling approaches.</p> <p>Specific activities will include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Expand partial-equilibrium modeling capacity among CARD-affiliated researchers so that they are able to develop PE crop models for commodities beyond maize. The PE model will be expanded in 2017 to include soybeans. The expansion of the model will include a period 	<p>Outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expanded PE model for Malawi that includes soybeans 2. Two researchers from Malawi trained in policy and market modeling 3. Development of a 10-year outlook for the maize and soybean sectors in Malawi; presentation of this analysis at the ReNAPRI Stakeholder Conference in November 2017. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased use of data based projections in policy decisions 2. More active engagement with all stakeholders in public and private sector is envisaged over the next 2 years to develop and share alternative future scenarios of grain and oilseed markets in Southern and Eastern by making use of the partial equilibrium modeling framework and database that has been developed.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>of data collection, extensive consultation with industry experts, and observation of market features through field work. While the field work is undertaken, the first version of the soybean module will be developed. The field work, module development, and validation of the model results will be led by Richard Kachule, aided by a research assistant from Malawi and in collaboration with UP staff. Two members from UP will travel to CARD for a 2-day technical meeting to assist with the expansion of the model and the initial validation of results.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Two researchers from Malawi will attend the mid-2017 course on policy and market modeling at the Food and Agricultural Policy Research Institute at the University of Missouri. 3) In order to expand the number of analysts and policy-makers that have exposure to this type of PE model building and applications, a three to five day short-course will then be held at CARD with up to five researchers. By the time this short course is held, the expanded PE model with soybean will be ready for use for the training. 4) Validation and refinement of results from the expanded PE model will be done by presenting the modeling results to industry and government. This process will lead into the development of a 10-year outlook for the maize and soybean sectors in Malawi. Mr. Kachule will present the results of this analysis at the ReNAPRI Stakeholder Conference in Cape Town in early November 2017. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. With the ReNAPRI outlook initiative that has gradually been expanding, a multifaceted approach is followed consisting of farm-level, sector-level, household and value-chain analyses within a Strategic Foresighting frame-work. The modeling framework has to be refined continuously to capture the salient features of the commodity markets as accurate as possible. To this end, the potential of integrating research related to value chains, shift in farm size, productivity etc. that is conducted under C4 will be explored. This can lead to more robust short, medium and long run projections as well as alternative future outcomes for various commodity markets in specific countries. The results of this initiative can feature in the annual ReNAPRI outlook presentation launched in November of each year.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

3.3 Projected Outcomes (by the end of Year 5)

- More active engagement with all stakeholders in public and private sector is envisaged over the next 2 years to develop and share alternative future scenarios of grain and oilseed markets in Southern and Eastern by making use of the partial equilibrium modeling framework and database that has been developed.
- With the ReNAPRI outlook initiative that has gradually been expanding, a multifaceted approach is followed consisting of farm-level, sector-level, household and value-chain analyses within a Strategic Foresighting frame-work. The modeling framework has to be refined continuously to capture the salient features of the commodity markets as accurate as possible. To this end, the potential of integrating research related to value chains, shift in farm size, productivity etc. that is conducted under C4 will be explored. This can lead to more robust short, medium and long run projections as well as alternative future outcomes for various commodity markets in specific countries. The results of this initiative can feature in the annual ReNAPRI outlook presentation launched in November of each year.
- Informed and evidence-based decision making by the Government of Malawi, especially on the National Agricultural Investment Plans (NAIPs), support to FISP, and other development programs.

- Informed policy engagement by USAID in Malawi
- Revised extension policy and development of an extension strategy in the country

3.4. Data Management Plan

	Dataset Type	Brief description	Anticipated time frame for a scholarly output to be completed based on this dataset?	When will it be registered in DDL?
1	Commodity Balance Sheets in Malawi	Historical commodity data on supply, demand, and trade in markets for maize and soybean in Malawi.		Early-2018
2	2015 Malawi agriculture and food security policy processes baseline survey	Focus of the survey is on the quality of these policy processes in Malawi.	FSP Working Paper on the analysis of baseline survey published January 2016	January 2018
3	2017 Malawi agriculture and food security policy processes endline survey	Resurvey of subset of respondents from several stakeholder groups that participated in the 2015 baseline survey on the same topic. Focus of the survey is on the quality of these policy processes in Malawi.	FSP Working Paper on the results to be completed by end of Q2 calendar 2018	Q3 calendar 2018
4	2017/18 Malawi value chain studies	Survey of value chain actors in the Pigeon pea, groundnuts, roots and tubers (cassava, Irish potatoes and Sweet potatoes), macadamia nuts, tea, coffee, bananas, tomatoes and mangoes value chains.	June 2018	Q3 of 2018

4. Component C1/C2 Eastern and Southern Africa – Tanzania and Other Countries

4.1. Introduction

Beginning in November 2013, FSP began applied policy research and policy process engagement in Tanzania funded by FSP-core resources. This work has complemented and built upon analytical work and capacity building activities led by MSU's Dr. David Nyange, who has been embedded since August 2013 within the Department of Policy/Planning of the Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives (DPP/MAFC) under the BMGF-funded GISAIA/Tanzania project. Dr. Nyange provides support to DPP/MAFC in agricultural policy analysis, capacity building, and policy coordination activities to meet MAFC-driven research and capacity building priorities.

In Year 1 of FSP, Dr. Nyange and a team of MSU faculty and local analysts responded to a direct request from MAFC and the Prime Minister's Office for Local and Regional Government (PMO-RALG) to lead a study and policy outreach activities related to the GoT's commitment to 'reduce or remove the Local Government Authority (LGA) Crop Cess (tax)'. This study was co-funded by FSP core and GISAIA-Tanzania.

Beginning in October 2014, FSP increased its research, policy engagement and capacity building activities in Tanzania through additional funding provided by both FSP-core and funds from a USAID/Tanzania Buy-in. In April 2016, the USAID/Tanzania mission confirmed that they will fund a new buy-in to FSP (\$5 million over 36 months beginning 1 May 2016) to continue and expand on-going FSP and MSU work in Tanzania in policy research and outreach, capacity building, and policy advisory and coordination activities in collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MALF) and Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA). The goal of the program is to accelerate the adoption in Tanzania of more effective policies and programs to drive broad-based agricultural sector growth, improved household food security and nutrition, and reduced poverty.

Since FY 2017 (Year 4 of FSP core project) all Tanzania country activities were funded and reported under ASPIRES (Tanzania mission buy-in project).

4.2. Continuing Activities from Previous Year(s)

None

4.3. Projected Outcomes (by the end of Year 5) (with continuing support through ASPIRES)

- Concrete legislative reform in the LGFA;
- Concrete reform in the facilitating legislation or regulations governing crop and livestock boards;
- Creation of a Market Intelligence Unit within Ministry of Agriculture, and integration of improved market analysis into policy decision making;
- Improved knowledge base (potentially leading to changed decisions) in the areas of (a) land and inputs policy, and (b) enabling environment and programmatic support to small- and medium enterprises in the mid- and downstream of the agrifood system

4.4. Data Management Plan

C1/C2 did not fund any data collection. Its funding helped prepare for data collection, which was then funded by Tanzania mission funds. Data sets will be made available through those awards.

5. Component C1/C2 Eastern and Southern Africa – Zambia

5.1. Introduction

Resources for FSP activities in Zambia under this component come from FSP core funding and a USAID/Zambia buy-in. This funding enables continued capacity building and technical support for policy system strengthening and agricultural policy research to Zambia following the end of the third phase of the Food Security Research Project (FSRP III). FSRP III created Zambia’s first think tank dedicated to agricultural policy research and outreach, the Indaba Agricultural Policy Research Institute (IAPRI), and has supported its institutional capacity development over the period 2012-2017. In Year 4, FSP activities in Zambia were carried out in support of IAPRI’s research, outreach and capacity building activities, and to support sustainable improvements in policy systems for agriculture. Major activities implemented in 2016/2017 were:

1. Grain and oilseeds market development for smallholders to inform policy discussions and investment prioritization;
2. Analysis of land commodification and alienation to inform dialogue on Zambia’s draft Land Policy;
3. Feed the Future midline indicator generation and analysis; and
4. Technical training to IAPRI researchers on modeling agricultural technology adoption, an overview of and introduction to impact evaluation methods, and a two-day writing workshop.

Of these, Activities 1 and 3 are completed. Activity 2 remains incomplete, and will be finalized during the current period ending November 2018. Capacity building activities under Activity 4 will be completed in 2018 through technical trainings for IAPRI researchers arranged in coordination with IAPRI management.

Additional policy-oriented activities have been identified and will be carried out in 2018 to inform and guide the Zambian government’s efforts to promote Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA).

5.2. Continuing Activities from Previous Year

<p>Activity # 2.1: Analysis of land commodification and alienation to inform Zambia’s draft Land Policy:</p> <p>In Zambia, the land policy is under review. To support the evidence base on land policy options, this work area focuses on the relationship between changing farm size dynamics and farm productivity in an effort to inform land and farm block policies. Research in this area will be carried</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Working paper and policy brief on Farm productivity and farm size: Implications for Land Allocation policies in Zambia 2. Presentation at Land working group meeting organized by IAPRI/Ministry of Lands <p>Outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase evidence base to inform policy debates on land allocation mechanisms by Ministry of Land, Traditional Authorities, and donors. 2. Increased understanding within the Government of Zambia (GoZ) of the implications of changing land size
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

out by researchers from MSU, IAPRI, and University of Zambia.	dynamics on agricultural commercialization, productivity, and poverty.
---------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------

5.3. Final Push towards Policy Influence (Task 1)

<p>1.1 Informing and guiding the Land Policy Bill in Zambia</p> <p>Lead: Muyanga, Jayne, Machina</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSP Policy Brief on Zambia Land Policy Bill • Parliamentarian sensitization meetings based on the Policy Brief <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parliamentarian sensitized on land policy issues • Informed policy decisions by Zambian parliamentarians
<p>1.2 Zambian smallholders’ agricultural policy preferences – using best-worst scaling</p> <p>Lead: Mason</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working paper on Zambian smallholder farmers’ preferences for input subsidies (e.g., FISP) versus other types of government agricultural sector programs and investments (e.g., extension, rural roads, etc.), including an analysis differences among different sub-groups of farmers (men vs. women, youth vs. older farmers) <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved understanding on agricultural policy preferences, including differences by gender and age group of the farmer
<p>1.3 Synthesis Review of strategies to guide the Zambian government’s efforts to promote climate-smart agriculture, resilience and sustainable forest management:</p> <p>It is widely accepted that there is an urgent need to identify strategies to make agri-food systems more resilient to the effects of rapidly changing climate conditions. African farmers and agri-food systems are particularly vulnerable to climate-related shocks due to the region’s reliance on rain-fed agricultural production systems, and the low incomes, assets and coping abilities of a large share of the region’s population. Various climate-smart agricultural</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. International Development/FSP working paper on the climate smartness of conservation agriculture in sub-Saharan Africa 2. Working paper and policy brief on the role of risk preferences in the adoption of Climate Smart Agricultural practices in Zambia 3. Outputs dissemination at a climate and natural resources management workshop in Zambia between July and September 2018. Tentatively joint workshop co-sponsored by IAPRI and MSU/FSP

<p>practices have been promoted for decades as means to increase productivity and build the resilience of rain-fed farming systems to climate change. However, the uptake remains low and the evidence base on understanding why remains thin. This activity therefore has been set up to provide empirical guidance on policies and investments to improve the climate resilience of Zambian agriculture.</p> <p>Leads: Ngoma, Angelsen, Jayne and Chapoto</p>	<p>Outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased evidence to inform debates on the climate smartness of conservation agriculture and how this can be enhanced given dynamics in the macro policy environment and population growth 2. Improved understanding on the role of risk preferences in the adoption of seemingly beneficial sustainable agricultural practices.
<p>1.4 Technical training to IAPRI researchers on impact evaluation methods</p> <p>Lead: Mason and Ngoma</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training workshops on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Difference-in-differences ○ Regression discontinuity ○ Decomposition analysis ○ Endogenous switching regression <p>Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved capacity within IAPRI to conduct impact evaluations

5.4 Projected Outcomes (by the end of 2018)

1. Capacity building of Zambian institutions on:
 - How to write impactful policy papers
 - Improving technical writing style and flow
 - How to provide peer review feedback
 - Methods for conducting impact assessments in agriculture
 - Development of a strategic policy engagement plan for IAPRI

2. Policy areas and outcomes:
 - Guiding policy deliberations on the intersection between climate change and agriculture with an emphasis on feasible approaches to promoting the objectives of climate smart agriculture in Zambia.
 - Informing debates on revisions to the Zambian Land Policy
 - Guiding policy and regulatory approaches to enhance welfare benefits of e-voucher/FISP
 - Support the development of Zambia’s inter-ministerial council on climate change
 - Working in collaboration with USAID-funded “tenure and global climate change project” to link evidence on land policy and climate adaption to land policy development

- In collaboration with IAPRI and MAL, support revisions to e-voucher input policy based on analysis of pilot program.

5.5. Data Management Plan

	Dataset type	Brief description	Anticipated time frame for a scholarly output to be completed based on this dataset?	When will it be registered in DDL?
1	Large-scale trader survey	Survey of large-scale traders in Zambia	Q2-2018	Within 1 month of the publication of a scholarly output
2	Emergent farmer survey – conducted by IAPRI	Survey of medium to large scale farmers in six districts of Zambia	Q3-2018	Within 1 month of the publication of a scholarly output

6. Component 3: Global Collaborative Research on Policy Process and Capacity

6.1 Introduction

Component 3 addresses the fundamental questions of how to achieve policy change. To do so, the C3 team has focused on four major activities. **Activity 1**, the major focus effort in years 1 and 2 of FSP, involved deriving and refining a conceptual framework (Kaleidoscope Model) to generate testable and operational hypotheses about key factors influencing policy change. **Activity 2**, the key focus in years 2 and 3, involved conducting 6 in-depth case studies of policy change (fertilizer policy in Ghana, Malawi and Tanzania and micro-nutrient policies Malawi, South Africa and Zambia) to test the rigor of the Kaleidoscope Model across different policy domains and disparate institutional, political, and economic settings. Since Year 4, the team has devoted a majority of its time to two new activities. **Activity 3** focuses more broadly on efforts to reform food security policy systems by analyzing how different experiments with institutional reforms (e.g. coordinating units, service delivery units, devolution of agricultural ministries) have emerged and how reform of policy institutions has altered incentives, stakeholder motivations and policy outcomes. **Activity 4** involves policy engagement applying a range of tools in a variety of settings including international policy forums, national stakeholder workshops, CAADP-Malabo Declaration follow-up processes and implementation of regional input policies in West Africa. Drawing on findings that cut across all activities, the team has developed a series of tools for policy process analysis, training and policy engagement.

6.2 Continuing Activities from Previous Year(s)

<p>Activity # 3. Changes in Policy Architecture: Origins and Impact</p> <p>This work examines efforts to reform policy systems by analyzing how different experiments with institutional reforms have emerged and how reform of policy institutions has altered incentives, stakeholder motivations and policy outcomes.</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Innovations in Policy Architecture: An Inventory of Policy System Reforms (SH) 2. Delivery units as vehicles for improving policy implementation (DR) 3. Ghana devolution of agriculture (DR)
	<p>Outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. improved understanding of factors triggering change in food security policy processes and policy architecture 2. practical lessons about how results-based management and devolution to local governments affects agricultural policy formulation and implementation

6.3 Final Push towards Policy Influence (Task 1)

Towards the priority task of giving a push towards policy influence, in this final year of FSP, C3 team will focus on following six activities building on C3-Activity 4, and the KM model.

