

Group 1: Breakout Discussion

Policy Element (1): Predictability of the Guiding Policy Framework

1. There is legislative (e.g. Parliament's) capacity to develop food security (agricultural and nutritional) policy change (to consider, debate, engage, draft, and ultimately pass good food security policies).

As evidenced by:

- *Functional Subcommittee(s) on agriculture and nutrition;*
- *Legislative Staffers provide or pull in expertise for legislative decision making;*
- *MPs understand key policy issues in food security.*
- *The agriculture and nutrition committees closely coordinate(s) with Ministerial technical personnel.*
- *An agriculture and food security committee (or committees that work on issues related to FS/ag/nutrition) promotes food security policies to the full legislature.*
- *The legislative branch has initiated, advocated for, and passed high quality FS policies.*

Group Score: On a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: "insufficient information."

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

-
2. The policy development and corresponding implementation process is **predictable** in accordance with the rules contained within the country's constitution, basic law, and elsewhere in the formal legal framework.

As evidenced by:

- *Clearly defined, accessible, and predictable legislative requirements are followed;*
- *Political process allows for dialogue to discuss and resolve differences and move forward.*
- *Legally rooted and unbiased dispute resolution process is a viable option if needed.*
- *There is a commonly shared interpretation and enforcement of the laws and regulations.*

Group Score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: "insufficient information."

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

3. The policy development and implementation process is **transparent** in accordance with the rules contained within the country's constitution, basic law, and elsewhere in the formal legal framework.

As evidenced by:

- *Clearly defined legislative requirements;*
- *The public has the opportunity to comment on draft policies, laws and regulations (such as comment period, non-state actor (NSA) or multi-stakeholder forum, governmental website or social media feedback fora);*
- *Budget documents, including budget proposals, are released fully and in a timely manner before, during, and after implementation.*

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: "insufficient information."

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

- No guideline on what constitutes public participation

Group 2 Breakout Discussion

Policy Element (2): Policy Development & Intra-governmental Coordination

4. There is an approved/official multi-sectoral, multi-year food security (agriculture and nutrition) plan which specifies priorities and objectives and **guides policy and program development and implementation.**

As evidenced by:

- *Government, including local authorities, agencies, and departments, implements and utilizes multi-year food security plan to guide policy and program development;*
- *Private sector and civil society organizations (CSOs) that represent member interests provide input that help inform priorities and planning.*

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: "insufficient information."

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

5. There is a government-led entity, such as a coordination unit or task force, with defined membership that works towards improving food security (ag and nutrition) policies and/ or programs.

As evidenced by:

- *The coordination unit meets regularly to discuss, develop, and coordinate.*
- *The entity has the relevant agencies from key governmental ministries (Trade, Finance, Health) and necessary governmental units;*
- *The members represent their governmental units, bringing information to and from the meetings;*
- *The members actively participate;*
- *The members have trust, a shared vision, and regular communication.*

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: "insufficient information."

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

6. There are government-led work groups or technical committees that perform **all** of the following functions: (1) Identifies policy and technical challenges/issues, (2) develops food security and agricultural sector- or project-specific food security (nutritional and agricultural) policies, (3) develops strategies, (4) consults within the sector and (5) drafts funding proposals.

As evidenced by:

- *The work groups or technical committees (such as ag or nutrition sector working group) have gone through the **full cycle** from problem identification, policy and strategy formulation, sector consultation and funding proposal drafted.*

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: "insufficient information."

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

7. There is a line of authority/participation by high-level decision-makers above the ministerial level **enabling efficient political support for the development and passage of new food security (nutrition and agricultural) policies.**

As evidenced by:

- *The prime minister's (and/or or president's office as appropriate in-country) is supportive of food security policies that cut across ministries (such as trade, health and agriculture).*
- *There is supportive leadership pushing food security policy reforms as a priority area.*

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: "insufficient information."

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

For KENYA: Are the different roles and responsibilities of County and National government clear and is there a harmonious and synergistic process of formulation & implementation of agricultural policies and programmes?

