

**SPS LOCATION:** Program Element EG.3.1: Agricultural Enabling Environment

**INITIATIVE AFFILIATION:** Global Food Security Strategy – CCIR 5: More effective governance, policy, and institutions

**INDICATOR TITLE: EG.3.1-d Milestones in improved institutional architecture for food security policy achieved with USG support [Multi-Level]**

**DEFINITION:**

This performance indicator reports on *milestones in improved institutional architecture for food systems policy achieved*. **Institutional architecture** (IA) broadly refers to “the entities and processes for policy formulation and implementation”<sup>18</sup>, and more specifically in this case to those for food systems policy. IA for food systems policy reflects both the capacity of specific types of organizations (such as ministries, policy think tanks, citizen interest groups and district governments) operating at different levels (international, regional, national, or sub-national) and the processes through which these organizations interact towards a common food systems goal (such as through inter-ministerial processes, scorecard reviews, or decentralization). A **milestone** is a ‘positive change’ that marks a significant achievement in the development of better performing, more effective policy systems and describes how the change contributes to improved policies and policy outcomes within a GFSS country or regional plan. **Food systems policy** is multi-sectoral and interdisciplinary, and includes policies on agriculture, nutrition, resilience, and other related areas that affect food security.

Operating Units (OUs) and Implementing Partners (IPs) can both report on this indicator. OUs should report milestones achieved during the past fiscal year with USG funding. Both OUs and IPs are encouraged to derive milestones from a theory of change for investments in policy institutional architecture, specifying milestone targets and tracking progress annually. Both targets and completed milestones can be reported through the template for this indicator. The milestones should align strategically with country or local stakeholder priorities. A milestone can relate to changes in organizations and processes leading to improved policy making and implementation at various levels: sub-national or local, national, regional, or international.

There are six core IA policy elements that are considered key for a robust food security policy institutional architecture<sup>19</sup>. These core IA policy elements are described below and in more detail in Annex 1 to this PIRS. The milestones reported should fit in one or more of these policy elements. These elements are not mutually exclusive and some overlap exists between them.

Milestones should be reported annually in a table (see template on Agrilinks here: <https://agrilinks.org/RFS-policy-reporting>), with the following information provided concisely for each milestone achieved: brief description of the milestone; the timeline i.e., the fiscal year the milestone is targeted for achieved; the level of implementation (see paragraph above); what primary and secondary (if more than one) IA policy element(s) the milestone can be associated with; where does the milestone fit within USG strategic objectives with reference to the Institutional Architecture theory of change; what was the role of the USG support; what stakeholders were supported in achieving the milestone; and what source(s) of information is available to document the milestone. These milestones should be recorded year after year in the annual reporting table until they are achieved. If a milestone was dropped, a quick explanation as to why it was dropped should be provided in the “Notes” column.

**IA Policy Elements**

- **Policy Element 1: Guiding Policy Framework** – There is a strong set of legal processes, actions, and articulated roles and responsibilities that underpin policy development, coordination, implementation, and accountability mechanism that collectively forms a cohesive guiding policy framework.
  - Illustrative Milestones: Establishment of parliamentary access to food security expertise; Comment period for draft law established; Citizen groups have regular and reliable access legislative processes and documentation.
- **Policy Element 2: Policy Development and Coordination** – Policies are designed in adherence to the guiding policy framework and a set policy agenda with systemic organization and communication between the national and regional levels and with all relevant stakeholders.
  - Illustrative Milestones: Facilitation of the formation of a joint sector food security committee in the Prime Minister's office (national); a regional protocol for coordinating staple food data (regional level); Planned schedule of meetings between Planning, Finance and Agriculture Ministries; Intergovernmental coordination forum established and operational (e.g. meets regularly, shares information, takes decisions).