<p>1.1 Training workshop: Strengthened policy, regulatory & financing frameworks to move from</p>	<p>Outputs</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------

<p>analysis to changing perceptions, strengthening alignment, leveraging change and influencing policy implementation capacity through NAIPs and RAIPs in each of the East, Southern and West Africa regions in respect of all key international, African and regional food security and nutrition - related obligations and commitments as regards <u>Senior policy, budget and implementation Government officials</u> by means of focused regional training workshop of five days for stakeholder from all three regions.</p> <p>This activity will build on both earlier C3 Activity 4 training of journalists and C3 mapping of (i) food security and nutrition-related international, African and regional obligations and commitments, (ii) the analysis and evaluation of 2014+ Malabo-compliant second generation NAIPs and (iii) the collection and analysis of country-specific FSN-related domestic policy, regulatory, implementation, institutional and financial frameworks.</p> <p>This work will result in the capacitation of Senior policy, budget and implementation. Government officials in order to provide information on, and empower them as regards the execution of their respective mandates in respect of, the international, African and regional FSN frameworks, and the in-country responses thereto.</p> <p>Lead: Sheryl, Nic and Suresh</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 five-day training workshop for the following FSN-related stakeholder group: Senior policy, budget and implementation Government officials in each of the following three regions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East Africa • Southern Africa • West Africa <p>(This workshop will be conducted between June 2018 and July 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A workshop report for each event. Additional workshops will be possible in collaboration with Africa Lead or by using the materials in other training events with Africa Lead, at the CAADP PPs etc. This would require additional budget resources. <p>Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhancement of the knowledge and understanding of the international, African and regional FSN-related obligations and commitments • Enhancement of the knowledge and understanding of the manner in which the stakeholder-specific mandates relating to their role in respect of the in-country promotion of sustainable FSN systems should be realised. <p>The potential impact of the activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Execution by four above mentioned stakeholder groups of their specific roles in ensuring the promotion and in-country realization of international, African and regional FSN-related obligations and commitments (e.g. in the case of Parliamentarians: oversight over the Executive; enactment of legislation, approval of policies as well as of five-year strategies, annual performance (work) plans and annual reports; public hearings; annual on-site inspections; and the consideration, ratification, approval and domestication of supra-national
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	FSN-related instruments and agreements, etc.).
<p>1.2. Continuation of the Malawi NAIP work: Mapping policy change in food security and nutrition</p> <p>This activity will build on an earlier assessment of Malawi's forthcoming National Agricultural Investment Plan and contribute to the on-going work under C3</p> <p>Lead: Elizabeth with Leonard Msuka overseen by Sheryl Hendriks</p>	<p>Outputs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A peer-reviewed journal publication on the Malawi NAIP assessment (submitted end Sept 2018) <p>Outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A comparative analysis of Malawi's NAIP I and II (report by end August 2018) <p>The potential impact of the activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing of lessons learnt from the Malawi case study
<p>1.3. Completion of C 3-Activity 4, West Africa Regional Pesticide Policy Engagement 1</p> <p>This work continues policy engagement begun under C3 Activity 4 with presentation of FSP results at the regional pesticide policy workshop convened by CSP and ECOWAS in November 2017. Though policy formulation has been sound, implementation is failing in two of the three key regional regulatory bodies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CILSS Institut du Sahel (INSAH) • Comité Sahélien des Pesticides (CSP) • Union Monétaire Ouest Africaine (UEMOA) <p>Lead: Steve H., Amadou Diarra</p>	<p>Outputs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations of FSP case study findings about the precarious status of pesticide policy implementation by national and regional pesticide regulators to key stakeholders, including USAID/WARP, UEMOA, WACPR, FAO, World Bank. <p>Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure funding from one or more donor stakeholders to finance short-term technical assistance reviewing funding options for sustainably financing the West Africa Committee for Pesticide Registration (WACPR) without damaging implementation capacity of national regulators. • Lobby with UEMOA to continue their financial support to national and regional pesticide management committees. <p>The potential impact of the activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation of a sustainable financial plan for national and regional regulators. • Relieve immense pressure on CSP, currently tasked with the largely unfunded mandate to implement 2 of 3 regional regulatory responsibilities.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve implementation of regional pesticide policies in the coastal West African countries.
<p>1.4 Development of a website that introduces the model in a succinct way and showcases the KM tools interactively (in collaboration and support from FSP Communications team—see Task 3)</p> <p>This would be a nice go-to site for materials for any training events that wouldn't require participants to trawl through multiple documents on the FSP website to find resources.</p> <p>The demand for this work comes from the national policy systems and the development partners in the developing countries who are in need of practical tools for analyzing the policy process. These tools are also needed for the faculty members in developing countries to introduce policy process curriculum in their courses.</p> <p>Lead: Sheryl, Elizabeth, Suresh, Danielle</p>	<p>Outputs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An interactive website that will provide all the tool for analyzing policy process in one place. The participants will be able to use the content in their training and teaching programs as well. (by end August 2018) <p>Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well informed actors and players in the policy system in developing countries. • Sustainable capacity development for understanding policy processes in the developing countries. <p>The potential impact of the activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of KM tools will enhance the understanding of the policy process by the country policy makers and development partners. • Improved capacity for and better policy debate and dialogue in developing countries • Improve implementation of food and agriculture policies in the developing countries.
<p>1.5 Finalization of the assessment of the linkages and coherence between the 2014 Malabo compliant second generation NAIPs and other country-specific policy, regulatory, implementation, institutional and financial frameworks</p> <p>This activity will build on earlier C3 mapping of (i) food security and nutrition-related international, African and regional obligations and commitments, (ii) the analysis and evaluation of 2014+ Malabo-compliant second generation NAIPs and</p>	<p>Outputs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment and coherence framework toolkit (June 2018) • Finalization of the assessment framework for evaluating other key country-specific FSN-related domestic policy, regulatory, implementation, institutional and financial frameworks (August 2018) • Reports for selected countries with regard to the extent of alignment, deficiencies in alignment and the formulation of concrete

<p>(iii) the collection and analysis of country-specific FSN-related domestic policy, regulatory, implementation, institutional and financial frameworks.</p> <p>This work will result in formulating concrete implementable proposals for aligning other key country-specific FSN-related domestic policy, regulatory, implementation, institutional and financial frameworks with both</p> <p>(i) the international, African and regional FSN frameworks, and</p> <p>(ii) the country specific 2014+ Malabo-compliant second generation NAIPs.</p> <p>Lead: Nic and Sheryl (leads) with Nico, Elmarie, Anel, Minette and Avelani</p>	<p>implementable proposals to effect the establishment of seamless linkages, alignment and coherence (September 2018)</p> <p>Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of the extent of alignment and deficiencies in alignment in order to implement concrete proposals to ensure full alignment and coherence for better food security and nutrition planning, programming, financing, implementation and M&E • Formulation of implementable proposals to effect the establishment of seamless linkages, alignment and coherence <p>The potential impact of the activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities for selected countries to align their domestic policy, regulatory, implementation, institutional and financial frameworks to their international, African and regional food security application-related obligations and commitments stronger plans, contingencies and systems for more resilient food security systems, and their 2014+ Malabo-compliant second generation NAIPs.
<p>1.6 A rapid assessment of the level of resilience built into 2014+ second generation national agriculture and food security investment plans (NAIPs)</p> <p>This activity will build on earlier C3 mapping of food security and nutrition policies and programs and the FTF policy matrixes carried out for countries. The work will use a resilience assessment tool to identify gaps in national investment plans</p> <p>Lead: Suresh, Sheryl and Nic</p>	<p>Outputs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resilience framework toolkit (end June 2018) • Assessment framework for evaluating NAIPs in this area (end July 2018) • Reports for selected countries with regard to resilience related to food security and nutrition planning, policies, programs, early warning and responses for food security and nutrition (end Sept 2018) <p>Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of the level of resilience of national food security systems for better planning and programming

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formulation of implementable proposals to effect the integration of, and coherence between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • African and regional resilience frameworks, • Country-specific domestic resilience -related policy, regulatory, implementation, institutional and financial frameworks, and • Country-specific 2014+ Malabo-compliant second generation NAIPs. <p>The potential impact of the activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stronger plans, contingencies and systems for more resilient and proactive food security and nutrition systems
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

6.4 Projected Outcomes (by the end of Year 5)

Collectively, by the end of the final year of FSP, the outcomes of Component 3 are expected to encompass three areas: policy influence, methodological advancements in the area of policy process analysis, and capacity building. With respect to **policy influence**, C3 will collaborate with other FSP components to use the Kaleidoscope Model to predict the possibility for reform in key policy domains already examined in different countries by the C3 team. Such domains include input subsidies, micronutrient interventions, pesticide policies, and land governance reforms. In doing so, attention will be given to what typically precipitates a reform mentality by governments, when and what type of research will be most effective, and whether there are sufficient budgetary resources and policy champions to sustain reforms. Insights from the Kaleidoscope Model will also inform ECOWAS and CILSS of the requirements for incentivizing West African governments to implement already agreed-upon regional input policies and strengthen linkages with C1/C2. Key outcomes from policy systems work under Activity 3 include enhancing the awareness of African governments about the potential of presidential delivery units and similar results-based management approaches to overseeing agricultural policy formulation and implementation. Furthermore, Activity 3 work on the impacts of agricultural devolution to district governments in Ghana will not only directly inform refinements to that policy by Ghana’s Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA) but also offer insights to other countries that are either undergoing this devolution process (e.g., Kenya) or considering it (e.g., Malawi). The case study on South Africa was conducted in parallel with the development of the South African National Food Security and Nutrition Plan of Action (or FSNP - the equivalent of a CAADP NAIP) that the SA-based team won a competitive bid to draft. The FSNP benefitted from the KM analysis process, especially in the rigor of the background analysis that meticulously documents the influence of human and child rights and the influence of the unfolding global nutrition agenda. The documentation of the global, African and regional policy landscape forms a base of the work being carried out under activity 4 in Malawi and will extend to an analysis of the food security policy landscape in Ghana in Y4. It is also feeding This analysis fed

into the ReSAKSS ATOR for 2015 and a paper under review for the Inter-Agency Partnership of Academies of Science guide for African policy makers.

The analysis of gender mainstreaming in nutrition policy in Malawi was workshopped as part of a review of the policies and is now an integral part to the review of the Malawi NAIP. This work provides an analytical framework for assessing gender mainstreaming in nutrition policy.

In terms of **methodological advancements**, the outcomes in this area are threefold. First, the development of a practitioner's guidebook for applying the Kaleidoscope Model will allow for conducting *rigorous* and *replicable* policy process research. Given that most policy process theoretical frameworks are not bolstered by a particular methodological approach or attention to standard operationalization of concepts, this is a significant public good outcome. Secondly, the development of a policy engagement toolkit will allow for engaging with a range of stakeholders to practically consider how reforms can be pursued in areas already deemed most amenable to change. Thirdly, through the work of Activity 4, an important outcome will be a replicable, cross-sectoral stocktaking analysis to identify trade-offs and complementarities in national and regional food security and nutrition policies.

Finally, in the area of **capacity building**, Activity 4 in particular will result in improved capacity of at least two African governments (e.g. Ghana and Malawi) to adhere to their CAADP-Malabo commitments. More broadly, through the contributions of all four activities, civil society and other stakeholders will have an enhanced ability to understand how policymaking is occurring in their respective countries and communities and have accessibility to methods and frameworks that allow for identifying entry points into the policy process. Through workshops and dissemination activities with the African Union's research unit as well as with parties that have expressed an interest in applying the Kaleidoscope Model, such as AfricaLead and FAO's MAFAP, the policy lessons learned and the research methods developed under C3 will reach a broad range of influential decisionmakers in the area of food and nutrition security.

The KM model has been integrated into the Food Security Policy Module of the Collaborative Masters in Agricultural Economics curriculum taught at the University of Pretoria and has been included in training for support of the NAIP review and redesign through a ReSAKSS module. Capacity in the use of the tool has been developed among 39 journalists (see C1/2 for more detail on the training) from Malawi, Zambia and South Africa. The list of outputs for this activity includes a radio broadcast where one of the young journalist explains the model in her own words. At least three PhD theses are using and applying the KM model at the University of Pretoria.

Summary list of projected outcomes for C3

1. Enhanced institutional capacity (explore possible collaboration with Africa Lead)
 - Kaleidoscope model dissemination and training workshops (public sector, CSOs, NGOs, private sector, parliamentarians)
 - Strengthen institutional capacity for implementing agricultural policy in Malawi
2. Improved policy processes
 - strategic policy engagement planning (Ghana)
 - implement policy engagement plan (Malawi)

3. Policy engagement

- institutional and governance stocktaking and assessment in selected CAADP countries (Malawi, TBD)
- stocktaking of international, African and regional agreements creating national obligations and commitments; assess alignment of domestic policies with such obligations and commitments
- engagement with development partners and governments on the benefits and disadvantages of different policy system structures and processes for enhancing food security
- apply web-based policy tools to policy planning processes in FSP countries (Malawi)
- analytical guidance on input policy reform process (Ghana, Malawi, Zambia)
- Regional pesticide policy review and dialogue (West Africa)
- Micro-nutrient policy engagement based on case study findings (possible topics below)
 - a. Sugar fortification: health food or health risk?
 - b. Iron: what's the sticking point?

6.5. Data Management Plan

No datasets are anticipated to be generated from the proposed activities.

7. Component 4: Engagement on Global Policy Debates on Food Security

7.1. 4a. Agrifood System Transformation in the Upstream: Land Dynamics, Land Governance, Fertilizer and Soil Fertility, Mechanization and Implications for Rural Employment

7.1.1. Introduction

Year 4 activities will continue the main research themes and policy engagement activities initiated in Year 1 to 3. We will also initiate two new research themes. The topics addressed in this activity are highly inter-related. Therefore, we will seek to integrate our topics of changing farmland ownership and use structure, implications of rising land prices in many areas of Africa, shifts in technologies (e.g., mechanization), fertilizer promotion strategies and sustainable intensification issues and market responses to these changing dynamics in a more integrated and holistic way in this final year. Specific tasks (# 5 and 6) to achieve this integration on land issues and structural transformation issues are described in later sections of this workplan. Here we focus on major activities continuing from the previous year, and activities planned to give a final push towards policy influence.

