

Theme 1. Institutional Architecture, Transformation, and Policy Processes (Moderator: Steve Haggblade)

The goals of this session are to identify what we have learned about the policy processes and institutional settings that are most conducive to progress on food security objectives.

Key questions addressed in this session include:

- *What methodologies are available for determining whether policy processes are transparent, accountable, and effective? How can complementarities across different methods be leveraged?*
- *What institutional arrangements facilitate or undermine policy implementation?*
- *How can civil society actors be mobilized to advance policy agendas that promote food security goals?*

DETAILED OUTLINE

A. Presentations (12 minutes/each)

- Quality of the Institutional Architecture of Agricultural and Food Security Processes: Insights from Malawi (Todd Benson)
- The Devolution Revolution in Agriculture: Learning from the Ghanaian Case (Danielle Resnick)
- Public and Political Will Work Applied to Climate Smart Agriculture in Senegal and Uganda (Lori Post)

Discussant: David Tardif-Douglin, AfricaLead

Floor discussion (15 minutes)

B. Presentations (12 minutes/each)

- Comprehensive policy change as a critical element of NAIP design (Elizabeth Mkandawire and Nic Olivier)
- Coordinated multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder partnerships: A new approach to institutional architecture and its application to NAIP coordination (Moraka Makhura)
- Establishing appropriate NAIP monitoring and evaluation systems to achieve SDG2 and Malabo commitments (Sheryl Hendriks and Nosipho Mabuza)

Discussant: Jim Oehmke, USAID

Floor discussion (15 minutes)

Theme 1. Institutional Architecture, Transformation, and Policy Processes (Moderator: Steve Haggblade)

PRESENTATION ABSTRACTS

Quality of the Institutional Architecture of Agricultural and Food Security Processes: Insights from Malawi

~ Todd Benson

Authors: Todd Benson, Zephania Nyirenda, Athur Mabiso, Flora Nankhuni, and Mywish Maredia

As part of the monitoring and evaluation framework of FSP-IL, the project had proposed two qualitative indicators to assess and track the institutional architecture and quality of policy processes on agriculture and food security in FTF countries where the project had major country level activities. This presentation discusses the results of this indicator tracking in one of the focused countries—Malawi. The study involved administering in 2015 and then again in 2017/18 the same survey questionnaire to a diverse sample of over 50 national stakeholders on the issues. The initial survey showed that, while some positive developments had been achieved, improvements were still needed both in the quality of those processes and in the quality of the institutions involved. However, contrary to expectations, the survey completed in 2017/18 showed an increase in pessimism among respondents. Indices on both the quality of the processes and on the quality of the institutional framework had dropped significantly from the baseline survey. This result was unexpected, as between 2015 and 2017/18 several policy achievements had been realized. However, Malawi also experienced recurrent widespread food insecurity over this period. The respondents seem to have seen a significant disconnect between the reasonably high quality of the policies developed through these processes and the results obtained—the quality of policy implementation so far has not met the aspirations of those policies. This Malawian example is then used to assess the value and challenges associated with using this somewhat quantitative approach to measuring trends in the quality of national policy processes. How much do they tell us? Can such measures be used to assess the impact of efforts to strengthen such processes?

Key document on this work:

FSP [Policy Research Brief 73](#) and [Research Paper 107](#)

Other countries for which such studies are conducted include--[Nigeria](#), [Zambia](#), [Tanzania](#), [Mali](#) and Senegal.

