

The WLI and Feed the Future

Feed the Future, the U.S.
government's global hunger and food
security initiative

SEE THE FEED CHANGE **FUTURE**

Feed the Future is the U.S. government's global hunger and food security initiative.

"...the United States is leading an effort to reach out to people around the world who are suffering, to provide them immediate assistance and to extend support for food security that will help them lift themselves out of poverty. All of us must join together in this effort, not just because it is right, but because by providing assistance to those countries most in need, we will provide new markets, we will drive the growth of the future that lifts all of us up."

— ***President Barack Obama***

On July 2009, global leaders committed to “act with the scale and urgency needed to achieve sustainable global food security.”

— ***G8 Summit Statement on Food Security, “L’Aquila” Joint Statement on Global Food Security (July 10, 2009)***

SEE THE FEED CHANGE FUTURE

The Global Challenge

- According to a FAO recent report, 925 million people suffer from chronic hunger. It is a crisis with devastating and far-reaching effects.
- Demand for food is projected to increase by 50 percent over the next 20 years. Increased demand will come primarily from population and income growth in middle-income countries.
- Because of climate change, rice yields are projected to fall more than 25 percent in most of the world's poorest countries.

The global challenge is achieving sustainable food security.

SEE THE FEED CHANGE **FUTURE**

FOOD SECURITY is defined as having four main components: availability, access, utilization, and stability.

A family is considered food secure when its members do not live in hunger or fear of hunger.

Families and individuals require a reliable and consistent source of quality food, as well as sufficient resources to purchase it.

People must also have the knowledge and basic sanitary conditions to choose, prepare, and distribute food in a way that results in good nutrition for all family members.

Finally, the ability to access and utilize food must remain stable and sustained over time.

SEE THE FEED CHANGE **FUTURE**

Feed the Future renews our commitment to invest in sustainably reducing hunger and poverty.

Feed the Future is guided by five common principles:

- 1) Invest in country-owned plans that support results-based programs;*
- 2) Strengthen strategic coordination – globally, regionally, and locally;*
- 3) Ensure a comprehensive approach – advancing agriculture-led growth, reducing under-nutrition, and increasing impacts of humanitarian food assistance;*
- 4) Leverage the benefits of multilateral institutions; and*
- 5) Deliver on sustained and accountable commitments.*

These principles embrace the *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness* and the *Accra Agenda for Action*, and were endorsed unanimously as the *Rome Principles for Sustainable Food Security* by 193 countries at the 2009 World Summit on Food Security.

A Comprehensive Approach

Feed the Future pursues two paths:

- Addressing the root causes of hunger that limit the potential of millions of people; and
- Establishing a lasting foundation for change by aligning our resources with country-owned processes and sustained, multi-stakeholder partnerships.

Key Objectives

- **Inclusive Agriculture Sector Growth**
- **Improve Nutritional Status**

Cross cutting Priorities

- **Global Research and Innovation**
- **Gender**
- **Natural Resources/Climate Change**



Feed the Future Focus Countries

Region	Countries
Africa	Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia
Asia	Bangladesh, Cambodia, Nepal, Tajikistan
Latin America and the Caribbean	Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua

FTF Results Framework

- Donors and partner countries should set benchmarks and targets for investments and be held publicly accountable to them.
- Results Framework may be a resource for Focus Countries by:
 - illustrating the types of program components that contribute to reducing poverty and hunger; and
 - showing the casual linkages between varying levels of objectives and indicators.
- Collect and evaluate reliable information
 - learn from our experience; and
 - develop results that we can share with other development partners.

Feed the Future Goal: Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger

Indicators: *Prevalence of poverty & Prevalence of underweight children*

First Level Objective:
Inclusive agriculture sector growth

Indicators: -Agriculture sector GDP
- Women's and men's incomes in rural households

First Level Objective:
Improved nutritional status esp. of women & children

Indicators: -Prevalence of stunted children
-Prevalence of wasted children
-Prevalence of underweight women

Second-Level Objectives

Improved agriculture productivity

-Gross margins per unit of land or animal of selected product

Improved markets

-Percent change in value of intra-regional exports of targeted commodities
- Value of incremental sales (farm-/firm level)

