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ORIGINS OF FEED THE FUTURE

• Food price spike of 2007-08

• G8 L’Aquila Food Security Initiative

• US pledge of $3.5 billion in aid to agriculture
PROGRAM APPROACH

• Quantum break from traditional US ag assistance
  • Traditional emphasis on monetized in-kind food aid

• Ownership
  • Paris Principles of Aid Effectiveness (2005)
  • Country Investment and Implementation Plans

• Inclusivity
  • Inclusive Agriculture Sector Growth
  • Women’s Empowerment
  • Broad partnerships and participation

• Sustainable results
OXFAM ASSESSMENT

• Examined FtF in five countries
  • Ethiopia
  • Ghana
  • Haiti
  • Senegal
  • Tanzania

• Qualitative research methods
  • Aimed at understanding process
  • 125 key informant interviews
  • 69 focus group interviews with male and female farmers

• Funded by Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Data collection period</th>
<th>Focus of intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Sept 2013 – Jan 2014</td>
<td>Wheat, teff, livestock value chains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>June/July, September 2014</td>
<td>Rice &amp; horticulture value chains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>March, June-July, 2013</td>
<td>Natural resource management; improved productivity of domestic food and export crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rice, maize, beans, plantains, mangoes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>April/May, July 2012</td>
<td>Climate change adaptation; natural resource management; productivity; access to markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>February/March, May-early July 2013</td>
<td>Rice, maize, horticulture crops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OWNERSHIP

• Alignment with national agricultural plans
  • Use of country systems
  • Donor coordination

• Interactions and stakeholders involved
  • Stakeholder engagement in program design
  • Beneficiary engagement in implementation
INCLUSIVITY

• The food security model

• Beneficiaries

• Gender equity and women’s empowerment
FINDINGS
USE OF COUNTRY SYSTEMS

• All study countries have medium-term agricultural development plans
• Ethiopia, Ghana, & Tanzania have donor coordination platforms for agriculture
• FtF heavily project oriented
  • Can undercut national strategic plans
  • Little direct budget support provided to local institutions or development agents
INTERACTIONS & STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED

• Prior consultation pre-implementation
  • Mostly at national level
  • Mainly engaged government officials
  • Heavy emphasis on process
  • Very time consuming
  • Little engagement of local officials
  • No involvement of farmers and beneficiaries

• Farmer involvement only at implementation
  • Put choices from pre-cooked menu into place
  • Not seen as partners in strategic priority setting
  • Does not mean projects do not meet needs
  • Many low-income farmers welcome any support
FOOD SECURITY MODEL

• Increased production in high-potential areas
  • Ethiopia: little focus on pastoral or resource-poor areas
  • Haiti: Artibonite Valley (rice bowl)

• Areas with high numbers of poor and hungry people not targeted

• Ghana the exception
  • Focused on more marginal areas and poorer farmers

• Market-oriented approach
  • Targets potential commercial farmers
  • “See agriculture as a business, not a social activity”

• Key goal: reduce consumer prices
BENEFICIARIES

• All farmers in project villages invited to participate
• No minimum land holding or level of education
  • In Haiti, “master farmer” candidates must be literate
• Participation via groups
  • New or existing farmer associations
  • New or existing cooperatives
• Training in marketable skills
  • Tractor operators
  • Veterinary technicians
• Lack of access to credit major constraint on participation
  • Poorer farmers cannot afford purchased inputs
PRODUCTIVITY GAINS

- Increased productivity in all study countries
- Mix of high-external input & agroecological approaches
  - Conservation farming
  - Agroforestry
  - Systems of Crop Intensification
- High-input the default
- Questions of sustainability
  - Do gains continue in the absence of FtF resources?
  - Does high-external input agriculture contribute to already substantial natural resource degradation?
EMPOWERING WOMEN?

• Significant number of women beneficiaries in all study countries
• Women have less access to land & credit than men
• Haiti: most training resources (73%) to men
• FtF did not reduce women’s workloads
• USAID-supported tools on women’s empowerment do not appear to drive program
  • Gender research
  • WEAI
  • Contrast with Bangladesh
CONCLUSIONS

• Ownership
  • FtF generally well-aligned with national plans
  • Limited stakeholder participation in program design
  • Northern NGOs or consulting firms generally lead implementation
  • Projectized approach does not build institutional capacity

• Inclusivity
  • Focus on sustainable intensification in high potential areas tends to be exclusionary
  • Main food-security pathway is indirect
RECOMMENDATIONS

• Broaden stakeholder engagement in all phases of program, including design, implementation, & evaluation
  • Can enhance sustainability of results
  • Treat farmer groups as active citizens, not just program implementers
• Greater focus on less-favored areas and more marginalized farmers for direct impact on poverty and hunger
• Improve access to credit to increase inclusivity
• Better integrate gender empowerment tools like WEAI into programming
• Provide direct budget support to local institutions