- Policy Element 3: Inclusivity and Stakeholder Engagement – All stakeholders (private sector, CSOs, marginalized groups, various political groups, etc.) are intentionally and systematically involved consistently in all aspects of the policymaking and implementation process, provided the tools and resources to do so meaningfully, and their contributions are integrated into the policy framework, process, and content.
  - Illustrative Milestones: Concerted efforts resulting in farmer association membership in an apex society (sub-national level), support to a representative civil society association focused on food security priorities (sub-national/national); Civil society and producer group platform for input to agricultural policy and program development; Joint sector review (JSR) committee established; inclusive policy dialogues formalized.
- Policy Element 4: Evidence Informed Policy Making – Policies are developed using relevant data and evidence to ensure contextually relevant and actionable policies that are effective and efficient based on existing knowledge of what works and does not work in the relevant sector(s).
  - Illustrative Milestones: Improved dissemination of agricultural data across multiple Ministries; Improved timeliness and availability of food security-related surveys and survey analysis; Public access to data on performance of the agriculture and food security sectors (e.g. dashboard monitoring systems; website data publication).
- Policy Element 5: Policy Implementation – Policies are enacted in a clear manner based on predetermined plans with multi-stakeholder ownership, sufficient capacity and resource commitments of relevant government institutions, and reliable feedback loops for adaptive management.
  - Illustrative Milestones: Improved budget justification for policy implementation; resources allocated for programs commensurate with objectives; Capacity of local government authorities to implement programs strengthened; Monitoring system for program and policy impacts established.
- Policy Element 6: Mutual Accountability – Government and policy stakeholders co-implement the policy process and policy implementation, responsive and supportive of each other's roles and responsibilities concerned with policymaking.
  - Illustrative Milestones: CAADP Joint Sector Review successfully completed; Donor mapping tool providing input on donor investments available; Joint metrics established for monitoring food security performance.

**RATIONALE:**

A country's capacity to undertake transparent, inclusive, predictable, and evidence-based policy change is fundamental to improving food security outcomes. Investing in strengthening a country's IA for food security policy is a GFSS priority as it provides a foundation for building the systemic capacities for managing a multi-sectoral food security program. The importance of good governance and accountable institutions in delivering on predictable and transparent policy change is widely recognized<sup>20</sup>. Data collected for this indicator will contribute to an improved understanding of the importance of policy IA and will be used in conjunction with other policy-related GFSS data to identify relationships between the policy system and policy changes. This indicator provides an opportunity to track the types of milestones and achievements OUs and IPs are delivering to improve systems, processes, and relationships that influence food systems policy. This indicator is linked CCIR 5: More effective governance, policy, and institutions of the Global Food Security Strategy.

<sup>18</sup> GFSS Implementation Guidance for Policy Programming (<https://www.feedthefuture.gov/resource/global-food-security-strategy-technical-guidance-on-policy-programming/>)

<sup>19</sup> Additional background information and resources are available on Agrilinks: <https://www.agrilinks.org/post/institutional-architecture-assessment-food-security-policy-change>

<sup>20</sup> Evidence can be found in "Africa Agriculture Status Report 2018: Catalyzing Government Capacity to Drive Agricultural Transformation." Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa, 2018. Accessed August 27, 2021. '

<p><i>UNIT:</i> 1/0 (if a table is available or not)</p>	<p><i>DISAGGREGATE BY:</i> (disaggregates in table only; not on indicator screen)</p> <p><u>Level:</u> Sub-national; national; regional; and international</p> <p><u>IA policy element:</u> Guiding Policy Framework; Policy Development and Coordination; Inclusivity and Stakeholder Engagement; Evidence-informed Policy-Making; Policy Implementation; Mutual Accountability</p>
<p><i>TYPE:</i> Outcome</p>	<p><i>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</i> N/A</p>
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES</b>	
<p>➤ <i>LEVEL OF COLLECTION</i></p>	<p>Sub-national, national, regional, or international</p>
<p>➤ <i>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:</i></p>	<p>OU staff; RFS staff; IP/IM staff</p>
<p>➤ <i>DATA SOURCE:</i></p>	<p>Data will be collected by relevant OU/Country Post/RFS/IP/IM officers engaged in activities supporting IA achievements</p>
<p>➤ <i>FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:</i></p>	<p>Annual</p>
<p>➤ <i>BASELINE INFO:</i></p>	<p>0</p>
<b>REPORTING NOTES</b>	
<p><i>DIS DATA ENTRY NOTES:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● This indicator does not have a quantitative component. It is reported via a standard table with the required information concerning the milestones achieved during the reporting year. A template table can be downloaded from the <a href="https://www.agrilinks.org/RFS-policy-reporting">Agrilinks</a> Policy Reporting page (<a href="https://www.agrilinks.org/RFS-policy-reporting">https://www.agrilinks.org/RFS-policy-reporting</a>) .</li> <li>● For USAID, OUs can report on this Indicator directly or assign this indicator to IPs/IMs.</li> <li>● Users (IPs and OUs) should fill out the standard template with information on the milestones in IA achieved or advanced with USG support and upload this directly in the FTF module in DIS (there is a document upload feature on the data entry screen for this indicator).</li> <li>● The completed table should be uploaded in FTFMS under the “Documents” section you see on this indicator data entry screen in DIS.</li> <li>● Additional documentation and supporting evidence should also be uploaded under “Documents”.</li> <li>● On the data entry screen, OU should enter 1 if a table was uploaded and 0 if not, to alert reviewers to look into “ Documents” to download the information.</li> </ul>	