7.1.2. Continuing Activities from Previous Year(s)

<p>Activity 3: Land policy</p> <p>Sub-Activity 3.1: Understanding land dynamics and impacts of land policy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Liaise more extensively with LPI through collaboration on country studies examining progress in the design and implementation of land policies to protect land rights of individuals and local communities in selected pilot countries (upcoming LPI conference in November, 2017). FSP researchers Muyanga has a paper accepted at upcoming LPI conference. 2. cross-country study examining in detail the relationship between farm scale and farm productivity 3. Prepare a policy brief on the report on point 2. <p>Lead: Muyanga and Jayne</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of LPI outreach event (November 2017) 2. Jayne and Muyanga to attend Global Food Security Conference and RENAPRI conference, both in Cape Town in late November/early December 3. Completion of cross-country study and policy brief on the role of land policy in agricultural transformation, contributing directly to C1/C2 processes in Malawi, Zambia and Tanzania and also regional level processes with LPI: January, 2018 4. Complete survey work on emergent investor farmers in Senegal started in 2016 and led by UP; produce FSP country report. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a stronger global evidence base for formulating policies and strategies to address complex problems associated with land tenure and land allocation in a range of African countries 2. Best practice lessons learnt from the pilot land tenure reform programs and inform rollout strategies of various programs in the rest of the country 3. FSP activities have already influenced African policy makers' thinking of the land policy formulation processes to promote inclusive
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>agricultural transformation in Malawi and Zambia. FSP anticipates that in FY17 and FY18 we will further influence land policy processes in at least three additional African countries in which FSP operates, and more broadly reach mainstream audiences in at least six countries.</p>
<p>Activity 5: Exploring the Relationships between Agricultural Transformation and Youth Employment in Africa’s Economic Transformation</p> <p>All tasks specified in year 4 work plan completed except: A report decomposing changes over time in per capita incomes by gender, age category, farm vs. off-farm for five African countries, with implications for employment shifts over time in Africa (Yeboah leading). This work will also be integrated into the forthcoming 2018 Chicago Council Global Food Security Report (Yeboah lead author), which will have widespread readership and influence on thinking.</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. report decomposing changes over time in per capita incomes by gender, age category, farm vs. off-farm for five African countries 2. policy brief on the above topic 3. policy engagement activities in Africa <p>Outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a better understanding of how Africa’s economies and employment patterns are changing and why 2. better evidence base to project future trends and develop policy options that take into account these anticipated trends. 3. C4a researchers will liaise more closely in FY17/18 with C4b researchers to identify synergies and ways of improving the analysis and policy proposals of both strands of work. 4. By the end of FY17, FSP activities influence the policy formulation of key foundations that have programs on youth livelihoods in Africa 5. By the end of FY18, FSP activities produce concrete guidance to African governments for promoting youth livelihoods within an overarching agricultural transformation framework. 6. By the end of FY17, recommendations identified through FSP research are discussed with African government representatives and incorporated into the youth livelihoods programs of at least three African governments by end of FY18.
<p>Activity #6: Agricultural financial markets intermediation to unlock food system transformation.</p> <p>The role of finance in food production is well known. Following the evidence of emergence of medium size farmers, this activity aims to determine the role and effect of finance on medium scale farmers in</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FSP report outlining steps for improving financial system ability to promote access to finance by disadvantaged groups and promote inclusive forms of agricultural transformation 2. Journal article on the effect of finance on medium size farms productivity.

<p>Southern Africa (Zambia and Malawi in particular). It will have three sub-activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyze finance system policies to determine how they affect relative access to finance by small/medium/large farms in Southern Africa with particular reference to Zambia and Malawi. This will be through desktop review of policies and the emerging issues will be tested with stakeholders. The activity will also draw from the BFS experts' prior work and emerging issues Determine financial requirements of the medium size farms [based on the structure of inputs, mechanization, land and labor markets]. The existing surveys conducted in FSP during the past four years will be used to evaluate the financial requirement of the medium size farms and will be complete meted by a limited surveying to establish a typical financially viable medium size farms Engagement activities with formal and informal financial sector in selected countries (Malawi and Zambia) and facilitate workshops to design financial solutions for medium size farmers 	<p>3. Outreach event in the region (details to be determined) in 2017 involving Ministries of Ag, Finance and private sector</p>
<p>Activity #7: Seed system policy</p> <p>Continue collaborative work with the CGIAR PIM program (cluster 1.2) on seed system and policies for vegetatively propagated crops. The focus of this joint work is focused on three countries and two crops—Kenya (potato), Nigeria (Cassava), and Vietnam (potato and cassava). The focus is on filling knowledge gaps on quality assurance system and related policy/regulatory issues such as seed certification, cross-border seed trade, seed relief (post-disaster), and integrating seed policies in national action plans for climate-resilient agriculture.</p> <p>The team will also explore engagement with BFS and partners on farmer “willingness to pay” for improved seed on a range of crops</p>	<p>Outcomes:</p> <p>4. Initiation of a new dialogue among governments in the regions to consider innovative ways of promoting broader access to finance by actors in the agri-food systems</p> <hr/> <p>Outputs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Review paper outlining major policy issues related to vegetatively propagated crops (Spring 2018) Engagement with USAID policy team involved in seed system policy issues (ongoing basis) <p>Outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Enhanced knowledge on seed system policy development targeted towards vegetatively propagated crops. Improved understanding of farmers’ willingness to pay for quality seeds, and policy implications for seed systems in developing countries.

in planning major new seed sector support programs.	
-----------------------------------------------------	--

7.1.3 Final Push towards Policy Influence (Task 1)

Towards the priority task of giving a push towards policy influence, in this final year of FSP, C4a team will focus on following four activities building on previous years' efforts and accomplishments.

<p>1.1. Sustainable Intensification and Climate Smart Agriculture</p> <p>Lead: Jayne and Muyanga</p> <p>-</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSP Synthesis Research Report (Q2-2018) • FSP Policy Brief (Q2-2018) • Policy engagement/outreach activity in Africa (venue and date to be determined, linked to CAADP process if possible, possibly under joint sponsorship with AGRA) (Q3-2018) • Policy outreach seminar in Washington DC (possibly BFS, venue/date TBD) (Q4-2018) • Targeted discussion with African Development Bank, with aim to influence design and implementation of AFDB Feed Africa Initiative on CSA/SI issues Q3-2018) <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The outcome will be a stronger evidence base for formulating policies and strategies to promote sustainable and profitable intensification of fertilizer use in African farming systems. • FSP activities (in coordination with IFDC, AFAP, MAFAP, AGRA and ReNAPRI partners) are able to influence the policy formulation process on fertilizer promotion programs in at least 3 African countries • FSP activities (in coordination with IFDC, AFAP and ReNAPRI partners) are able to tangibly lead to an improved policy environment for fertilizer in at least 3 African countries (already achieved in Zambia and Malawi, currently working on this outcome in Kenya and Tanzania).
<p>1.2 Mechanization in Agricultural Transformation: South- South Learning and Knowledge Exchange</p> <p>Lead: Takeshima</p>	<p>Outputs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finish mechanization south-south learning case study book

	<p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In this final year, FSP resources will be used to complement PIM and CSSP funding supports for IFPRI researcher to participate in policy engagement activities in Ghana and Nigeria for possible influence on the government’s policy improvements on mechanization
<p>1.3 Policy engagement activities on Youth Employment and Access to Land</p> <p>In this final year, FSP resources will be used for policy engagement and outreach with several important global and regional partners. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy engagement at the upcoming 2018 Chicago Council Global Food Security Conference on Youth Livelihoods (FSP staff are leading the 2018 report and we believe there is great opportunity for FSP to influence thinking of thousands of high-level participants at this event). • Policy engagement/outreach activity with GIZ • AFDB Coordinator for ENABLE Youth initiative has invited FSP/C4a to jointly prepare a paper on how access to land influenced youth engagement in agri-food systems employment. This provides great opportunity to influence AFDB programs on youth livelihoods in Africa. • Contribute material on youth access to land and youth livelihoods to IFAD’s 2019 Rural Development Report • Policy outreach seminar in late 2018, Washington DC (possibly BFS, venue/date TBD) <p>Lead: Yeboah and Jayne</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 4-page FSP policy brief that synthesizes work on youth employment under C4a to date (Q2-2018) • Joint paper with ENABLE on influence of land access on youth engagement in agri-food system (Q4-2018) • Contribution to IFAD’s 2019 Rural Development Report (Q2-2018) <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development partners will have greater understanding of how Africa’s economies and employment patterns are changing and why, what are the future trends, and what policy options, investments, and programs are needed to engage youth and increase their livelihood opportunities in agri-food system.
<p>1.4 Seed system policy</p> <p>In collaboration with PIM, continue research and engagement on farmers’ willingness to pay for quality seeds on different crops. Engage in outreach events to disseminate</p>	<p>Outputs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSP Research Paper and Policy Synthesis on Farmer Willingness to Pay work • Engagement with USAID policy team involved in seed system policy issues (ongoing basis)

<p>the findings from the VPC and legume studies. Explore engagement with AGRA, ISSD, BFS and partners on farmer “willingness to pay” for improved seed on a range of crops in planning major new seed sector support programs.</p> <p>Lead: Maredia</p>	<p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced knowledge on seed system policy development targeted towards vegetatively propagated crops and other staple (non-maize) crops. • Improved understanding of farmers’ willingness to pay for quality seeds, and policy implications for seed systems in developing countries.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

7.1.4. Projected Outcomes (by the end of Year 5)

1. Support to the AU-LPI
 - a stronger global evidence base for formulating policies and strategies to address complex problems associated with land tenure and land allocation in a range of African countries
 - Best practice lessons learnt from the pilot land tenure reform programs and inform rollout strategies of various programs in the rest of the country
 - Through partnership with AU-LPI, influence the proper implementation of the AU declaration on land issues and challenges in 10 AU member states
 - In partnership with AU-LPI and its NELGA program, improve capacity to ensure regular tracking and reporting of progress made in land policy development and implementation built and sustained in 10 AU member states
2. Sustainable Agricultural Intensification
 - FSP activities (in coordination with IFDC, AFAP, MAFAP, AGRA and ReNAPRI partners) are able to influence the policy formulation process on fertilizer promotion programs in at least 3 African countries
 - FSP activities (in coordination with IFDC, AFAP and ReNAPRI partners) are able to tangibly lead to an improved policy environment for fertilizer in at least 3 African countries (already achieved in Zambia and Malawi, currently working on this outcome in Kenya and Tanzania).
 - FSP activities lead to a better understanding among at least five African governments of needed changes in agricultural extension programs to promote productive and resilient agri-food systems
 - FSP activities lead to a better understanding by African policy makers of ways to effectively promote resilience and climate-smart agricultural interventions in sub-Saharan Africa. Public policy discussions in Africa will be including concrete new proposals contained in FSP C4a reports.
3. Land Policies
 - FSP activities have already influenced African policy makers’ thinking of the land policy formulation processes to promote inclusive agricultural transformation in Malawi and Zambia. FSP anticipates that in FY17 and FY18 we will further influence land policy

- processes in at least three additional African countries in which FSP operates, and more broadly reach mainstream audiences in at least six countries.
- Improved and sustained capacity of AU-member states in tracking land policy development and implementation and reporting progress regularly
 - FSP activities are able to influence the process of identifying and collecting quantifiable indicators of tenure security and land governance to monitor and track progress made in land policy formation and implementation
 - FSP activities influence the AU-LPI agenda in facilitating south-south learning in identifying and adoption of innovative and replicable best practices in land policy
4. Mechanization
- FSP activities are able to influence the understanding by African policymakers on the linkages between agricultural mechanization and broad economic transformation
 - FSP activities are able to provide African policymakers better understanding of the roles of the private sector in agricultural mechanization growth, through more concrete narratives in both Asia and Africa of private-sector growth in machinery investments, service provisions
 - FSP activities are able to improve the understanding of the effects of mechanization on agricultural productivity, efficiency, and heterogeneity in demand, which can potentially influence the designs of government-facilitated custom hiring service enterprises
 - Through the promotion of south-south learning, FSP activities are able to influence the mechanization policy in at least two African countries
5. Employment and Livelihoods, with a youth/gender focus
- By the end of FY17, FSP activities influence the policy formulation of key foundations that have programs on youth livelihoods in Africa
 - By the end of FY18, FSP activities produce concrete guidance to African governments for promoting youth livelihoods within an overarching agricultural transformation framework.

7.1.5. Data Management Plan

	Dataset Type	Brief description	Anticipated time frame for a scholarly output to be completed based on this dataset?	When will it be registered in DDL?
1	Farm household survey	Socio economic farm data - Malawi/2014, including medium-scale farms	Completed August 2016 (journal article in Land)	1st quarter 2018
2	Farm household survey	Socio economic farm data - Mozambique/2016, including medium-scale farms	Apr-17 – slowed down due to data quality issues, no analysis undertaken yet	1st quarter 2018
3	Farm household survey	Socio economic farm data - Senegal/2016, including medium-scale farms	Jul-17	3rd quarter 2018

4	Listing of Medium-scale farms in 8 districts of Tanzania	Listing of all medium-and large scale farms in eight (8) in rural Tanzania (completed in August 2016). This involves interviews with village headmen who provide information on households controlling 10 hectares and above, their landholding sizes and the area under crop, and GPS coordinates of the villages	1st Quarter/2019	1st quarter 2018
5	Farmer survey data	Survey of 1,200 farm households in rural Tanzania. Collect household demographic data, agricultural practices, incomes, soil samples, and household location GPS coordinates (completed June 2017)	1st Quarter/2019	3rd quarter 2018
6	Farmer survey data - Zambia	Listing of all medium-scale farms in six (6) districts in Zambia. This involves obtaining lists from Zambia National Farmers Union and interviews with ward-level extension workers. Develop lists of landholdings over 10 hectares and a separate list for those who operate more than 10 hectares of farmland. After listings are developed, we aim to interview roughly 5% of the medium-scale farms identified in the listing exercise to obtain information on their characteristics, how and when they acquired their farms, main residence (telephone farmer vs. full time farmer), the area under crops, production levels, etc., and GPS coordinates of the villages	1st quarter 2017 (listing), 3rd quarter 2017 (survey)	2nd quarter 2018

7.2. 4b: Agrifood System Transformation in the Downstream and Implications for Linkages to the Upstream

7.2.1. Introduction

The purpose of work under this component is to (a) document the rapid changes underway in agrifood systems of the African continent and (b) help policy makers design programs and policies that promote rapid but equitable growth in the systems. Six key messages are emerging from this research. These are:

1. A diet transformation on the demand side: Population growth, rapid urbanization, and per capita income growth are driving very rapid growth in the amount of food demanded through markets, and in its composition: a diet transformation towards non-cereal foods, fresh foods (both animal and vegetable/fruit) processed foods, and food away from home, all increasingly sourced (even in rural areas) through markets. This demand-side transformation represents an enormous opportunity for local and regional agribusiness firms if they can be competitive in supplying these rapidly growing and transforming markets. It also has troubling implications for nutrition and for the emerging “double burden” of malnutrition.
2. A quiet revolution on the supply side: In most countries, this diet transformation and its associated urbanization and income growth are fueling a quiet revolution in the “hidden middle” of the continent’s agrifood systems: investment, huge in aggregate, by millions of micro, small, and medium-sized firms (as well as large firms) in the wholesaling, processing, and logistical operations between farming and retailing. This segment of the agrifood system, and the rise of SMEs within it, have largely escaped the attention of donors and government policymakers.
3. The primacy of domestic food value chains: Most food is coming from domestic food value chains – in most countries, food import bills amount to only about 10% of total food consumption. Furthermore, while imports are higher in urban areas (about 20%), in most urban areas of Africa their share does not rise with incomes. This means that, in most countries, domestic food systems, including for higher value foods, are competing with imports. Whether they are able to continue competing, and capture most of the growth in demand going forward, depends on the business enabling environment put in place by governments.
4. The primacy of urban demand, especially in secondary and tertiary cities: Most food is flowing in rural-urban supply chains to urban areas that now are the majority of food markets. In Africa, secondary and tertiary cities and towns now hold more people than primary cities. They are thus crucial as demanders of food and as intermediate nodes for supply chains. The urban agenda and the food security/food system agendas thus cannot be separated.
5. But also a reverse flow of processed foods from urban- to rural areas: About half of food consumption in rural areas is now sourced through markets. Most of this purchased food is processed in some way. A major emerging trend therefore is the flow of processed foods

through markets within rural areas (rural-rural flows) and from urban areas to rural areas (urban-rural flows). There is almost no empirical research on this emerging phenomenon.

