

ANNEX 6: SYNTHESIS OF SCORES, STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES FOR THE 6 POLICY ELEMENTS : Kenya Workshop of FS Institutional Architecture, January 28th -to February 1st , 2018 GoK, Africa Lead and USAID

Policy Elements	Questions	Scores	Strengths	Weaknesses
Policy Element (1): Predictability of the Guiding Policy Framework	Q1. There is legislative capacity to develop food security	3: marginally satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parliament prioritizes formation of committees Bring expertise expertise Advocacy and goodwill to form FS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor Coordination Lack of data for policy formulation Poor understanding of policy formulation
	Q2. 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.	3: marginally satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing constitution allows for dialogue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inaccessible information Weak structure for dialogue Inadequate training
	Q3. 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	5: excellent		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No guideline on what constitutes public participation

ANNEX 6: SYNTHESIS OF SCORES, STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES FOR THE 6 POLICY ELEMENTS : Kenya Workshop of FS Institutional Architecture, January 28th -to February 1st , 2018 GoK, Africa Lead and USAID

	framework.			
Policy Element (2): Policy Development & Intra-governmental Coordination	Q4. 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.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All aspects of agriculture are stipulated Government supports policy development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy developed before devolution Nutrition aspects not well captured
	Q5. There is a government-le identity, such as a coordination unit or task force, with defined membership that works towards improving food security (ag and nutrition) policies and/ or programs.	4: good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-chaired by two levels of government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated relevant authorities eg trade, health and finance
	Q6 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		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structures are in place with regular meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Membership from counties not regular

ANNEX 6: SYNTHESIS OF SCORES, STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES FOR THE 6 POLICY ELEMENTS : Kenya Workshop of FS Institutional Architecture, January 28th -to February 1st , 2018 GoK, Africa Lead and USAID

	security (nutritional and agricultural)policies, (3) develops strategies, (4) consults within the sector and (5) drafts funding proposals.			
	Q7. 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.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports policy formation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate funding • Policy formation takes a long time
Policy Element (3): Inclusivity and Stakeholder Consultation	Q8. The private sector (PS) is provided meaningful opportunity to participate in FS policy formulation and strategy discussions.	3: marginally satisfactory;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improves participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of capacity • Processes are weak and unclear
	Q9. Organization(s) representing the private	2: moderately weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logistics and resources are a challenge

ANNEX 6: SYNTHESIS OF SCORES, STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES FOR THE 6 POLICY ELEMENTS : Kenya Workshop of FS Institutional Architecture, January 28th -to February 1st , 2018 GoK, Africa Lead and USAID

	sector have the capacity to present analysis supported by evidence to influence government-led discussions on food security policy.			
	Q10. Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) are provided the meaningful opportunity to participate in FS policy formulation and strategy discussions.	4: good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government is proactive • Opportunities are provided for participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor capacity and at times politics override real issues
	Q11. CSOs have the capacity to present analysis supported by evidence to influence government-led discussions on food security policy.	2: moderately weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some CSOs strong, others are weak based on funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some are partial and lack integrity
Policy Element (4): Evidence-based Analysis and M&E	Q12. National food security priority policy initiatives/ investment plan/ strategy is based on economic and financial analysis.	2: moderately weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are institutions that conduct research • Detailed reports from planning unit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No centralization of data • Inclusivity of the government coordination is not even • Lack of coordination • National agricultural research system (NARS) • Policies lack framework
	Q13. Good performance monitoring measures and targets have been developed for the	2: moderately weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

ANNEX 6: SYNTHESIS OF SCORES, STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES FOR THE 6 POLICY ELEMENTS : Kenya Workshop of FS Institutional Architecture, January 28th -to February 1st , 2018 GoK, Africa Lead and USAID

	national food security policies/plans.			
	Q14. The Government has the capacity to monitor and evaluate food security policies and programs.	2: moderately weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 •
	Q15.Does the media disseminate food security stakeholders with sufficient information and evidence that they can use to help make decisions?	3: marginally satisfactory;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide coverage of media, vibrant media that publish food security issues • Adequate listening to culture in the country • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing of broadcast could be improved to coincide with primetime • Response mechanism for issues raised by the media is sometimes inadequate
Policy Element (5): Policy Implementation	Q16.The overall food security strategy has been broken down into programs and projects that have a sufficient level of detail to permit implementation.	3: marginally satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good will to support it • Policy in place but implementation is poor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
	Q17.Resources are committed that allow for the implementation of the identified FS policy agenda.	3: marginally satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 release the money, the county and districts can decide what to priotize 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 •

ANNEX 6: SYNTHESIS OF SCORES, STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES FOR THE 6 POLICY ELEMENTS : Kenya Workshop of FS Institutional Architecture, January 28th -to February 1st , 2018 GoK, Africa Lead and USAID

			•	
Policy Element (6): Mutual Accountability	Q18. 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.	3: marginally satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forum exists • Consultations taking place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of trust • Sector is wide yet focus is more on national government • Donor reports rarely shared with counties
	Q19. 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.	2: moderately weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BR process is now active • Some activities are in selected counties only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited consultation • No formal JSR is done
	Q20. There is regular multi-directional and on-going constructive dialogue among key agriculture and FS stakeholders.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dialogue exists • Government reports are available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited feedback from NSA • Forums weak at our county level