<b>ANNEX 1: Institutional Architecture Policy Elements &amp; Illustrative Sub-elements</b>
<b>Policy Element 1: Guiding Policy Framework</b>
There is a strong set of legal processes, actions, and articulated roles and responsibilities that underpin policy development, coordination, implementation, and accountability mechanism that collectively forms a cohesive guiding policy framework.
1.1. Clearly Defined and Consistent Policy Framework: The policy framework that outlines and supports policy-making is detailed in a clear and concise way that is easily understandable, and is applied and enforced across the policy agenda from year to year.
1.2. Transparency of the Policy Making Process: The policy development process is known to all engaged stakeholders and pertinent information and changes to the process are communicated openly and clearly to all stakeholders in accordance with the rules contained within the country's constitution, basic law, and elsewhere in the formal legal framework.
1.3. Clearly Defined Institutional Responsibilities: Institutional roles and responsibilities (including those of the legislature and judiciary) are well articulated, understood by all relevant parties, applied across the policy agenda from year to year.
<b>Policy Element 2: Policy Development &amp; Coordination</b>
Policies are designed in adherence to the guiding policy framework and a set policy agenda with systemic organization and communication between the national and regional levels and with all relevant stakeholders.
2.1. Policy Agenda and Priorities Developed: There is an approved/official multi-sectoral, multi-year plan which specifies policy priorities and objectives and guides policy and program development and implementation.
2.2. Established Policy Process with Dedicated Resources: There is a detailed and legally supported set of actions, founded on the guiding policy framework, that outlines how to develop policy. This established policy process has committed resources including a coordination unit dedicated to carrying out the policy-making process and funding allocated to support policy making processes.
2.3. Coordination Process: There is a process for effectively aligning institutional roles and responsibilities and involvement of various actors in the policymaking process led by a government entity, such as a coordination unit or task force with a mandate to coordinate the policymaking process, including between the county/regional and national government and involvement of all relevant stakeholders throughout.
2.4. Technical Capacity: Relevant institutional representatives have the skills and knowledge to draft effective, transparent, inclusive, and actionable policies and effectively implement their institutional roles and responsibilities outlined in the guiding policy framework. Stakeholders (government and non-governmental alike) have skills and capacity to discuss in a productive manner contentious and differing policy perspectives in order to make decisions on policy change.
2.5. Political Will: There is supportive leadership pushing desired policy reforms as a priority area, including commitment of resources and personnel, and intentional building of public will
<b>Policy Element 3: Inclusivity and Stakeholder Engagement</b>
All stakeholders (private sector, CSOs, marginalized groups, various political groups, etc.) are intentionally and systematically involved consistently in all aspects of the policymaking and implementation process, provided the tools and resources to do so meaningfully, and their contributions are integrated into the policy framework, process, and content.
3.1. Inclusive Participation in Policy Process: Inclusion is factored into the guiding policy framework, coordinating implementation, and is a determinant of the policy development process. Ways of engaging in policy development and implementation are co-designed and initiated with sufficient timing to best enable participation.
3.2. Accessible Policy Information (*framework, process, and content): Information pertaining to the policy framework, policy process/coordination, and policy content are readily available and intentionally disseminated in a timely manner to all stakeholders to support engagement. Policies and any materials relevant to the policy process and its creation are accessible in languages (or formats- for visually impaired or illiterate stakeholders) of stakeholders.
3.3. Multi-level, Equitable Stakeholder Participation: Stakeholder engagement is consistent, equitable, and meaningful for all stakeholders (including marginalized groups) throughout policy development and implementation.
3.4. Depth and Impact of Participation: Engagement of all relevant stakeholders from policy development through policy implementation is verified and inputs of stakeholders are reflected in policy process decisions and policy content.
<b>Policy Element 4: Evidence Informed Policy Making</b>
Policies are developed using relevant data and evidence to ensure contextually relevant and actionable policies that are effective and efficient based on existing knowledge of what works and does not work in the relevant sector(s).
4.1. Evidence Generated in a Timely Manner: Data is regularly produced on policy implementation (national database) and research and analyses pertinent to policy decisions are commissioned from credible research institutions. Sharing of relevant data, research, analysis is done in a timely manner to inform policy decision-making.