As evidenced by:

- *The existence of a coordinating mechanism between County and National governments*
- *The absence of "turf wars" and inter-governmental conflicts on resources and policy*
- *Clarity of roles among all stakeholders*

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: "insufficient information."

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Group 3 Breakout Discussion

Policy Element (3): Inclusivity and Stakeholder Consultation

8. The private sector (PS) is provided meaningful opportunity to participate in FS policy formulation and strategy discussions.

As evidenced by:

- *The private sector is invited to participate and included in the dialogue of the:*
 - *Policy coordination management unit;*
 - *Technical working groups;*
 - *Discussion forums;*
 - *Legislative comment periods*
- *Government considers and acts upon PS evidence-based feedback if appropriate.*

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; **3: marginally satisfactory**; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: "insufficient information."

Strengths:

- Opportunity is provided thus participation improving

Weaknesses:

- Lack of capacity and processes are weak and unclear

9. Organization(s) representing the private sector have the capacity to present analysis supported by evidence to influence government-led discussions on food security policy.

As evidenced by:

- *Member-based private sector organizations are able to represent their constituents' interests*
- *Member-based private sector organizations are able to articulate and communicate policy positions*
- *Member-based private sector organizations are able to provide some level of evidence-based analysis to support their viewpoints*
- *There is one or more member-based private sector organization that communicates policy positions (through public participation in policy formulation and strategy discussions, or through written communication to policy coordination/steering*

committee, or through other public communication such as letters to newspaper editors, etc.).

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: "insufficient information."

Strengths:

- Have capacity

Weaknesses:

- Logistics and resource challenges

10. Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) are provided the meaningful opportunity to participate in FS policy formulation and strategy discussions.

As evidenced by:

- *CSOs are invited to participate and included in the dialogue of the:*
 - *Policy coordination management unit*
 - *Technical working groups*
 - *Discussion forums*
 - *Legislative comment periods*
- *Government considers and acts upon CSO evidence-based feedback if appropriate*

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: "insufficient information."

Strengths:

- Are proactive
- Opportunities are provided for participation

Weaknesses:

- Poor capacity and sometimes politics override real issues

11. CSOs have the **capacity** to present analysis supported by evidence to influence government-led discussions on food security policy.

As evidenced by:

- *CSOs are able to represent their constituents' or members' interests;*
- *CSOs are able to articulate and communicate policy positions;*
- *CSOs are able to provide some level of evidence-based analysis to support their viewpoints;*
- *There is one or more CSO organization that communicates policy positions (through public participation in policy formulation and strategy discussions, or through written communication to policy coordination/steering committee, or through other public communication such as letters to newspaper editors, etc.).*

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: "insufficient information."

Strengths:

- Some are strong and others are weak depending on funding

Weaknesses:

Some are impartial and lack integrity

Group 4 Breakout Discussion

Policy Element (4): Evidence-based Analysis and M&E

12. National food security priority policy initiatives/ investment plan/ strategy is based on economic and financial analysis.

As evidenced by:

- *An entity such as an internal governmental policy analysis unit or a contracted policy think tank/ research institute has carried out high quality economic and financial analysis that formed the basis of the national food security priority policy initiatives;*
- *Economic and financial data and analyses are publicly available and are used or referenced in determining priorities for FS policy initiatives.*

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: "insufficient information."

Strengths:

- We have KU, Tegemo, Kepra we have institutions that do policy research
- Planning unit within the MoA that produces a report that is very detailed, economic review of agriculture each year
- One example will collaboration with research that has been successful is in the Pest control. Research and evidence flows from MoA through extension officers
- Asset is that we have a lot of products being produced by all of our great institutions producing evidence

Weaknesses:

- Data is in different places, distributed among different ministries and departments – need a system to bring all of the data together. Fisheries, livestock, crops units have different/uneven capacities. All different departments collect their own data, and coordination is uneven
- Inclusivity of the government coordination is not even
- KM issue – same indicators/metrics have different data bc of different methodologies/data collection approaches/protocols, so data cannot be brought together and harmonized. If methodologies are harmonized, then we can compare, analyze and consolidate data with devolution and counties are separated
- Lack of coordination around between the institutions inside and outside of the govt collecting data. A lot of programs are working in this area, but "we still not yet there"
- National agricultural research system (NARS) – the system is there, but no program is coordinated with it to bring in policy frameworks and inform the agenda.