6. **Major implications for employment:** These agribusiness opportunities have major implications for employment. The specific implications, however, depend critically on the size distribution of the firms that capture growing demand. Policies that help micro firms grow in size, and that favor competitive response by small and medium-size firms, can generate substantial employment within the hidden middle. On the other hand, policies that favor consolidation into fewer, larger firms will result in less employment growth from this quiet revolution. Because women play major roles in most food processing and food away from home, pro-employment policies in this area will favor gender equity.

The C4b team has targeted four sets of stakeholders (host country governments, bilateral and multi-lateral donors, the private sector, and civil society) through various outreach events at national, regional, and global levels. It has also promoted and built capacity for research in this area with local research institutions.

At national level, the C4b team has worked hand-in-hand with country programs to mainstream these messages and begin achieving concrete policy impact. The C4b team has engaged at national level with (a) policy-makers in and beyond the agricultural sector, (b) bilateral and multi-lateral donors, (c) private sector, and (d) civil society in all four countries over the past two years. At regional level, C4b has engaged with ReSAKSS through its Annual Trends and Outlook Report of 2015, its continental conference that same year, and ReSAKSS meetings in Washington that brought together selected African policy makers. At global level, C4b has formally engaged through roundtables, invited chapters, keynote speeches, invited talks, invited reviews, and informal requests with USAID/Washington, IFAD, FAO, World Bank, The MasterCard Foundation, the Chicago Council on Global Affairs, and the CG system’s A4NH program (Agriculture for Nutrition and Health).

In this final year, our focus will be on completing major activities continuing from the previous year, and outreach activities planned to give a final push towards policy influence.

7.2.2. Continuing Activities from Previous Year (from carry forward funds)

<p>Activity #2: Poultry sector analysis and outreach in Nigeria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Leveraging AA funds, the C4b Nigeria team will conduct surveys at the following nodes in Oyo State: (a) Poultry producers, (b) Feed mills, (c) Maize wholesalers, (d) Maize farmers, and (d) Poultry retailers. ii. The team will work with partners at various research institutes and institutions of higher learning with mandates to support governments in their agricultural policy development and implementation to disseminate this information at multiple levels. iii. While working at the federal level in Nigeria, the team will also work at the state level, due to the important role of the states in actual implementation of national 	<p>Outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Multiple reports and presentations from the work <p>Outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Greater knowledge among policy makers on policy challenges and priorities to promote a competitive poultry and feedgrains sector 2. Greater capacity among faculty and students at collaborating universities to engage in this kind of work.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>policies and the fact that states often have their own specific agenda. In Spring, 2017, seminars on the sector will be organized at several federal and state level fora.</p>	
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

7.2.3. Final Push towards Policy Influence (Task 1)

Towards the priority task of giving a final push towards policy influence, in this final year of FSP, C4b team will focus on following four activities building on previous years’ efforts, accomplishments, and outputs of Task number 5 (described in Section 2 of this Workplan).

<p>1.1 Contributions to IFAD Rural Development Report 2019 Lead: Tschirley, Reardon (Jayne also)</p> <p>Tschirley will serve as Lead External Author for the RDR 2019; Reardon and Jayne will each author background papers. Topic is “Investing in Rural Youth.” Research under C4a and C4 will central to the overall framing of the report and to the chapters authored by Reardon and Jayne.</p>	<p>Output: Flagship report for IFAD. Outreach based on the report with European donor agencies and LMIC governments</p> <p>Outcomes: Heavy influence on IFAD programming over the next three years (RDRs come out on 3-year cycles). Influence on thinking and programming of other donors and governments</p>
<p>1.2 Agrilinks outreach in September or October, 2018 Lead: Tschirley, Reardon (Jayne also)</p> <p>This agrilinks seminar will bring together the four years of work under the two components, including the Task 5 work in 2018</p>	<p>Output: Agrilinks seminar; powerpoint; two policy briefs</p> <p>Outcomes: Wide awareness of dynamics of change in food systems, and policy implications.</p>
<p>1.3 Engagement in Tanzania on 1) oilseeds policy, and 2) agroprocessing strategy Lead: Nyange, Tschirley, Olabisi</p> <p>The three are leading research on consumer demand for oilseeds that is contributing to the design of policy for the rapidly growing sector</p>	<p>Output: One journal article; one research report; one policy brief</p> <p>Outcomes: Influence on GOT decisions regarding (a) oilseed tariff policy and (b) incentives to sunflower production and processing</p>

7.2.4 Projected Outcomes (by the end of Year 5)

1. Enhanced institutional capacity
 - Intensive collaborative research with local colleagues in Senegal, Nigeria, and Tanzania will take advantage of the training done in each country and sharply build capacities for applied policy research and engagement among public- and academic sector staff in each country.
2. Improved policy processes and policy engagement
 - In Tanzania, C4-downstream results will be fed into the research-to-policy change planning exercise being led by Sitko
 - Following the multi-country workshop to be held during Q1 of Year 5, country-level follow-up workshops with local stakeholder working groups will be designed to generate specific input into policy processes related to agribusiness competitiveness in each country.

7.2.5. Data Management Plan

	Dataset Type	Brief description	Anticipated time frame for a scholarly output to be completed based on this dataset?	When will it be registered in DDL?
1	Tanzania Retail Survey data	Retail survey in 3 cities in Tanzania documenting market share of different types of retail outlets, and rates of change of market share across major food groups in Tanzania. Retail outlets (Supermarket chains, independents, traditional shops, market vendors and street vendors).	1 st quarter 2018	2 nd quarter 2018
2	Tanzania Maize Millers Survey dataset	Survey of processors of maize meal and mixed meal products in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania to examine recent changes in the structure of this important sector.	1 st quarter 2018	2 nd quarter 2018
3	Nigeria poultry value chain survey datasets	Surveys at multiple levels of poultry value chain in Nigeria	2 nd quarter 2018	4 th quarter 2018

8. Component 5: Strategic Analytical Agenda and Support to Donor Policy and Strategy

8.1. Introduction

This component provides a synthesis of research findings from FSP activities or customized on-demand technical support through analytics, dialogue, in-country consultation, and training drawing from the wealth of research outputs and skills of the FSP team member institutions.

During the last year, the C5 supported BFS through the following activities:

- Supported the US Government inter-agency Global Food Security Strategy country selection team by developing a tool and supporting analysis to assist in the identification of the GFSS target countries.
- Undertook analysis and participated in discussions with the GFSS interagency team tasked with identifying a transition strategy for GFSS target countries.
- With GFSS focus on systemic, national level food systems change, FSP-C5 has been also made major contributions to conceptualization and development of new indicators to track performance and transformation of agri-food systems in GFSS and other countries, including the AgGDP+ indicator (including farm level as well as off farm components of agriculture from GDP national accounts), as well as employment in these sectors called AgEMP+.
- University of Pretoria undertook a new activity of mapping policy change in food security and nutrition to feed into and provide quality control on African government National Agricultural Investment Plans.
- Assisted in reviewing USAID Missions progress toward achieving policy change in line with their FTF Policy plans.

8.2 Continuing Activities from Previous Year

<p>Activity #1: Supporting the BFS Policy Unit with research evidence and analysis.</p> <p>The C5 workplan varies depending on the needs of the BFS Policy Unit and their partners. In the past, C5 has provided support to the Policy Unit, country missions, and USAID strategy more broadly through summaries of FSP research, literatures reviews, rapid analysis, and on-demand technical advising. It is expected that this will continue in 2018 by directly assisting USAID and its global development partners to assess trends and evaluate options on critical policy issues that have a bearing on the achievement of shared FTF, Global Food Security Strategy, and CAADP goals. As this is the last year of FSP, this task may also heavily focus on summarizing lessons learned and</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapid-response analysis, in-country consultation, and training to fill key knowledge gaps. • Evidence and analysis to shape USAID investments and the new Global Food Security Strategy. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USAID, FTF and GFSS policy programing will be better informed and evidence-based.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>policy outcomes from FSP research and engagement.</p> <p>Lead: IFPRI</p>	
<p>Activity #2: Supporting the GFSS Target Country transition strategy</p> <p>The USG interagency is committed to the long-term goal of ensuring target countries reach an end state where they can transition out of target country status under Feed the Future. The decision to strategically transition will be based on sustainable reductions in poverty, hunger and malnutrition, concomitant improvements in capacity and the commitment to improve food security. C5 is supporting the interagency team developing the strategic transition framework and developing indicators and tools to track country progress over time.</p> <p>Lead: IFPRI</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis and indicator data to support the GFSS interagency team in developing the GFSS transition strategy. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USAID, FTF and GFSS policy programing will be better informed and evidence-based.
<p>Activity #3: Analysis of annual Mission reporting on policy matrix progress</p> <p>One of the USG priority food security objectives is supporting better policies systems in 19 Feed the Future countries and five regional programs. This activity annually supports USAID to examine performance on priority food security policies outlined in these 24 FTF policy matrices as well as the reasons for their success and the barriers to their progress.</p> <p>Lead: IFPRI</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Annual report summarizing FTF missions' progress in implementing their policy matrices and improving policy systems. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. USAID, FTF and GFSS policy programing will be better informed and evidence-based.
<p>Activity #4: Mapping policy change in food security and nutrition</p> <p>This activity will build on an earlier C3 mapping of food security and nutrition policies and programs globally (78) countries and the FTF policy matrixes carried out for countries. The work will continue to document the policy changes, new policies passed with regard to food security, food security and nutrition or nutrition as more NAIP IIs emerge in 2018.</p> <p>(See the motivation statement below)</p> <p>Lead: University of Pretoria (Hendriks and Olivier)</p>	<p>Outputs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated report on the review and documentation of policy changes, new policies passed with regard to food security, food security and nutrition or nutrition, including innovations (September 2018) • Updated report on the review and documentation of related changes in institutional architecture, including innovations (September 2018) • Updated report on the comparison of national M&E frameworks with regard to SDG indicators, Agenda 2063 indicators and the CAADP results framework (September 2018)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued updating of existing database of international, African and regional FSN-related obligations and commitments as well as country-specific FSN-related policy, regulatory, implementation and institutional arrangements and Continued migration of policy and strategy database to ReSAKSS website as a global public good (on-going) <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A deeper understanding of more recent trends in policy and programme change with regard to the integration of nutrition into NAIPs • A deeper understanding of the scope and extent of the translation of international policy directions into national policies and programmes with regard to food security and nutrition • A deeper understanding of what institutional changes have occurred to accommodate these changes in policy and the increasing need coordination among sectors and stakeholders. • Identification of gaps related to food security and nutrition policy and programmes <p>Potential impact of this activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing of lessons learnt and a menu of design options for countries across the world. • Opportunities for countries to adopt innovations from other countries with regard to programme and institutional design for better coordination and improved outcomes of development programmes. • Stronger development plans and focused national investment plans.
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

8.3 New Activities

<p>Activity # 5: Updating of the FTF Institutional Architecture Assessments (IAAs) with recent food security policy changes</p> <p>This activity will build on earlier C3 mapping of food security and nutrition policies and programmes and the FTF policy matrixes carried out for countries. The work will update the IAAs with the information from C5 A2 from 2017 and 2018 and the extensive body of data collected through C3 A4.</p> <p>(See the motivation statement below)</p> <p>Lead: University of Pretoria (Olivier and Hendriks)</p>	<p>Outputs Updated IAAs for all AU priority countries and Feed the Future countries (May 2019)</p>
	<p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updating of IAAs with institutional changes identified in Task 8 (i) and C5 Activity 2 that have occurred to accommodate these changes in policy and the increasing need coordination among sectors and stakeholders. Most of the IAAs were missing essential food security and nutrition elements and links to the broader development and constitutional contexts. • Comparative analysis if the trends in changes made <p>Potential impact of this activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater alignment of global, continental, regional and national policy contexts for more efficient policy frameworks and implementation • More efficient coordination and mutual accountability systems for improved impact of implementation • Stronger policy systems and higher levels of multi-sectoral coordination and cooperation • Opportunities for countries to adopt innovations from other countries with regard to program and institutional design for better coordination and improved outcomes of development programs.

Motivation and rationale for Activities 4 and 5: Dramatic change has been happening in Africa for at least the past decade. Agricultural transformation in Africa is leading to tangible impacts on economic growth, poverty reduction and reducing under nutrition. Much of the progress can be attributed to the revived focus on agriculture as a driver of inclusive economic growth through the Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP). The CAADP was initiated through the 2003 Maputo Declaration on Agriculture and Food Security in Africa (AU 2003), and sought to achieve Millennium Development Goal one (MDG-1) to halve the turn of the century levels of extreme poverty and hunger by 2015.

The main goal of the 2003 CAADP is to help African countries attain higher rates of inclusive economic growth through agriculture, forestry and fisheries sector-led development that eliminates hunger, reduces poverty, food insecurity and malnutrition and enables the expansion of agricultural exports. Despite some progress, the growth has been unequal and not sufficient to significantly reduce food insecurity, malnutrition and poverty. What is more, according to a review of progress (AU/NEPAD 2016), it was realised that (i) increased growth was not only dependent on the proportion of income allocated to the agricultural sector; (ii) encouraging private sector investment and growing trade called for a favourable business environment that extended beyond the powers of the ministry of agriculture, and (iii) multi-sectoral intervention and coordination were required to simultaneously remove constraints and barriers to growth and create an enabling environment for transformation.

In 2014, the 23rd AU Assembly adopted the Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods. The enhanced 2014 Malabo Declaration reaffirms the central commitments of the 2003 Maputo Declaration, but shifts away from the single-sector scope of the 2003 Maputo CAADP. This 2014 Malabo focussed CAADP approach pays attention to irrigation, mechanisation and post-harvest losses and waste, while including areas of infrastructure, natural resources, land tenure, trade and nutrition elements that go beyond the mandate of the Ministry of Agriculture. Rather, the Malabo-aligned second generation country-specific NAIPs provide a prioritised set of strategic agriculture, food security and nutrition-centered initiatives as part of, and within the framework of, a nation's broader economic and social development agenda.

Since the 2003 Maputo Declaration, the execution of CAADP's evidence-based planning and implementation focus has brought technical credibility to African development processes, both at the continental and country level, instilling greater confidence from public, private and international investors and leading to more targeted actions. The current (post 2014 Malabo) CAADP process involves (i) stock taking of the current policies and programmes in the country, and (ii) an analysis of the trends with regard to development, whilst (iii) identifying future growth opportunities that will help the country achieve both the CAADP and the nationally defined targets, and then determining the basket of interventions to achieve these. In this way, the second generation (2014+) Malabo aligned NAIPs provide the vehicle to link national development frameworks to multi-sectoral action to:

- 1) Further the commitment to the CAADP process
- 2) Increase investment finance in agriculture, forestry and fisheries
- 3) End hunger, improve food security and reduce malnutrition
- 4) Eradicate poverty through agriculture
- 5) Increase intra-African trade in agriculture commodities and services
- 6) Improve resilience to climate variability
- 7) Enforce mutual accountability for actions and results.