Increased private investment in agriculture and nutrition-related activities

-Value of new private investment in agriculture sector or value chain

Increased agricultural value chain on- and off-farm jobs

-Jobs created by investment in agricultural value chains

Increased resilience of vulnerable communities and households

-Household Hunger Scale

Improved access to diverse and quality foods

-Dietary diversity for women and children

Improved nutrition-related behaviors

-Exclusive breastfeeding under six months

Improved use of maternal and child health and nutrition services

-Prevalence of maternal anemia

Second-Level Objective Indicators

Programs and policies to support agriculture sector growth

AVAILABILITY

Programs and policies to increase access to markets and facilitate trade

ACCESS

Programs and policies to reduce inequities

STABILITY

Programs and policies to support positive gains in nutrition

UTILIZATION

Definition of Food Security

Relevant IRs for the WLI

- The WLI activities mainly fall under First Level Objective 1: Inclusive Agriculture Sector Growth
- Relevant Intermediate Results are:
 - IR1: Improved Agriculture Productivity
 - IR2: Expanding Markets and Trade
 - IR4: Increased Employment Opportunities in Project-level Targeted Value Chains

Relevant Sub-IRs for the WLI

- Sub-IR1.1: Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity
- Sub-IR1.2: Enhanced technology development, dissemination, management and innovation
- Sub-IR1.3: Improved agriculture policy environment
- Sub-IR2.4: Improved access to business development and sound and affordable financial and risk management services

Types of Indicators

- **Output indicators:** Tangible and intended products or consequences of an activity
- **Outcome indicators:** The results of the products or consequences from the outputs
- **Impact indicators:** Medium to long-term effects produced by a project or program that change the development situation of a country

Core FTF Indicators for the WLI

IR1: “Improved Agriculture Productivity”

- Sub-IR1.1: Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (disaggregated by sex). Examples include:
 - Outcome indicator reported annually and collected by benchmark teams
 - Mechanical and physical: new land preparation, harvesting, processing
 - Biological: new varieties and breeds that are higher yielding, higher in nutrition content or more resilient to climate change
 - Chemical: fertilizers, insecticides and pesticides sustainably and environmentally applied
 - Management and cultural practices: sustainable water management, sustainable land management, management practices that increase climate change resilience
- What are the challenges to collecting this data?

Core FTF Indicators for the WLI

IR1: “Improved Agriculture Productivity”

- Sub-IR1.1: Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (disaggregated by sex). Examples include:
 - Output indicator reported annually and collected by benchmark teams and ICARDA
 - Includes farmers, ranchers, fishers and other producers
 - Training in best practices in productivity, post-harvest management, business management, linking to markets, etc.
 - Training on climate change risk, adaptation and mitigation
 - Training on food security, WRM, sustainable agriculture and climate change resilience
 - Training to extension specialists, researchers, policymakers and others

Core FTF Indicators for the WLI

IR1: “Improved Agriculture Productivity”

- Sub-IR1.1: Number of individuals who have received USG supported long-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (disaggregated by sex). Examples include:
 - Output indicator reported annually and collected by benchmark teams and ICARDA
 - Students from a bachelor’s, master’s or PhD program
 - Postdoctoral and fellowship programs included
 - Training on climate change risk, adaptation and mitigation
 - Training on food security, WRM, sustainable agriculture and climate change resilience
- Do the last two indicators get at some of the capacity building activities of the WLI? How would we better tell the WLI story?

Core FTF Indicators for the WLI

IR1: “Improved Agriculture Productivity”

- Sub-IR1.1: Number of stakeholders implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change as a result of USG assistance (disaggregated by sex).
 - Outcome indicator reported annually and collected by benchmark teams and ICARDA
 - Mitigate the effects of climate change by using appropriate new and tested management practices or implement measures that reduce the risks of climate change impacts
 - Examples could include:
 - Changing the exposure or sensitivity of crops (e.g. switching crops, using greenhouses, or changing the cropping calendar)
 - Soil management practices that reduce rainwater run-off and increase infiltration
 - Changing grazing practices
 - Applying new technologies like improved seeds and irrigation methods
 - Diversifying into different income-generating activities or into crops that are less susceptible to drought and greater climatic variability
- Could this data be readily gathered? What activities do you have that could be reported under this indicator?

Core FTF Indicators for the WLI

IR1: “Improved Agriculture Productivity”

- Sub-IR1.1: Number of food security private enterprises, producers’ organizations, fishing associations, water users’ associations, women’s groups, trade associations and CBOs receiving USG assistance. Examples include:
 - Output indicator reported annually and collected by benchmark teams and ICARDA
 - Tracks civil society capacity building
 - Includes support aimed at organization functions such as member services, storage, processing, management, marketing and accounting
- Most teams reported on this indicator, should we keep it?