4.2. Quality Evidence is Available, Accessible, and Trustworthy for/on Policy Making: Relevant and current evidence gathered using accepted data gathering methods, data interpretation is transparent and unbiased, and evidence is translated into accessible forms for a variety of audiences.
4.3. Evidence Regularly Incorporated into Policy Decisions: Few/no policy decisions are taken without reference to relevant supporting evidence.
4.4. Capacity to Generate and Use Quality Evidence: The Government has the capacity to monitor and evaluate policies and programs and know when additional evidence may need to be commissioned. All stakeholders have the knowledge and skills to connect evidence to relevant policy considerations.
Policy Element 5: Policy Implementation
Policies are enacted in a clear manner based on predetermined plans with multi-stakeholder ownership, sufficient capacity and resource commitments of relevant government institutions, and reliable feedback loops for adaptive management.
5.1. Implementation Plans Developed: The policy in question has been broken down into projects/programs that have a sufficient level of detail to permit implementation and “packaged” priorities can be translated into funding proposals to gain support for projects/programs from development partners to address financing gaps.
5.2. Implementation Capacity: The policy in question has been “packaged” into priority projects that can be managed by ministerial units, which have the necessary skills and knowledge to carry out their roles and responsibilities for policy implementation effectively.
5.3. Policy Implementation Resources Committed by Host Country: Resources are committed by the host country to implement the identified policy agenda. Over time, the country’s budget is adjusted to provide adequate financing for the implementation of actions required to implement policy priorities. Budget documents, including budget proposals, are released fully and in a timely manner.
5.4. Transparent Policy Implementation: Monitoring data and analysis of policy implementation results are shared with stakeholders and evidence-informed adaptations to anticipated policy implementation are discussed with relevant stakeholders (as applicable) and clearly communicated.
5.5. Monitoring and Evaluation Design and Implementation: Capacity exists within the public sector, private sector, or civil society to review the effectiveness and impact of policy changes through good performance monitoring measures and targets which have been developed and are utilized to analyze implementation of policies/plans.
Policy Element 6: Mutual Accountability
Government and policy stakeholders co-implement the policy process and policy implementation, responsive and supportive of each other’s roles and responsibilities concerned with policymaking.
6.1. Government Accountability: Government responsiveness to stakeholder questions and concerns regarding the policy process and implementation, hosts joint stakeholder reviews, and adaptively manages policy development and implementation.
6.2. Donor Coordination and Collaboration: There is a process for donor participation in the policy process and for aligning government and donor objectives and priorities. Donor programs should contribute directly to host country strategies, plans, and objectives and are coordinated across donors to avoid duplication. This may include the signing of cooperation frameworks that indicate a joint commitment to specific policy change goals.
6.3. Private Sector Accountability: The private sector constructively engages in dialogue with other stakeholders, provides evidence-backed policy inputs, and is receptive to feedback from other stakeholders involved in policy making/implementation. Private sector investors report to relevant stakeholders on investment commitments, if applicable.
6.4. CSO Sector Accountability: The CSO sector constructively engages in dialogue with other stakeholders, provides evidence-backed policy inputs, and is receptive to feedback from other stakeholders involved in policy making/implementation.