- Policies should have frameworks, and then frameworks have vehicles. We need to understand and coordinate the research agenda for the institutions producing evidence
 - How are research findings found?? Who sets the research agenda? Different policy research agenda for the different institutions
 - High quality data is expensive to collect and there is not adequate funding by government to fund this. Available funding is how the institutions make decisions about research to pursue
 - “What we have is informing what we do.” Policy makers are not demanding evidence
-

13. Good performance monitoring measures and targets have been developed for the national food security policies/plans.

As evidenced by:

- *The national food security (agricultural and nutrition) policies/plans include: specific objectives, performance indicators, and targets.*
- *Those indicators and targets are realistic and can be used to monitor the accomplishment of the objectives.*

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country’s performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: “insufficient information.”

14. The Government has the capacity to monitor and evaluate food security policies and programs.

As evidenced by:

- *Government has systems to monitor, collect data, analyze the results, and communicate (internally and externally) policy/ program effectiveness through the M&E framework.*
- *The government has the ability to review data on policy performance and produce an analysis of the policy’s effectiveness.*
- *A policy analysis function/unit exists and has adequate and skilled staff, and is sufficiently funded. If required, specific analysis can be outsourced to specialized firms or consultants as needed (case-by-case).*

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country’s performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: “insufficient information.”

Strengths:

- There is a strong appreciation for the need for sector-wide M&E framework
 - Program-wide M&E frameworks exist, and we know that we have activities are contributing to food security
-

Weaknesses:

- There is a strong appreciation for the need for sector-wide M&E framework
 - Program-wide M&E frameworks exist, and we know that we have activities are contributing to food security
-

15. Does the media disseminate food security stakeholders with sufficient information and evidence that they can use to help make decisions?

As evidenced by:

- *The media presents meaningful case studies and statistics.*
- *The public can expect that urgent food security priorities would be highlighted in the press and garner attention.*
- *The media helps readers understand who makes decisions and how they are made for food security-related policies.*

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: "insufficient information."

Strengths:

- Wide coverage of media, vibrant media that publish food security issues
 - Adequate listening to culture in the country
-

Weaknesses:

- Timing of broadcast could be improved to coincide with primetime
 - Response mechanism for issues raised by the media is sometimes inadequate
-
-
-
-

Group 5 Breakout Discussion

Policy Element (5): Policy Implementation

16. The overall food security strategy has been broken down into programs and projects that have a sufficient level of detail to permit implementation.

As evidenced by:

- *The overall food security strategy (covering the topics of ag and nutrition) has been “packaged” into priorities that can be managed by ministerial units, including clearly defining lead ministries/responsible unit for cross-sectoral programs and projects*

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; **3: marginally satisfactory**; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: “insufficient information.”

Strengths:

- Good will to support it.
 - Strategic grain reserves exists—it is a strength
 - We have a policy. But is it adequate, and is it implemented?
 - Have a unit being built to cover aflatoxin
 - Gov designated funds for floods- there is an early warning system
 - New strategy is being developed
-

Weaknesses:

Would be nice to know from old one from old one how many indicators and what

The early warning system needs to be enhanced (drought, floods, etc.). It only looks at drought, but it should also look at other elements like Pests (including new ones from climate change) and aflatoxins. Meteorological Department manages the early warning system but they just look at drought. It does exist but the response is the weakness

Fall army worm, we had 6 month warning from West Africa, knew solution, but it took long to get budget from government as there is not a rapid response time.

Gov votes to spend money on flood—but if there is another emergency it is not flexible. There has to be a more general emergency fund. It should be national and then get domesticated.

I think there is an emergency fund. But there is a lack of capacity to access it. There are some county governments that are not able spend all their money

11 counties risk missing out emergency budget.