In addition, all African countries have committed themselves to realize the specific food security and nutrition (FSN) targets identified in:

- 1) The two 2014 Malabo Declarations (to have, by 2025, ended hunger and reduced stunting to 10% and underweight to 5%)
- 2) SDG 2 (to end hunger and improve nutrition)
- 3) Agenda 2063's first 10 Year Implementation Plan (2014-2023) (to reduce hunger by 20%, and malnutrition to 50%, of their 2014 levels).

The Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Food Security Policy (FSP) seeks to conduct food security policy analysis and provide support to government policy and related reforms. This includes identifying a range of possible improvements with regard to agriculture, food security and nutrition policies as well as to the design of the CAADP NAIPs. This support is intended to increase the probability that countries will be in a position to deliver fully on (a) the 2014 AU Malabo Declarations¹ related to food security and nutrition (FSN) related SDG commitments, and (b) key FSN-related international, African, regional and country-specific domestic policy and statutory obligations and commitments.

Within this context, a methodology has been developed (through FSP component 3 activity 4, the gender analysis and component 5 activity 2) for evaluating the effectiveness of development planning in terms of the alignment and linkages of (i) international, African and regional commitments and (ii) national transversal development imperatives (including, but not limited to, the country-specific constitution, vision, medium term growth and development strategy, and cross-cutting intergovernmental, financial and development legislation), (iii) the quality of the NAIPs in attaining the Malabo and SDG2 targets related to food security and nutrition and (iv) assessing the gender equality components against commitments.

The proposed activities build on this work, and extending it to include resilience and to move beyond the assessment of country policy, regulatory and institutional architecture assessments to apply this to regional frameworks (e.g. SADC, EAC and ECOWAS) as well as to Regional Agricultural Investment Plans (RAIPS) and Regional FSN Strategies (Plans).

¹ This includes the Malabo Declaration on Nutrition Security for Inclusive Economic Growth and Sustainable Development. <http://www.g20ys.org/upload/auto/f20d5372b44d38f099213d39bad3d251f90369dc.pdf>

9. Management Support for Coordination, Communication, Compliance and Impact

This Food Security Policy Innovation Lab is led by a management team at MSU (M. Maredia, S. Longabaugh, O. Tasje), IFPRI (X. Diao and I. Matias) and UP (S. Hendricks and E. Mkandawire) that serves as a liaison between USAID and the FSP Consortium partners. This team provides support to the FSP Innovation Lab through coordination, communication, compliance and facilitating capacity building and policy change drawing from the wealth of research outputs produced by the FSP Component teams C1 to C5. At each partner institution, the management team is supported by the business office staff that have key responsibilities in the contractual and financial management of the FSP Leader award, Mission buy-ins, and Associate Awards.

In this extended Year 5 workplan period, the team plans to continue to provide this supporting role to the Component teams and the FSP Consortium. Additionally, more focus and attention will be devoted by the Management team on completing priority tasks identified by USAID (Tasks 1 to 7), and on follow-up action plans to respond to the recently completed mid-term evaluation.

Specific tasks identified for this final year workplan includes:

9.1 Follow up on Internal/External Review Recommendations

Most of the recommendation from the external evaluation are being addressed in the Component workplans described in previous sections and priority tasks identified in Section 2. In addition, we will seek to respond to the following three specific recommendations as part of the management task.

EQ 2.1: Encourage USAID Missions and AfricaLEAD to facilitate their partner government colleagues from other countries to participate in Tanzania to participate in 2018 Annual Agricultural Policy Conference and meet with Policy Analysis Group.

EQ 4.1: Undertake one-time stakeholder demand assessment or survey into the routine FSP IL and Mission-funded AA and Buy-in M&E processes, but with the specific limited focus on final workplan stakeholder surveys or focus group by country and by C3, C4(a) and C4(b) to be designed and implemented in coordination with FSP communications team.

EQ 3.1: Strengthen coordination among the several global research components and programs.

In response to this recommendation (3.1), we will strive to identify and support synergies between global components and country policy reform activities, by increasing both the quantity and quality of interaction between country programs and global component teams. Some resources are set aside to support a project-wide meeting/conference to bring together team members across Components, consortium partners, country teams, and USAID to share project accomplishments, information about ongoing complementary activities, discuss lessons learned, and draw implications/guidance for future investments on policy research to facilitate the successful implementation of the new Global Food Security Strategy of the U.S. government.

9.2 Compliance with Open Data Management Plan

Each project component team funded by the FSP Core project has developed a data management plan that identifies all the datasets and elaborates on the plan for complying with the open data directives of USAID. Given the multiple partners and the nature of the program, there are many open data access sites available to FSP team members. The management team will continue to track and monitor the progress of this data management plan in year 5. The goal is to have the data available in the key sites used by professionals in each field, and give highest exposure to the data, in addition to registering these datasets in the USAID Development Data Library (DDL).

9.3 Grant Management, Reporting, and Monitoring and Evaluation

The management team will also continue to play a major role in providing support to the FSP program in terms of:

- Managing institutional sub-contracts and consultancy contracts (including reviewing workplans, budgets, invoicing, meeting Institutional Review Board requirements)
- Submitting required USAID reports: bi-monthly, semi-annual, and financial reports, accruals, etc.
- Submitting published outputs to USAID's DEC system
- Collecting, maintaining and submitting to FTFMS system project M&E data

Providing support to Associate Awards and mission buy-ins in the development of the M&E plan, data collection templates, and conducting the baseline / midline /endline surveys for the qualitative indicators

Section 2. Other Priority Tasks and Activities for the Final Year

Task 2: FSP Synthesis Document about Lessons Learned

Aims:

To show the collective lessons learned across all components of FSP in an integrated way that showcases FSP researchers' contributions to advancing knowledge about agrifood system transformation processes and policies, pathways to policy change, and opportunities to achieve resilient and responsive policy systems. The synthesis will be a manageable paper (rather than a large-scale report) and will contain graphics, boxes, and other features that consolidate complex messages into a digestible and visual format. [Note: Although we will briefly describe the management structure of FSP across three institutions and the benefits of this approach, we will not devote extensive space to this element since it is already detailed in the FSP evaluation and is only relevant to a small audience within FSP and BFS].

Audience:

We want to aim for a broad audience that enables FSP's technical findings to be accessible to development experts, civil society and the private sector, policymakers, and laypeople.

Dissemination:

The paper will be accompanied by a shorter policy brief and an Agrilinks webinar and could be one component of a larger end of project event with the whole FSP team.

Core team:

Benson, Haggblade, Hendriks, Resnick

Key supplemental team:

Diao, Maredia, Paymal, and Rajul Pandya-Lorch (Director of IFPRI's Communications and Public Affairs Division), with supporting input from Atwood and Crawford

Timeframe:

Jan-March 2018

- Engagement with Atwood regarding the contents of the initial draft outline (see below)
- Engagement with other FSP colleagues, FSP evaluation report, and FSP outcome stories to expand the outline and identify any gaps that should be addressed
- Share detailed outline with the entire FSP team by early March for any feedback
- Finalize outline by end of March with more detailed division of labor
- Liaise with Paymal and Pandya-Lorch about editing, communications, and graphic design support that will be needed and when

March-June 2018

- Draft report completed by end of June 2018

- Circulate to FSP and USAID colleagues by end June 2018 for feedback

July – September 2018

- Host a one to two-day workshop in early July with core and supplemental team members to identify next steps for moving towards a final draft, including the major conclusions as well as the communication and dissemination strategy
- Finalize draft by end September, incorporating full FSP team feedback and decisions made at workshop

September – December 2018

- Proceed with dissemination strategy, including transforming the paper into one or more briefs, organizing seminars, and contributing to a broader end of project event

DRAFT OUTLINE FOR SYNTHESIS REPORT

- I. Introduction (Initial Leads: Resnick with support from entire Task Force)**
 - a. Overview of megatrends in agriculture and food security in developing countries
 - b. General synthesis on knowledge accumulation in these areas by other organizations (e.g. FAO, IFAD, etc.)
 - c. Summary of FSP’s role in advancing knowledge on these trends and impact on domestic and regional policy efforts
 - d. Structure of FSP
 - i. Advantage of an inter-disciplinary and multi-institutional team, leveraging country offices and programs to be locally-relevant and informed
 - ii. Flexible and responsive engagement with both USAID and host country governments, enabling medium-to long-term research on critical issues to be combined with short-term demand-driven requests; this enabled FSP to be simultaneously proactive in advancing the research agenda, even in contentious areas (e.g. land), and reactive to immediate policy needs
 - e. Organization of the paper

- II. Pushing the frontiers of conventional wisdom on agrifood system transformation and emerging policy issues (Initial Leads: Haggblade, with support from Hendriks, especially on nutrition and gender)**
 - a. Graphical overview of agri-food system transformation process, inclusive of the inputs, production, post-farm, and consumption components
 - i. This will illustrate which element of the process FSP contributed to and which it did not
 - b. Key research findings along this process:
 - i. Land
 - ii. Technological Inputs
 - iii. Value chains
 - iv. Employment
 - v. Diet and nutrition change
 - c. Policy implications of this work in some of the above dimensions, including with respect to gender, youth, and climate

- III. Pathways to policy change (Initial Leads: Resnick and Benson, with support from entire Task Force)**
- a. FSP provided a theory of policy change and the role that research plays in generating change
 - i. Elaborate on the Kaleidoscope Model
 - ii. Include two boxes on lessons learned from the case studies on micronutrients and on input subsidies
 - b. Examples of policy impact from FSP research at the country level, contextualized according to a typology of the agri-food system transformation and policy environment facing the following FSP countries
 - i. Malawi
 - ii. Mali
 - iii. Mozambique
 - iv. Myanmar
 - v. Nigeria
 - vi. Senegal
 - vii. South Africa
 - viii. Tanzania
 - ix. Zambia
 - c. Examples of policy impact from FSP research at the regional level, including
 - i. West Africa
 - ii. East Africa
 - iii. AU/CAADP
 - d. Examples where change did not materialize and why not
 - e. Synthesis of when and why policy change was more likely
- IV. Capacity building and partnerships for responsive policy systems (Initial Leads: Hendriks and Benson)**
- a. Capacity building tools (e.g. practitioners' guides, database of food security regulations, etc.)
 - b. Capacity building fora/modalities
 - i. Being embedded within ministries and ongoing policy process (e.g. Malawi, Myanmar)
 - ii. Networking with universities (e.g. Nigeria)
 - iii. Journalist training
 - iv. Technical assistance (e.g. African Union Land Policy Initiative, South African nutrition strategies)
 - v. expanding the dialogue (Tanzania)
 - c. Expanding the dialogue (e.g. annual Tanzania policy workshop, ReNAPRI)
 - d. Synthesis of lessons learned about how to make a policy system more responsive to evidence and research
- V. Conclusions/Looking Forward (Entire Task Force)**

Task 3: Better communication of policy influence and people level impact

In 2018, FSP communication will focus on the production and dissemination of stories that demonstrate the impact of FSP's work on individuals and institutions. These stories will emphasize FSP's activities to support policy reforms. The communication will include core funded activities as well as in-country AA and Buy-In projects. This plan requires the support and collaboration from the country and component leaders. In this final year, we aim to accomplish following tasks, under the leadership of the FSP communications manager, Elisabeth Paymal, with support from IFPRI communication team, and E. Mkandawire from the University of Pretoria.

1. Produce “outcome stories with a human face”

These outcome stories will be told from the voice of individuals or institutions that directly benefit from FSP's activity. As much as possible, these stories will demonstrate the impact of policy reforms through testimonials. Additional stories will address the capacity building aspect of FSP's work. Produced quarterly, for each country, these outcome stories will target USAID and Feed the Future audiences. They will be disseminated through these donors' communications channels as well as within partners institutions (MSU, IFPRI, and UP), and with social media.

Country and project component leaders will be asked to identify potential outcome stories based on the progress of their work. A tentative quarterly editorial calendar identifying upcoming reforms and potential stories will be set by February 2018. Short videos for the most impactful stories will be produced as stories are being developed.

The UP team (led by E. Mkandawire), in particular, will coordinate with FSP communications manager and in-country communications staff, to contribute to the following two types of communication outputs in this final year. These tasks are based on UP's research and on-going outreach activity:

- a) Building on the FSP work in which the University of Pretoria has been involved, the team will produce media pieces and publications, and focus on the impact that some of these outputs have had on policy change as well as people's lives. The work will begin by documenting all the outputs from FSP and identifying clear outcomes from each of these outputs. Human-interest pieces and other outputs will be published in the Conversation Africa or as blogs on other FSP social media pages. The outputs will take the form of written, audio or video pieces which will be published online. We will also reach out to the journalists and media houses we have worked with in the past to assist in reporting and disseminating these human-interest pieces. Specific outputs planned over the year include:
 - Continuous communication on outputs and successes on the various social media platforms.
 - A consolidated list of the reach of all the research outputs on the various social media websites.
 - A short video clip on the Kaleidoscope Model for policy change. This clip will be disseminated using different forms of social media.
 - A peer-reviewed journal publication on the South Africa micronutrient case study.
 - A media piece (video, audio or written publication) show casing how the Malawi micronutrient case study is informing government at the highest level.

- A human-interest piece on how the policy dialogue influenced policy change and how the dialogue itself has changed interactions between communities, policy-makers and other stakeholders.
- A short video clip on how to apply the integrated framework for gender analysis in nutrition policy. This clip will be disseminated using different forms of social media.

b) Communication outputs on gender and nutrition case studies. The work will document the policy changes and new policies passed that have been influenced by the gender and nutrition case study. Specific outputs planned include:

- A human-interest piece on how the policy dialogue influenced policy change and how the dialogue itself has changed interactions between communities, policy-makers and other stakeholders.
- A short video clip on how to apply the integrated framework for gender analysis in nutrition policy. This clip will be disseminated using different forms of social media.

2. Plan for developing a comprehensive communication strategy for each AA/Buy-in projects

Further coordination and support will be provided to in-country AA and Buy-in projects. One goal is to establish a tentative communications plan for each country. It will be key to engage in-country chiefs of party and component leaders to get the necessary support and identify adequate actions and most important stories.

For countries with a dedicated communications staff (Nigeria, Malawi, and Tanzania), regular communications meetings will be set up with each project communications manager. Visits to these countries will further facilitate coordination and collaborations. They will allow to offer direct support to the staff, toward the creation of updated communication plans and tools (for example the NAPAS: Malawi *Newsletter*). For the countries that do not have a dedicated communications staff, the project communications manager will continue to offer support. In-country target audiences will be both more clearly defined, and further inclusive.

FSP communications also need to be better coordinated with USAID in-country missions' --which is another goal for the country visits. More exposure of the impact of FSP's work can be sought out through the missions' connections and channels. The communications will also be better coordinated within the partners (IFPRI, University of Pretoria, and MSU). Additional collaborations will be sought out between the communicators of these institutions.