Core FTF Indicators for the WLI

IR1: “Improved Agriculture Productivity”

- Sub-IR1.2: Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance.
Examples include:
 - Outcome indicator reported annually and collected by benchmark teams
 - Mechanical and physical: new land preparation, harvesting, processing
 - Biological: new varieties and breeds that are higher yielding, higher in nutrition content or more resilient to climate change
 - Chemical: fertilizers, insecticides and pesticides sustainably and environmentally applied
 - Management and cultural practices: sustainable water management, sustainable land management, management practices that increase climate change resilience, conservation agriculture
 - Postharvest handling
- Do teams believe they could accurately collect this data?

Core FTF Indicators for the WLI

IR1: “Improved Agriculture Productivity”

- Sub-IR1.2: Number of technologies or management practices in one of the following phases of development:
 - Under research
 - Under field testing
 - Made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance
- Output indicator reported annually and collected by benchmark teams and ICARDA
- Examples include: mechanical and physical, biological, chemical, management and cultural practices and postharvest handling advances
- What examples does your team have for this indicator?

Should We Consider These Indicators?

Under IR1 “Improved Agriculture Productivity”:

- Sub-IR1.2: Number of water resources sustainability assessments undertaken (outcome)
 - Environmental water requirements and sustainability of water use in the face of climate change
- Sub-IR1.3: Number of policies/regulations/administrative procedures analyzed (output)
 - Is this relevant to the WLI at this stage? (Oasis?)

Under IR2 “Expanding Markets and Trade”:

- Sub-IR2.4: Number of MSMEs receiving business development services from USG assisted sources (output)
 - Disaggregate by sex of owner, type of enterprise and size or enterprise
 - Could help with market access, input supply, technology and product development, training and technical assistance, finance, infrastructure and policy
- How many sites believe they could report on these indicators?

Should We Consider These Indicators?

Under IR4 “Increased Employment Opportunities”:

- Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation (outcome)
 - Is this relevant to the WLI at this stage or is it a future goal?
 - Jobs should be converted to full time equivalents
 - Disaggregated by sex

Missing from FTF:

- Number of people with access to safe and reliable drinking water (outcome)
 - Future goal?
 - Addresses the nutrition side of the FTF framework
- How many sites believe they could report on these indicators?

Sampling

- Sampling is the act, process or technique of selecting a representative part of a population for the purpose of determining parameters or characteristics of the whole population
- Methods of random sampling:
 - Simple random sampling: A group of people are selected at random from a complete list of a given population
 - Cluster sampling: By selecting geographic clusters of villages or HHs within a population time and \$\$\$ are saved
 - Random walk: Interviewers follow a random route and interview people
 - Panel or cohort surveys
- Must take care to not have bias
- Need to ensure the sample includes all groups

Establishing Baselines

- Baselines are the first set of data to be collected for performance monitoring and for impact evaluation
- It is difficult if not impossible to establish reasonable performance targets without some idea of the starting point
- Baselines are used to:
 - Establish the starting point for indicators
 - Reveal the nature, magnitude and severity of a situation
 - Ascertain appropriate amounts of intervention required
 - Determine targets

WLI Baselines

- Teams have done an excellent job of obtaining baselines to help future impact evaluations
- Indicators that could be collected during an impact evaluation using WLI data and baselines (note, these are NOT collected annually):
 - Prevalence of poverty: percent of people living on less than \$1.25/day
 - Percent change in agricultural GDP
 - Gross margin per unit of land, kilogram, or animal of selected product (dollars/hectare or dollars/animal)
 - Number of policies/regulations/administrative procedures approved
 - Per capita expenditures (proxy for income)
- Do teams feel they could chart this type of data for previous years? Is it available? What are the historical trends?

Does FTF Fully Capture the WLI?

- How does the WLI differ from FTF?
- Should WLI be working more to capture the nutrition components of FTF?
- Are there other indicators you believe better capture your work?
 - FTF indicators are not the be all and end all. Your narratives and site-specific indicators are key to telling the story of the WLI.

WLI Indicators

- Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance
- Number of individuals who have received USG short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training
- Number of stakeholders implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change
- Number of food security private enterprises, producers' organizations, fishing associations, water users' associations, women's groups, trade associations and CBOs receiving USG assistance.
- Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance.
- Number of technologies or management practices in one of the following phases of development:
 - Under research
 - Under field testing
 - Made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance

Questions?

- Sarah Tully: stully@usaid.gov
- Scott Christiansen: schristiansen@usaid.gov