CIPD (county integrated dev plans) don't have full capacity to budget properly, to absorb funds,

17. Resources are committed that allow for the implementation of the identified FS policy agenda.

As evidenced by:

- *At least 75% of the identified annual policy workplan that stems from the policy agenda is implemented.*
- *Over time, the country's budget has been adjusted to provide adequate financing for the implementation of actions required to implement policy priorities*
- *Capacity exists to submit proposals and secure funds to address financing gaps.*
- *Government budget committed and disbursed to agriculture is effective in improving food security.*

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: "insufficient information."

Strengths:

- National budget sets the policy. There have been 5 years only of devolution. There is an amount of money given to the county government. But the national gov doesn't ringfence the money, the county and districts can decide what to priotize

Weaknesses:

But capacity to absorb goes along with funds being allocated- in Kenya several county governments send back funds at the end of the year, or spent funds on things that weren't in the budget

Questions is this national policy or local policy?

There is an ability to attract funds like GASP funding for food security (\$24 mil) but not clear how it is disbursed and where it goes.

Research from KIPPRA 1% disbursed to ag in the counties

In 90s there was a shortage of cash and you can only spend money that you have.

Now If Miss, the figure is there on paper. It is difficult. Treasury is like a business—if they don't have the money they have no business to disburse it.

Before gov paper was as good as a physical note.

Group 6 Breakout Discussion

Policy Element (6): Mutual Accountability

18. There is a mechanism for donor participation in the food security policy process to align government and donor objectives and priorities, and coordinate resources and activities.

As evidenced by:

- *A forum exists for regularly scheduled donor-government meetings*
- *Both donors and government share their priorities and objectives with each other*
- *Donor activities are coordinated (by either donors or the government) to avoid duplication.*
- *There is trust between donors and government.*
- *Donors and governments (including local government authorities) share information and learning to build off of each other's work. There is open and regular communication.*

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: "insufficient information."

Strengths:

- Forum exist frequently
1. Consultations taking place

Weaknesses:

- Lack of trust
- Sector is wide, alignment is on national government
- Donor reports are rarely shared with the counties

19. A formal stakeholder review session (i.e. the Joint Sector Review for CAADP) is used for adaptive management of policies and programs in agriculture and food security.

As evidenced by:

- *A formal ag sector stakeholder review session is held annually or at regularly predetermined intervals.*

- *Analysis of M&E data used for monitoring progress on agricultural development and food security is clearly presented.*
- *Government prepares for, openly and constructively engages in, and reacts with thoughtful consideration to incorporate evidence-based feedback from the review session.*
- *Follow-up action items are noted and then completed.*
- *Key development partners are included.*
- *The forum is based on a shared vision, and builds open communication, and trust.*
- *A report on feedback provided is made publicly available.*
- *Local level stakeholders provide and receive information and learning that feeds into or is derived from the review session.*

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: "insufficient information."

Strengths:

- BR process is now active
- Some activity are in selected counties

Weaknesses:

- Limited consultation, there are irregular studies that feed on the JSR
- No formal JSR is done

20. There is regular multi-directional and on-going constructive dialogue among key agriculture and FS stakeholders.

As evidenced by:

- *Government, non-state actors (NSAs) and donors openly and constructively engage in dialogue and react with thoughtful consideration to incorporate evidence-based feedback.*
- *The government provides feedback to non-state actors, at least annually, on the performance of the food security policies and the agricultural sector.*
- *Feedback is provided to both NSAs and government during the annual stakeholder feedback forum.*

- *The feedback forum is used as mechanism to hold private sector investors accountable to investment commitments, if applicable.*
- *The government and NSAs base their feedback on data/ evidence.*
- *The government or its representatives provide feedback based on first-hand field experience.*

Group score: on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) how would you rate Country's performance in this area?

Circle one: 1: poor; 2: moderately weak; 3: marginally satisfactory; 4: good; 5: excellent; or N/A: "insufficient information."

Strengths:

- Awareness/ Dialogue exists
 - Government reports are available
-

Weaknesses:

- Limited feedback among NSA and government
 - Forums weak at county level
 - Weak data and M& E to support dialogue
-
-