3. Communication tools

- The [web site](#) needs to be redesigned because the current Content Management System that supports it is being retired. It will require additional communication support for processing individual postings.
- It is expected that a **document of “lessons learned”** from the project will be produced. Graphic design could be considered in-house at IFPRI or MSU. Printing expenses are to be planned for.

- **Social media** engagement will remain limited to one Twitter account, with the goal to increase the number of followers to above 800.
- Articles in *The Conversation* will be proposed as FSP Research Papers are being published.

Task 4: Final lessons/approaches on sustainable local policy research capacity

Aims:

The proposed report on lessons on sustainable local policy research and analytical capacity strengthening aims to document the approaches and best practices used by various components of FSP-IL in the last five years in building local research and analytical capacity for sustainable impact on food and nutrition security. It will also identify the lessons from the implementation of the capacity strengthening activities under FSP-IL. The team will review the capacity strengthening activities of the FSP components and develop a set of strategies that were found useful for developing local capacities under FSP. The document will also describe a capacity assessment tool and a capacity tracking tool to be used by local policy research institutions in their effort to build local policy research and analytical capacity.

Activities and outputs:

The content of the report will be based on an initial framework paper that will borrow from the existing and currently developed frameworks and three case studies of reviews on in-country capacity strengthening activities during FSP-IL implementation.

The frame works will be developed based on the C3 thematic output such as the Kaleidoscope model, the tools under preparation for the Capacity Development for Agricultural Innovation Systems, and the Institutional Architecture frame work developed by the Africa Lead.

First country will be Malawi where considerable investment has been made to build local capacity for improving policy processes. It will focus on the Ministry of Agriculture and the local university as the centers for capacity building for food and agricultural policy. Malawi presents an example of consistent policy failures due to poor incentives in the policy systems for generation and use of evidence for policy making. The second country will be Myanmar where capacity strengthening efforts has focused on building the capacity of the actors and players of the national food policy system, during and after the period of transition to a democratic government.

In Myanmar the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and irrigation, Yezin Agricultural University, and the Department of Agricultural Research will be the local focal points. Myanmar is still emerging from a long history of military rule and the institutions are still evolving towards using evidence ion policy making.

The third country case will be from Zambia where long term efforts to policy research capacity in the local think tank – IAPRI- will be analyzed. Zambia provides a case study of successful transfer to the responsibilities from a externally driven initiative to the locally owned organization, which currently faces a choices in terms of the business model for its sustainability and maintaining its relevance and credibility. Results from the case studies will feed into the development of capacity needs assessment and tracking tools.

In preparing the overall synthesis paper, the country level case studies will be analyzed in the context of the regional and continental level policy capacity for addressing policy questions and issues at these levels. This will be done both in the African and south Asian context.

Audience:

The audience for this report would be country USAID missions and broader audience including the development community interested in capacity development of evidence generation for policy making in developing countries. More importantly, the synthesis paper will be reviewed and discussed with the collaborators and the policy researchers in the national systems for their inputs and feedback. The synthesis report will be useful for local policy research organizations from public, private and NGO sectors.

Dissemination:

The report will be widely available on the MSU – FSP website. Further a policy brief will be prepared to reach out policy makers and research leaders. In addition, we envisage a workshop in University of Pretoria where the key collaborators and the researchers of FSP will be brought in to validate the needs assessment and tracking tools prepared as part of the report. In addition, other regional fora on capacity development issues, such as the planned RENAPRI regional conference in November 2018 will be used for receiving the feedback from the local research and policy community before finalizing the report.

Core team:

Babu, Hendriks, Boughton, Jayne, Meyer and other local collaborators (to be identified)

Key supplemental team:

Diao, Maredia, Benson

Timeframe:

Jan-March 2018

- Initial discussion with the report team on the responsibilities
- Engagement with in country partners for the case study preparation

March-June 2018

- Develop a framework paper that would guide the case studies
- Conduct three case studies in Malawi, Myanmar and Zambia – prepare draft reports
- Conduct the review of FSP outputs and develop the synthesis of the lessons for capacity development activities.

July – September 2018

- Prepare the draft report on capacity development lessons from FSP combining the findings of a one to two-day workshop in early July with core and supplemental team members to identify next steps for moving towards a final draft, including the major conclusions as well as the communication and dissemination strategy.

- Circulate the draft report for the comments of the FSP researchers and other key colleagues in the development community working on capacity issues.
- Prepare for a validation workshop in University of Pretoria.

September – December 2018

- Conduct the validation workshop.
- Revise the capacity lessons report by end of November.

Requested budget and resources

- Labor: Time allocation of the researchers in IFPRI, MSU and UP vary and they are identified as part of the budget.
- Validation workshop: Approximately \$25,000. This allocation includes \$15,000 for workshop (part of UP budget), and support for 2 consultants for 2 countries @ 5000 each to support the local development of the case study (part of IFPRI's budget). The Myanmar case study and related costs are not part of this Core FSP budget, but will be cover through other sources.
- Travel of the case study countries amounting to \$20,000--\$17,000 total for researchers from MSU (50%) and IFPRI (50%) to travel to UP for the validation workshop, and \$3000 is for UP for regional travel for case studies including RENAPRI workshop in November.

Task 5: C4a and C4b joint findings/recommendations on implications of structural transformation from farm to fork

Core team members: D. Tschirley, Ferdi Meyer, T.S. Jayne, and Tom Reardon

Key supplemental team: Minten, Muyanga, Yeboah, Liverpool-Tasie

This work will bring together existing findings under C4a and C4b, along with new quantitative and qualitative (scenario-based) analysis, to generate a forward-looking assessment of agrifood system transformation in Africa. It will highlight the factors that will influence the nature of this transformation and its impact on smallholder farmers, micro- and small entrepreneurs, the majority of consumers that remain below the international poverty line, and on the level and distribution of employment in- and out of the agrifood system. Focusing on selected large and rapidly transforming value chains, it will generate recommendations for policy, public and private investments that are differentiated by the stage of transformation of each chain.

The main elements of the work will include:

1. A summary of what is known about changing diets on the continent based on analysis of household survey data. In keeping with previous work, these changes will be assessed from both a commodity perspective and a processing content perspective;
2. A summary about what is known of changes in the midstream and downstream in countries where we have primary survey data: Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. A less detailed assessment of such changes (based on key informant interviews, not primary survey data) in Zambia and Malawi.
3. Focusing now on maize, soybean, and sunflower value chains in Tanzania, Malawi, and Zambia:
 - a. Use of longitudinal balance sheet data and other data to examine shifts in area planted, yields, production, consumption, trade flow and prices that have occurred in these value chains. Relating of this to the findings from the household level analysis (this diet change analysis will include results for these three countries). This analysis will serve as an exogenous check on the implications of the household level analysis (#1) and will begin to illuminate how the systems have responded to the demand side changes;
 - b. Synthesis of what is known about:
 - i. Change in the structure of farming, including the rise of medium-scale farms, and its implication for the competitiveness of smallholder farmers in future;
 - ii. Transformation in the midstream and downstream (wholesalers, processors, and retailers) of the selected value chains (maize and maize meal, soybean and sunflower seed, oil and cake).
 - iii. Trends in import dependence. This will be examined both by commodity and by the processing classification that C4b has used in much of its work.
 - c. Formal scenario building for the future evolution of the selected value chains. This exercise will develop a narrative around a combination of plausible future scenarios w.r.t. the evolution of and the key drivers that will influence the transformation of these markets. The focus will be on the types of policies and the types and level of programmatic investments that will be made,

- d. Bringing this information together in a partial equilibrium modeling framework to quantitatively project the evolution of area planted, prices, and trade flows for the selected commodities and countries.
- 4. Summary of the implications of the work for the challenges and opportunities likely to predominate over the next 10-15 years, and of the policies and programs that will be needed to maximize benefit for system participants.

Roles and responsibilities

- Item 1 (diet change): Tschirley and Reardon
- Item 2 (midstream change): Tom Reardon, David Tschirley, Saweda Liverpool-Tasie, and Bart Minten for Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. Ferdi Meyer and ReNAPRI colleagues for Zambia and Malawi
- Item 3a (balance sheets) and item 3d (PE modeling): Ferdi Meyer with colleagues from selected centers of ReNAPRI.
- Item 3b.i (farm level changes): Thom Jayne and colleagues
- Item 3b.ii: This will come from Item 2
- Item 3b.iii (scenario building) and item 4 (overall writeup): Analysts from all three institutions and both C4a and C4b.

Timeline

Activities	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
TASK 5												
Development of scenarios (including workshop)												
Development of PE model with scenarios												
Writeup of summarized implications, by scenario, of C4a/b work for:												
Farm level structural and behavioral change												
Post-farm structural and behavioral change												
Location of employment												
Import share in food consumption												
Final writeup of Task 5 work												
Contribution to writing of FINAL report												

Task 6: land related research findings/recommendations/policy actions

Core team members: Jayne and Hosaena

Key supplemental team: Muyanga and Yeboah

Aim:

In this final year, the C4a team plans to develop a synthesis report with integrated set of mutually informing findings and recommendation between the MSU/UP and IFPRI land policy research teams. This will be an important outcome, especially in light of the very specific policy implications of some of the IFPRI work on alternative tools/policies to ensure secure land tenure and the bigger picture, important trend findings of MSU on key changes in farm structure/size of holding that may be emerging from insecure tenure and failure of current tenure regimes. The team will focus on completing following activities in 2018.

Activity 1: Complete Synthesis Report of IFPRI and MSU/UP work on land under FSP – integrating IFPRI, MSU, and E3 land work (initial draft written but needs to be finished) **(Q3-2018)**

Activity 2: Complete FSP Research Policy Brief after completion of synthesis report above **(Q3-2018)**

Activity 3: FSP/MSU C4a to participate in African Development Bank-led initiative on ENABLE Youth, to guide AFDB position on land policies to promote youth access to land, outreach event, May 2017, Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire **(Q2, 2018)**

Activity 4: Organize outreach session at African Capacity Building Foundation / African Union event on the role of youth access to land in African agricultural transformation, April 5-6, 2018, Accra, Ghana **(Q2, 2018)**

Activity 5: AUC-RECs (e.g., IGAD) Land Policy Dialogue/Conference – Hosaena to explore and potentially participate **(Q2, 2018)**

Activity 6: Land outreach event in Washington, DC, AAEA meetings, August 5-7, 2018, MSU/IFPRI to participate, showcasing C4a Land key findings and policy implications to date **(Q3, 2018)**.

Activity 7: MSU (Jayne, Muyanga, Yeboah and RENAPRI) Plenary Session at 2018 ICAE/Vancouver, presenting key findings from C4a Land work. Also, IFPRI/Hosaena parallel sessions and organized symposium at 2018 ICAE/Vancouver, presenting key findings from C4a Land work. **(Q3, 2018)**

Activity 8: IFPRI/Hosaena support to ALPC on design of 5 year programs on Monitoring and Evaluation of Land governance as well as program on Youth, access to land and employment opportunities **(Q1 - Q4, 2018)**

Activity 9: IFPRI/Hosaena Cross-country (Nigeria, Mozambique, Ghana and Ethiopia) synthesis report on drivers of tenure insecurity and innovative measure of safeguarding land rights **(Q3, 2018)**

Activity 10: IFPRI/Hosaena Complete FSP Research Policy Brief after completion of synthesis report above (#9) **(Q4, 2018)**

Activity 11: IFPRI/Hosaena (outreach) Domestication of the new framework/toolkit for Monitoring and Evaluation of Land Governance in 5 African countries **(Q1 – Q3, 2018)**

Task 7: Synthesizing policy findings and lessons on cross-cutting themes (gender, nutrition, climate resilience, and youth employment)

Core team: Theriault and Maredia

The FSP program has considered gender, nutrition, climate change and youth employment as cross-cutting themes in research related to food security policy. The internal assessment conducted by Kristy Cook documented several gender related policy findings and activities within FSP, and had made a recommendation to undertake a systematic review and synthesis of one or more of these cross-cutting themes. Under this priority task 7, we plan to conduct a systematic review of all FSP publications and outputs with the aim of synthesizing key findings and identifying concise policy recommendations. This will be an important standalone document. But the expectation is that this review could also inform the larger end of project FSP lessons learned and synthesis document (task 2).

Outputs

- 4 policy briefs – one for each cross-cutting issue (i.e., gender, nutrition, youth, and climate change)

Outcomes

- Improved knowledge of researchers and policymakers about gender, youth, nutrition, and climate change

Potential impact of the activity

- Those cross-cutting issues would be better integrated in the design and implementation of research activities as well as programs and policies

Timeline: April-May 2018

ANNEX 1: List of Ongoing and Prospective Buy-Ins and Associate Awards

Description	Dates	Amount	Obligated	Status (as of Jan 31, 2018)
Food Security Policy Leader Award RC102750	Signed: 7/15/2013 - 1/14/2020	\$15,000,000	\$11,300,000	Operational
Modification Buy-In:				
USAID/Mali RC104270	Signed: 9/8/2014 - 7/14/2018	\$ 900,000	\$ 900,000	Operational
USAID/Tanzania RC104271	Signed: 9/8/2014 - 7/17/2018	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	Operational
USAID/West Africa RC104272	Signed: 9/8/2014 - 7/14/2018	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000	Operational
USAID/Tanzania (ASPIRE) RC106131	Signed: 5/1/2016 - 1/14/2020	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 6,000,000	Operational
USAID/Zambia RC106132	Signed: 9/8/2014 - 1/14/2020	\$ 1,500,168	\$ 400,000	Operational
USAID/CDAIS Toolkit RC107949	Signed: 10/1/2017 - 1/14/2020	\$ 700,000	\$ 700,000	Operational
USAID/Venezuela RC107950	Signed: 10/1/2017 - 1/14/2020	\$ 300,600	\$ 150,000	Operational
Total FSP Core (including Modifications)		\$25,500,768	\$ 20,550,000	
Associate Awards:				
Food Security Policy Project (Burma) RC104236	Signed: 9/24/2014 - 9/23/2019	\$ 7,718,509	\$ 5,743,307	Operational
Malawi New Alliance Policy Acceleration Support (NAPAS) RC104584	Signed: 11/27/2014 - 11/27/2018	\$ 4,002,467	\$ 4,002,467	Operational
African Great Lakes Coffee RC105110	Signed 7/20/2015 - 7/19/2018	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 1,390,000	Operational
Senegal Agricultural Policy Project (PAPA) RC105142	Signed: 7/27/2015 - 7/26/2018	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 2,878,962	Operational
Nigeria Agricultural Policy Project RC105214	Signed: 7/1/2015 - 6/30/2020	\$12,499,999	\$ 4,390,953	Operational
Mali RC105885	Signed 7/1/2015 - 2/15/2021	\$ 4,399,932	\$ 2,000,000	Operational
Total FSP Associate Awards		\$ 36,420,907	\$ 20,405,689	
Total FSP		\$ 61,921,675	\$ 40,955,689	

ANNEX 2: FSP Component 5: Request Form

Title

<i>Individual Requesting</i>		
<i>Summary of Task</i>		
<i>Contribution to BFS Policy Agenda</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Institutional Architecture <input type="checkbox"/> Enabling Environment for Private Sector <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Trade <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Inputs <input type="checkbox"/> Land and Natural Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Resilience and Agricultural Risk Management <input type="checkbox"/> Nutrition	<input type="checkbox"/> Mutual Accountability <input type="checkbox"/> Systems change <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural transformation <input type="checkbox"/> Foresighting <input type="checkbox"/> CAADP/Malabo support <input type="checkbox"/> Overall Policy Team support
<i>Personnel and approx. budget</i>		
<i>Approx. completion date</i>		
<i>Deliverable</i>		