~*~*~

The Devolution Revolution: Implications for Agricultural Service Delivery in Ghana

~ Danielle Resnick

In 2009, Ghana began pursuing the devolution of functions and responsibilities from the central government to the country's 216 Metropolitan, Municipal, and District Assemblies (MMDAs). Agriculture was among one of the first sectors to be devolved, a process that became effective in 2012. This paper analyzes how this transition has proceeded, with a focus on the implications for agricultural civil servants within the MMDAs, accountability to citizens, and agricultural expenditures. Empirically, the paper draws on a survey of 960 rural households, 80 District Directors of Agriculture (DDAs), district level budget data from 2012 to 2016, and semi-structured interviews with a range of national and local government stakeholders. The findings show a number of positive benefits of the transition for DDAs, including more opportunities for employment mobility and the chance to engage more

Theme 1. Institutional Architecture, Transformation, and Policy Processes (Moderator: *Steve Haggblade*)

with local citizens in designing agricultural projects. Yet, financial constraints are the main complaint, with low and uncertain funding a common hindrance to delivering services and adequately staffing offices. Budget data reveals that the share of funding budgeted for agriculture has changed only marginally since 2012 while agricultural expenditures in absolute terms and as a proportion of agricultural households has declined, even in comparison to other devolved sectors. Political incentives may be partially responsible for these trends in budgeting as elected Assembly members tend to prioritize other sectors with more visible outcomes. Citizens are influenced by these dynamics, with those who have access to agricultural goods and services being significantly more likely to claim that they are satisfied with the agricultural devolution process.

Key document on this work:

[Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Food Security Policy Research Paper 95.](#)

~*~*~

Public and Political Will Work Applied to Climate Smart Agriculture in Senegal and Uganda

~ *Lori Post*

The international community has advocated the adoption of climate-smart agriculture (CSA) as lower-income countries deal with the negative consequences of climate change. Scaling up such policies, practices, and programs successfully will require support from a variety of local stakeholders. Such support requires alignment between CSA solutions and the problem understandings of stakeholders. However, problem understandings can differ across individuals, stakeholder groups, and geographic areas. Consequently, we examine understandings of climate problems and socioeconomic and infrastructure problems related to agriculture among different stakeholder groups in Uganda and Senegal. We operationalized and measured these problem understandings following the detailed guidance of the political will and public will approach for analyzing social change. Semi-structured interviews elicited stakeholder-generated lists of problems for each group. Limited quantification of problem understandings and their relative importance or “ripeness” demonstrates how contexts might shape opportunities for CSA.

Key document on this work:

Raile, E. D., Young, L. M., Bonabana-Wabbi, J., Kirinya, J., Mbaye, S., Wooldridge, L., Post, L. A. (2018).

Agriculture in Shifting Climates: The Configuration and Ripeness of Problem Understandings in Uganda and Senegal. *Review of Policy Research*, 35(2), 302-325.

~*~*~

Comprehensive policy change as a critical element of NAIP design

~ *Elizabeth Mkandawire and Nic Olivier*

African countries have made great strides in economic and agricultural development. However, reductions in hunger and malnutrition have been slow. The complex nature of food security requires that multiple players cooperate in policy development and implementation. Variable interpretations

Theme 1. Institutional Architecture, Transformation, and Policy Processes (Moderator: *Steve Haggblade*)

of food security exist, yet there is no formal guidance on what constitutes a food security policy. The 2003 CAADP Framework and the changing context of international commitments on food insecurity have led to significant developments in the conceptualization of food security. Our study assessed 11 National Agriculture Investment Plans (NAIP) to determine if national policies align with the evolving understanding of food security and the changing context of international commitments on reducing food insecurity. Our study found little evidence of active policy review, deliberate strategy design and action planning to achieve development goals related to food security and inclusive growth. Focus on nutrition has increased at the neglect of other elements of food security. Lack of coherence and poor guidance regarding both what a food security policy should include and cover as well as the lack of guidance and clarification on the role of policies, strategies and action plans exists. There is considerable potential for the NAIP process to stimulate comprehensive and sequenced policy review and reform while taking into account the changing environment of agriculture and food systems.