ANNEX 3: Matrix of Country Level Activities Funded Under the FTF Innovation Lab for Food Security Policy Research in this Workplan Period

Note: Activities in Ethiopia and Myanmar listed in this workplan and the following table are supported from either carryover funds or represent synthesis work based on work completed in previous years. No in-country activities are planned in these two countries from the new appropriation funds (FY 17)

Country	Research Component and Topic	Lead researcher/ Component	In-Country Mission Contact (if any)	Collaborating in-country partner (if any)	Short description for BFS to share with Mission in requesting concurrence (2-3 sentences or short paragraph, including possible utility to mission)
Burma	Research study on “Strategic Planning for Irrigation Development in Myanmar”	Mark Rosegrant: C1/C2 Asia, Activity # 4	Dan Swift, Leslie Marbury	MOALI	A top priority for MOALI is to develop an improved irrigation strategy. Irrigation is critical to achieving increased smallholder productivity and diversification into high value enterprises, while at the same time adapting to climate change. Historically, large investments have been made in dams but smallholder access to irrigation water, and technical support for diversification and productivity gains, remains underdeveloped. Burma has been identified as one of the most vulnerable countries in the world to climate change and hence irrigation strategy is key to improved livelihood resilience. Complementary investments are needed to enhance access to improved varieties, extension, and financial services.
Burma	Capacity strengthening for new Agricultural Policy Unit in Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Irrigation	Duncan Boughton: C1/C2 Asia, Activity # 6			
Burma	Assessing Trade Comparative Advantage among Myanmar’s Neighboring Countries: Challenges and Opportunities for Myanmar’s Agricultural Exports	Kevin Chen: C1/C2 Asia, Activity # 7			

Country	Research Component and Topic	Lead researcher/ Component	In-Country Mission Contact (if any)	Collaborating in-country partner (if any)	Short description for BFS to share with Mission in requesting concurrence (2-3 sentences or short paragraph, including possible utility to mission)
Burma	Capacity building fora/modalities	Danielle Resnik.Task 2, IV. b.			i. Being embedded within ministries and ongoing policy process (e.g.Burma)
Burma	Final lessons/approaches on sustainable local policy research capacity	Suresh Babu. Task 4. ii.			<p>The proposed report on Capacity Strengthening aims to document the approaches used by various components of FSP in building local research capacity for sustainable impact. It will also identify the lessons from the implementation of the capacity strengthening activities under FSP.</p> <p>The content of the report will be based on three case studies (Malawi, Burma and Zambia) - Item 2 (midstream change): Tom Reardon, David Tschirley, Saweda Liverpool-Tasie, and Bart Minten for Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. Ferdi Meyer and ReNAPRI colleagues for Zambia and Malawi</p>
Burma	Pathways to policy change	Danielle Resnik.Task 2, III. b.			Examples of policy impact from FSP research at the country level, contextualized according to a typology of the agri-food system transformation and policy environment facing FSP countries
Burma	Final lessons/approaches on sustainable local policy research capacity	Suresh Babu. Task 4. ii.			<p>The proposed report on Capacity Strengthening aims to document the approaches used by various components of FSP in building local research capacity for sustainable impact. It will also identify the lessons from the implementation of the capacity strengthening activities under FSP.The content of the report will be based on three case studies (Malawi, Burma and Zambia) - Item 2 (midstream change): Tom Reardon, David Tschirley, Saweda Liverpool-Tasie, and Bart Minten for Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. Ferdi Meyer and ReNAPRI colleagues for Zambia and Malawi</p>
East Africa	Examples of policy impact from FSP research at the regional level	Danielle Resnik.Task 2, III. c.			c. Examples of policy impact from FSP research at the regional level, including

Country	Research Component and Topic	Lead researcher/ Component	In-Country Mission Contact (if any)	Collaborating in-country partner (if any)	Short description for BFS to share with Mission in requesting concurrence (2-3 sentences or short paragraph, including possible utility to mission)
East Africa	Training workshop	Sheryl Hendriks: C3, Task 1.2			Strengthened policy, regulatory & financing frameworks to move from analysis to changing perceptions, strengthening alignment, leveraging change and influencing policy implementation capacity through NAIPs and RAIPs in each of the East, Southern and West Africa regions by means of focused regional training workshop of five days for stakeholder from all three regions.
Ethiopia	Final lessons/approaches on sustainable local policy research capacity	Suresh Babu. Task 4. ii.			<p>The proposed report on Capacity Strengthening aims to document the approaches used by various components of FSP in building local research capacity for sustainable impact. It will also identify the lessons from the implementation of the capacity strengthening activities under FSP.</p> <p>The content of the report will be based on three case studies (Malawi, Burma and Zambia) - Item 2 (midstream change): Tom Reardon, David Tschirley, Saweda Liverpool-Tasie, and Bart Minten for Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. Ferdi Meyer and ReNAPRI colleagues for Zambia and Malawi</p>
Ethiopia	C4a and C4b joint findings/recommendations on implications of structural transformation from farm to fork	Dave Tschirley. Task 5			This work will bring together existing findings under C4a and C4b, along with new quantitative and qualitative (scenario-based) analysis, to generate a forward-looking assessment of agrifood system transformation in Africa. 2. A summary about what is known of changes in the midstream and downstream in countries where we have primary survey data: Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. A less detailed assessment of such changes (based on key informant interviews, not primary survey data) in Zambia and Malawi. 3. Focusing now on maize, soybean, and sunflower value chains in Tanzania, Malawi, and Zambia.

Country	Research Component and Topic	Lead researcher/ Component	In-Country Mission Contact (if any)	Collaborating in-country partner (if any)	Short description for BFS to share with Mission in requesting concurrence (2-3 sentences or short paragraph, including possible utility to mission)
Ethiopia	Final lessons/approaches on sustainable local policy research capacity	Suresh Babu. Task 4. ii.			The proposed report on Capacity Strengthening aims to document the approaches used by various components of FSP in building local research capacity for sustainable impact. It will also identify the lessons from the implementation of the capacity strengthening activities under FSP. The content of the report will be based on three case studies (Malawi, Burma and Zambia) - Item 2 (midstream change): Tom Reardon, David Tschirley, Saweda Liverpool-Tasie, and Bart Minten for Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. Ferdi Meyer and ReNAPRI colleagues for Zambia and Malawi
Ghana	Changes in Policy Architecture: Origins and Impact	Danielle Resnick, C3 Activity # 3 : 3. Ghana devolution of agriculture			This work examines efforts to reform policy systems by analyzing how different experiments with institutional reforms have emerged and how reform of policy institutions has altered incentives, stakeholder motivations and policy outcomes.
Ghana	Mechanization in Agricultural Transformation: South-South Learning and Knowledge Exchange	Hiro Takeshima. C4a, Task 1.2			FSP resources will be used to complement PIM and CSSP funding supports for IFPRI researcher to participate in policy engagement activities in Ghana and Nigeria for possible influence on the government's policy improvements on mechanization
Kenya	Sustainable Intensification and Climate Smart Agriculture	Thom Jayne. C4a, Task 1.1		IFDC, AFAP and ReNAPRI	FSP activities are able to tangibly lead to an improved policy environment for fertilizer in at least 3 African countries (already achieved in Zambia and Malawi, currently working on this outcome in Kenya and Tanzania).

Country	Research Component and Topic	Lead researcher/ Component	In-Country Mission Contact (if any)	Collaborating in-country partner (if any)	Short description for BFS to share with Mission in requesting concurrence (2-3 sentences or short paragraph, including possible utility to mission)
Kenya	Seed system policy	Mywish Maredia. C4a, Activity #7:			Continue collaborative work with the CGIAR PIM program on seed system and policies for vegetatively propagated crops. The focus is on three countries and two crops—Kenya (potato), Nigeria (Cassava), and Vietnam (potato and cassava). The focus is on filling knowledge gaps on quality assurance system and related policy/regulatory issues such as seed certification, cross-border seed trade, seed relief (post-disaster), and integrating seed policies in national action plans for climate-resilient agriculture.
Malawi	Agricultural financial markets intermediation to unlock food system transformation.	Thom Jayne: 4a., Activity #6:			The role of finance in food production is well known. Following the evidence of emergence of medium size farmers, this activity aims to determine the role and effect of finance on medium scale farmers in Southern Africa (Zambia and Malawi in particular).
Malawi	Capacity building in PE modeling methods	Ferdi Meyer: C1/C2 Malawi, Activity 3:		CARD, Lilongwe Univ. of Ag. & Nat. Res., Bunda, Malawi, ReNAPRI	In FY2017, staff from the University of Pretoria will use FSP funding to provide training in the use of partial equilibrium (PE) modeling methods for policy analyses and national and regional crop market outlook projections to researchers affiliated with the Centre for Agricultural Research and Development (CARD). CARD is a policy research institution associated with the Lilongwe University of Agriculture & Natural Resources, Bunda, Malawi and is a member of the Regional Network of Agricultural Policy Research Institutes (ReNAPRI).
Malawi	Continuation of the Malawi NAIP work	Elizaabethy Makandawere, C3. Task 1.2			Mapping policy change in food security and nutrition This activity will build on an earlier assessment of Malawi's forthcoming National Agricultural Investment Plan and contribute to the on-going work under C3

Country	Research Component and Topic	Lead researcher/ Component	In-Country Mission Contact (if any)	Collaborating in-country partner (if any)	Short description for BFS to share with Mission in requesting concurrence (2-3 sentences or short paragraph, including possible utility to mission)
Malawi	Final lessons/approaches on sustainable local policy research capacity	Suresh Babu. Task 4. ii.			<p>The proposed report on Capacity Strengthening aims to document the approaches used by various components of FSP in building local research capacity for sustainable impact. It will also identify the lessons from the implementation of the capacity strengthening activities under FSP.</p> <p>The content of the report will be based on three case studies (Malawi, Burma and Zambia) - Item 2 (midstream change): Tom Reardon, David Tschirley, Saweda Liverpool-Tasic, and Bart Minten for Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. Ferdi Meyer and ReNAPRI colleagues for Zambia and Malawi</p>
Malawi	Pathways to policy change	Danielle Resnik. Task 2, III. b.			Examples of policy impact from FSP research at the country level, contextualized according to a typology of the agri-food system transformation and policy environment facing FSP countries
Malawi	Plan for developing a comprehensive communication strategy for each AA/Buy-in projects	Elisabeth Paymal. Task 3. 2.			<p>Further coordination and support will be provided to in-country AA and Buy-in projects.</p> <p>For countries with a dedicated communications staff (Nigeria, Malawi, and Tanzania), regular communications meetings will be set up with each project communications manager. Visits to these countries will further facilitate coordination and collaborations.</p>

Country	Research Component and Topic	Lead researcher/ Component	In-Country Mission Contact (if any)	Collaborating in-country partner (if any)	Short description for BFS to share with Mission in requesting concurrence (2-3 sentences or short paragraph, including possible utility to mission)
Malawi	Final lessons/approaches on sustainable local policy research capacity	Suresh Babu. Task 4. ii.			<p>The proposed report on Capacity Strengthening aims to document the approaches used by various components of FSP in building local research capacity for sustainable impact. It will also identify the lessons from the implementation of the capacity strengthening activities under FSP. The team will review the capacity strengthening activities of the FSP components and develop a set of strategies that were found useful for developing local capacities under FSP. The document will also describe a capacity assessment tool and a capacity tracking tool to be used by local research institutions in their effort to build local capacity.</p> <p>The content of the report will be based on three case studies (Malawi, Burma and Zambia) - Item 2 (midstream change): Tom Reardon, David Tschirley, Saweda Liverpool-Tasie, and Bart Minten for Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. Ferdi Meyer and ReNAPRI colleagues for Zambia and Malawi</p>
Malawi	C4a and C4b joint findings/recommendations on implications of structural transformation from farm to fork	Dave Tschirley. Task 5			<p>This work will bring together existing findings under C4a and C4b, along with new quantitative and qualitative (scenario-based) analysis, to generate a forward-looking assessment of agrifood system transformation in Africa. 2. A summary about what is known of changes in the midstream and downstream in countries where we have primary survey data: Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. A less detailed assessment of such changes (based on key informant interviews, not primary survey data) in Zambia and Malawi. 3. Focusing now on maize, soybean, and sunflower value chains in Tanzania, Malawi, and Zambia.</p>
Malawi	Capacity building fora/modalities	Danielle Resnik. Task 2, IV. b.			<p>i. Being embedded within ministries and ongoing policy process (e.g. Malawi)</p>

Country	Research Component and Topic	Lead researcher/ Component	In-Country Mission Contact (if any)	Collaborating in-country partner (if any)	Short description for BFS to share with Mission in requesting concurrence (2-3 sentences or short paragraph, including possible utility to mission)
Mali	Support to national programs: Mali	C1/C2 West Africa. Activity #5. Haggblade, Thériault, Smale, Koné and Traoré		IER, IPR, CPS/SDR	working closely with three local institutions on a program of collaborative policy research and capacity building.
Mali	Pathways to policy change	Danielle Resnik.Task 2, III. b.			Examples of policy impact from FSP research at the country level, contextualized according to a typology of the agri-food system transformation and policy environment facing FSP countries
Mozambique	Pathways to policy change	Danielle Resnik.Task 2, III. b.			Examples of policy impact from FSP research at the country level, contextualized according to a typology of the agri-food system transformation and policy environment facing FSP countries
Nigeria	Final lessons/approaches on sustainable local policy research capacity	Suresh Babu. Task 4. ii.			<p>The proposed report on Capacity Strengthening aims to document the approaches used by various components of FSP in building local research capacity for sustainable impact. It will also identify the lessons from the implementation of the capacity strengthening activities under FSP. The team will review the capacity strengthening activities of the FSP components and develop a set of strategies that were found useful for developing local capacities under FSP. The document will also describe a capacity assessment tool and a capacity tracking tool to be used by local research institutions in their effort to build local capacity.</p> <p>The content of the report will be based on three case studies (Malawi, Burma and Zambia) - Item 2 (midstream change): Tom Reardon, David Tschirley, Saweda Liverpool-Tasie, and Bart Minten for Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. Ferdi Meyer and ReNAPRI colleagues for Zambia and Malawi</p>

Country	Research Component and Topic	Lead researcher/ Component	In-Country Mission Contact (if any)	Collaborating in-country partner (if any)	Short description for BFS to share with Mission in requesting concurrence (2-3 sentences or short paragraph, including possible utility to mission)
Nigeria	Capacity building fora/modalities	Danielle Resnik.Task 2, IV. b.			ii. Networking with universities (e.g. Nigeria)
Nigeria	C4a and C4b joint findings/recommendations on implications of structural transformation from farm to fork	Dave Tschirley. Task 5			This work will bring together existing findings under C4a and C4b, along with new quantitative and qualitative (scenario-based) analysis, to generate a forward-looking assessment of agrifood system transformation in Africa. 2. A summary about what is known of changes in the midstream and downstream in countries where we have primary survey data: Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. A less detailed assessment of such changes (based on key informant interviews, not primary survey data) in Zambia and Malawi. 3. Focusing now on maize, soybean, and sunflower value chains in Tanzania, Malawi, and Zambia.
Nigeria	Final lessons/approaches on sustainable local policy research capacity	Suresh Babu. Task 4. ii.			The proposed report on Capacity Strengthening aims to document the approaches used by various components of FSP in building local research capacity for sustainable impact. It will also identify the lessons from the implementation of the capacity strengthening activities under FSP. The content of the report will be based on three case studies (Malawi, Burma and Zambia) - Item 2 (midstream change): Tom Reardon, David Tschirley, Saweda Liverpool-Tasie, and Bart Minten for Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. Ferdi Meyer and ReNAPRI colleagues for Zambia and Malawi
Nigeria	Mechanization in Agricultural Transformation: South-South Learning and Knowledge Exchange	Hiro Takeshima. C4a, Task 1.2			FSP resources will be used to complement PIM and CSSP funding supports for IFPRI researcher to participate in policy engagement activities in Ghana and Nigeria for possible influence on the government's policy improvements on mechanization

Country	Research Component and Topic	Lead researcher/ Component	In-Country Mission Contact (if any)	Collaborating in-country partner (if any)	Short description for BFS to share with Mission in requesting concurrence (2-3 sentences or short paragraph, including possible utility to mission)
Nigeria	Pathways to policy change	Danielle Resnik.Task 2, III. b.			Examples of policy impact from FSP research at the country level, contextualized according to a typology of the agri-food system transformation and policy environment facing FSP countries
Nigeria	Plan for developing a comprehensive communication strategy for each AA/Buy-in projects	Elisabeth Paymal. Task 3. 2.			Further coordination and support will be provided to in-country AA and Buy-in projects. For countries with a dedicated communications staff (Nigeria, Malawi, and Tanzania), regular communications meetings will be set up with each project communications manager. Visits to these countries will further facilitate coordination and collaborations.
Nigeria	Poultry sector analysis and outreach in Nigeria:	Saweda Liverpool-Tasie, C4b, Activity 2			i. Leveraging AA funds, the C4b Nigeria team will conduct surveys at the following nodes in Oyo State: (a) Poultry producers, (b) Feed mills, (c) Maize wholesalers, (d) Maize farmers, and (d) Poultry retailers. ii. The team will work with partners at various research institutes and institutions of higher learning with mandates to support governments in their agricultural policy development and implementation to disseminate this information at multiple levels. iii. While working at the federal level in Nigeria, the team will also work at the state level, due to the important role of the states in actual implementation of national policies and the fact that states often have their own specific agenda. In Spring, 2017, seminars on the sector will be organized at several federal and state level fora.

Country	Research Component and Topic	Lead researcher/ Component	In-Country Mission Contact (if any)	Collaborating in-country partner (if any)	Short description for BFS to share with Mission in requesting concurrence (2-3 sentences or short paragraph, including possible utility to mission)
Nigeria	Seed system policy	Mywish Maredia. C4a, Activity #7:			Continue collaborative work with the CGIAR PIM program on seed system and policies for vegetatively propagated crops. The focus is on three countries and two crops—Kenya (potato), Nigeria (Cassava), and Vietnam (potato and cassava). The focus is on filling knowledge gaps on quality assurance system and related policy/regulatory issues such as seed certification, cross-border seed trade, seed relief (post-disaster), and integrating seed policies in national action plans for climate-resilient agriculture.
Senegal	Pathways to policy change	Danielle Resnik.Task 2, III. b.			Examples of policy impact from FSP research at the country level, contextualized according to a typology of the agri-food system transformation and policy environment facing FSP countries
South Africa	Capacity building fora/modalities	Danielle Resnik.Task 2, IV. b.			iv. Technical assistance (e.g. African Union Land Policy Initiative, South African nutrition strategies)
South Africa	Pathways to policy change	Danielle Resnik.Task 2, III. b.			Examples of policy impact from FSP research at the country level, contextualized according to a typology of the agri-food system transformation and policy environment facing FSP countries
Southern Africa	Training workshop	Sheryl Hendriks: C3, Task 1.3			Strengthened policy, regulatory & financing frameworks to move from analysis to changing perceptions, strengthening alignment, leveraging change and influencing policy implementation capacity through NAIPs and RAIPs in each of the East, Southern and West Africa regions by means of focused regional training workshop of five days for stakeholder from all three regions.

Country	Research Component and Topic	Lead researcher/ Component	In-Country Mission Contact (if any)	Collaborating in-country partner (if any)	Short description for BFS to share with Mission in requesting concurrence (2-3 sentences or short paragraph, including possible utility to mission)
Tanzania	Final lessons/approaches on sustainable local policy research capacity	Suresh Babu. Task 4. ii.			The proposed report on Capacity Strengthening aims to document the approaches used by various components of FSP in building local research capacity for sustainable impact. It will also identify the lessons from the implementation of the capacity strengthening activities under FSP. The content of the report will be based on three case studies (Malawi, Burma and Zambia) - Item 2 (midstream change): Tom Reardon, David Tschirley, Saweda Liverpool-Tasie, and Bart Minten for Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. Ferdi Meyer and ReNAPRI colleagues for Zambia and Malawi
Tanzania	Sustainable Intensification and Climate Smart Agriculture	Thom Jayne. C4a, Task 1.1		IFDC, AFAP and ReNAPRI	FSP activities are able to tangibly lead to an improved policy environment for fertilizer in at least 3 African countries (already achieved in Zambia and Malawi, currently working on this outcome in Kenya and Tanzania).
Tanzania	Engagement in Tanzania on 1) oilseeds policy, and 2) agroprocessing strategy	David Nyange. C4b, Task 1.2			research on consumer demand for oilseeds that is contributing to the design of policy for the rapidly growing sector
Tanzania	C4a and C4b joint findings/recommendations on implications of structural transformation from farm to fork	Dave Tschirley. Task 5			This work will bring together existing findings under C4a and C4b, along with new quantitative and qualitative (scenario-based) analysis, to generate a forward-looking assessment of agrifood system transformation in Africa. 2. A summary about what is known of changes in the midstream and downstream in countries where we have primary survey data: Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. A less detailed assessment of such changes (based on key informant interviews, not primary survey data) in Zambia and Malawi. 3. Focusing now on maize, soybean, and sunflower value chains in Tanzania, Malawi, and Zambia.

Country	Research Component and Topic	Lead researcher/ Component	In-Country Mission Contact (if any)	Collaborating in-country partner (if any)	Short description for BFS to share with Mission in requesting concurrence (2-3 sentences or short paragraph, including possible utility to mission)
Tanzania	Plan for developing a comprehensive communication strategy for each AA/Buy-in projects	Elisabeth Paymal. Task 3. 2.			Further coordination and support will be provided to in-country AA and Buy-in projects. For countries with a dedicated communications staff (Nigeria, Malawi, and Tanzania), regular communications meetings will be set up with each project communications manager. Visits to these countries will further facilitate coordination and collaborations.
Tanzania	Pathways to policy change	Danielle Resnik. Task 2, III. b.			Examples of policy impact from FSP research at the country level, contextualized according to a typology of the agri-food system transformation and policy environment facing FSP countries
Tanzania	Capacity building fora/modalities	Danielle Resnik. Task 2, IV. b.			v. expanding the dialogue (Tanzania)
Vietnam	Seed system policy	Mywish Maredia. C4a, Activity #7:			Continue collaborative work with the CGIAR PIM program on seed system and policies for vegetatively propagated crops. The focus is on three countries and two crops—Kenya (potato), Nigeria (Cassava), and Vietnam (potato and cassava). The focus is on filling knowledge gaps on quality assurance system and related policy/regulatory issues such as seed certification, cross-border seed trade, seed relief (post-disaster), and integrating seed policies in national action plans for climate-resilient agriculture.

Country	Research Component and Topic	Lead researcher/ Component	In-Country Mission Contact (if any)	Collaborating in-country partner (if any)	Short description for BFS to share with Mission in requesting concurrence (2-3 sentences or short paragraph, including possible utility to mission)
West Africa	1.3. Completion of C 3-Activity 4, West Africa Regional Pesticide Policy Engagement 1	Steve Haggblade. C3, Task 1.3			<p>This work continues policy engagement begun under C3 Activity 4 with presentation of FSP results at the regional pesticide policy workshop convened by CSP and ECOWAS in November 2017. Though policy formulation has been sound, implementation is failing in two of the three key regional regulatory bodies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CILSS Institut du Sahel (INSAH) • Comité Sahélien des Pesticides (CSP) • Union Monétaire Ouest Africaine (UEMOA)
West Africa	Examples of policy impact from FSP research at the regional level,	Danielle Resnik.Task 2, III. c.			c. Examples of policy impact from FSP research at the regional level, including
West Africa	Training workshop:	Sheryl Hendriks: C3, Task 1.1			Strengthened policy, regulatory & financing frameworks to move from analysis to changing perceptions, strengthening alignment, leveraging change and influencing policy implementation capacity through NAIPs and RAIPs in each of the East, Southern and West Africa regions by means of focused regional training workshop of five days for stakeholder from all three regions.
Zambia	Final lessons/approaches on sustainable local policy research capacity	Suresh Babu. Task 4. ii.			<p>The proposed report on Capacity Strengthening aims to document the approaches used by various components of FSP in building local research capacity for sustainable impact. It will also identify the lessons from the implementation of the capacity strengthening activities under FSP.</p> <p>The content of the report will be based on three case studies (Malawi, Burma and Zambia) - Item 2 (midstream change): Tom Reardon, David Tschirley, Saweda Liverpool-Tasic, and Bart Minten for Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. Ferdi Meyer and ReNAPRI colleagues for Zambia and Malawi</p>

Country	Research Component and Topic	Lead researcher/ Component	In-Country Mission Contact (if any)	Collaborating in-country partner (if any)	Short description for BFS to share with Mission in requesting concurrence (2-3 sentences or short paragraph, including possible utility to mission)
Zambia	Analysis of land commodification and alienation to inform Zambia's draft Land Policy:	Thom Jayne, C1/C2 Zambia, Activity # 2.1:		IAPRI	In Zambia, the land policy is under review. To support the evidence base on land policy options, this work area focuses on the relationship between changing farm size dynamics and farm productivity in an effort to inform land and farm block policies. Research in this area will be carried out by researchers from MSU, IAPRI, and University of Zambia.
Zambia	Agricultural financial markets intermediation to unlock food system transformation.	Thom Jayne: 4a., Activity #6:			The role of finance in food production is well known. Following the evidence of emergence of medium size farmers, this activity aims to determine the role and effect of finance on medium scale farmers in Southern Africa (Zambia and Malawi in particular).
Zambia	C4a and C4b joint findings/recommendations on implications of structural transformation from farm to fork	Dave Tschirley. Task 5			This work will bring together existing findings under C4a and C4b, along with new quantitative and qualitative (scenario-based) analysis, to generate a forward-looking assessment of agrifood system transformation in Africa. 2. A summary about what is known of changes in the midstream and downstream in countries where we have primary survey data: Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. A less detailed assessment of such changes (based on key informant interviews, not primary survey data) in Zambia and Malawi. 3. Focusing now on maize, soybean, and sunflower value chains in Tanzania, Malawi, and Zambia.

Country	Research Component and Topic	Lead researcher/ Component	In-Country Mission Contact (if any)	Collaborating in-country partner (if any)	Short description for BFS to share with Mission in requesting concurrence (2-3 sentences or short paragraph, including possible utility to mission)
Zambia	Final lessons/approaches on sustainable local policy research capacity	Suresh Babu. Task 4. ii.			<p>The proposed report on Capacity Strengthening aims to document the approaches used by various components of FSP in building local research capacity for sustainable impact. It will also identify the lessons from the implementation of the capacity strengthening activities under FSP.</p> <p>The content of the report will be based on three case studies (Malawi, Burma and Zambia) - Item 2 (midstream change): Tom Reardon, David Tschirley, Saweda Liverpool-Tasic, and Bart Minten for Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. Ferdi Meyer and ReNAPRI colleagues for Zambia and Malawi</p>
Zambia	Pathways to policy change	Danielle Resnik. Task 2, III. b.			Examples of policy impact from FSP research at the country level, contextualized according to a typology of the agri-food system transformation and policy environment facing FSP countries
Zambia	Informing and guiding the Land Policy Bill in Zambia	Milu Muyanga, C1/C2 Zambia, Task 1: 1.1			<p>Outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSP Policy Brief on Zambia Land Policy Bill • Parliamentarian sensitization meetings based on the Policy Brief <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parliamentarian sensitized on land policy issues • Informed policy decisions by Zambian parliamentarians

Country	Research Component and Topic	Lead researcher/ Component	In-Country Mission Contact (if any)	Collaborating in-country partner (if any)	Short description for BFS to share with Mission in requesting concurrence (2-3 sentences or short paragraph, including possible utility to mission)
Zambia	Zambian smallholders' agricultural policy preferences – using best-worst scaling	Nicole Mason, C1/C2 Zambia, Task 1: 1.2			<p>Outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working paper on Zambian smallholder farmers' preferences for input subsidies (e.g., FISP) versus other types of government agricultural sector programs and investments (e.g., extension, rural roads, etc.), including an analysis differences among different sub-groups of farmers (men vs. women, youth vs. older farmers) <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved understanding on agricultural policy preferences, including differences by gender and age group of the farmer
Zambia	Synthesis Review of strategies to guide the Zambian government's efforts to promote climate-smart agriculture, resilience and sustainable forest management:	Ngoma, C1/C2 Zambia, Task 1: 1.3			<p>It is widely accepted that there is an urgent need to identify strategies to make agri-food systems more resilient to the effects of rapidly changing climate conditions. African farmers and agri-food systems are particularly vulnerable to climate-related shocks due to the region's reliance on rain-fed agricultural production systems, and the low incomes, assets and coping abilities of a large share of the region's population. Various climate-smart agricultural practices have been promoted for decades as means to increase productivity and build the resilience of rain-fed farming systems to climate change. However, the uptake remains low and the evidence base on understanding why remains thin. This activity therefore has been set up to provide empirical guidance on policies and investments to improve the climate resilience of Zambian agriculture.</p>

Country	Research Component and Topic	Lead researcher/ Component	In-Country Mission Contact (if any)	Collaborating in-country partner (if any)	Short description for BFS to share with Mission in requesting concurrence (2-3 sentences or short paragraph, including possible utility to mission)
Zambia	Technical training to IAPRI researchers on impact evaluation methods	Nicole Mason, C1/C2 Zambia, Taske: 1.4			Outputs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training workshops on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Difference-in-differences o Regression discontinuity o Decomposition analysis o Endogenous switching regression Outcome: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved capacity within IAPRI to conduct impact evaluations

C1: Country-Level Collaborative Research (on Farms, Firms, and Markets) and Formulation/Analysis of Policy Options

C2: Country-Level Capacity-Building for Policy (Data, Analysis, Advocacy, Formulation, Consultation, Coordination, and Implementation)

C3: Global Collaborative Research on Support to the Policy Process and Policy Capacity

C4:a Agrifood System Transformation in the Upstream: Land Dynamics, Land Governance, Mechanization and Implications for Rural Employment

C4:b Agrifood System Transformation in the Downstream and Implications for Linkages to the Upstream

C5: Strategic Analytical Agenda and Support to Donor Policy and Strategy