Key document on this work:

Hendriks, Olivier, Mkandawire, Mabuza, and Makhura. Creating the Necessary Policy Context for Progress on the Malabo Declaration: A Review of Food Security and Nutrition Policy Changes in 11 Africa Countries. [Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Food Security Policy Research Paper 122.](#)

~*~*~

Coordinated multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder partnerships: A new approach to institutional architecture and its application to NAIP coordination ~ *Moraka N. Makhura*

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) urge for greater partnership among stakeholders to achieve the SDGs. The positioning of food security in the national development policy agenda demands the establishment of an institutional coordination structure. Food Security and Nutrition (FSN) is generally expressed as an impact measure. The centrality of FSN in national development agendas offers an opportunity for multi-sectoral approaches and multi-stakeholder institutional design to ensure policy coherence and coordinated implementation. This may manifest in platforms established to support the implementation of a National Agriculture Investment Plan (NAIP). The Inclusive Sustainable Partnerships for Development Framework (ISP4D) was developed and used to assess how fit for purpose the institutional architectures set out in the 11 NAIPs were in terms of multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordination for FSN. The study found that fewer than half of the 11 countries' NAIPs included supra-national, coordinated institutions. Supra-national structures have more power and authority to mobilise the relevant stakeholders. In many countries, the coordinating institutions seem to reflect more government involvement, with lower inclusion of the private sector, CSOs and beneficiaries. Many institutions are sectorally biased towards the agricultural sector. The NAIPs reflected a focus on national coordination, without replicating these structures at the lower levels of government. For countries to achieve more effective institutional coordination, the NAIPs should provide for a higher level body to provide oversight and clearer guidance to NAIP teams. Countries may also follow the six step process proposed by HLPE (2018) on ways of establishing a Multi-stakeholder Partnerships (MSP) for FSN purpose.

Theme 1. Institutional Architecture, Transformation, and Policy Processes (Moderator: *Steve Haggblade*)

Key documents on this work:

- Makhura, MN., Hendriks, SL., Olivier, NJJ., Mkandawire, E., Vilakazi, N. and Olivier, NJJ. 2019. Are the NAIP II institutional architectures fit for purpose for achieving SDG 2 in Africa? Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Food Security Research Paper (forthcoming).
- Makhura, MN., Hendriks, SL., Olivier, NJJ., Mkandawire, E., Vilakazi, N. and Olivier, NJJ. 2019. Are the NAIP II institutional architectures fit for purpose for achieving SDG 2 in Africa? Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Food Security Policy Research Brief (forthcoming).

~*~*~

Establishing appropriate NAIP monitoring and evaluation systems to achieve SDG2 and Malabo commitments *~ Sheryl Hendriks and Nosipho Mabuza*

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), Africa's Agenda 2063 and the 2014 Malabo Declaration have introduced greater integration of development objectives across traditional sectors, offering opportunities for greater accountability. Integrated development programs require a comprehensive set of indicators drawn from data across traditional sectors. Aligning National Agricultural Investment Plans (NAIP) with the UN's Sustainable Development Goals, Agenda 2063 and national development plans improves the coherence and efficiency of planning. It also allows countries to streamline monitoring and reporting on international, continental and national policies hence reducing the need for parallel reporting systems. Our study assessed the monitoring and evaluation indicator frameworks of 10 NAIPs' to determine their alignment with the African Union's Biennial Review (BR), the First 10-year Implementation Plan of the African Union's Agenda 2063 and the SDGs. The study found that country-level planning did take into account the international and African transversal sectoral frameworks. The lack of appreciation of the full scope of what food security is led to an imbalanced focus on production by some countries. This suggests that ministries are still working in silos rather than embracing a multi-sectoral approach to integrated planning. The findings of the analysis raise the need for considerably more training on the BR, the design of the NAIP monitoring and evaluation and the alignment of these with Agenda 2063 and the SDGs to ensure compliance and improve the quality of reporting across the transversal development space.

Key documents on this work:

- Hendriks, SL., Mabuza, N., Hendriks, KR., Olivier, NJJ., Makhura, MN., Mkandawire, E., Mkhwanazi, N., Mkusa, L. and Vilakazi, N. 2018. An evaluation of the level of integration and alignment of the Malabo commitments, Africa's Agenda 2030 and the SDGs in 10 National Agricultural Food Security Investment Plans. Food Security Policy [Research Paper 108](#) and [Policy Research Brief 71](#).

