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Overview

This report describes the main activities and outputs of the Future Agriculture Consortium (FAC) under the theme of Growth and Social Protection for Phase I. Core work on the theme has involved the development of a conceptual framework setting out potential and evolving synergies and conflicts between social protection and agricultural growth in the livelihoods of poor and vulnerable people, in local and national economies, and in policy formulation and implementation. Publication and discussion of the framework has led to its uptake outside the FAC and in the country theme work. In Ethiopia and Malawi this has engaged strongly with evaluations and national and donor policy reviews of innovative and major national social protection and/or agricultural growth policies.

Such engagement has, necessarily, followed the national rather than FAC timetable, and hence theme work in these two countries has not reached the planned September completion; this is a price worth paying for the opportunities to learn from and contribute to these major national programmes, which have continent-wide relevance. In Kenya, theme work has explored, with national stakeholders, the multiple and often uncoordinated social protection interventions of different players, as well as their actual and potential interactions with agricultural development. This work has generated considerable interest and provides a platform for rethinking and improving policies and interventions.

Work on this theme has achieved considerable leverage through its integration with non-FAC work being conducted by FAC-members and by stimulating interest in the theme by other players. There are also strong cross-theme linkages through work on the policy processes of social protection and agricultural policy development, and through recognition of the importance of labour markets and on- and off-farm diversification in social protection/agriculture livelihood linkages.

Further work in the remainder of Phase I will involve writing up and reporting the work in Ethiopia and Malawi, and synthesis of this with other work being conducted by consortium members, with particular emphasis on cross-country lesson-learning.

Theme objectives

The objectives of the theme work is to examine the trade-offs and complementarities between growth and social protection policies, instruments and impacts.

Achievements

Core activities

In the initial phase of work on this theme an approach was developed to thinking about the relationships between agriculture, growth and social protection. This identified an important set of principles for policy which allows for positive interactions between growth-oriented and social protection-oriented objectives. A number of issues were identified including:

• the types of instruments (e.g. cash, food, inputs, or vouchers);
• their objectives (provision, prevention, promotion or transformation);
• their timing (with regard to seasonal agricultural activities and food and cash flows);
• their scale (as both the size and number of transfers have important threshold and multiplier effects, which affect social protection and agricultural outcomes in livelihoods and economies);
• their targeting and conditionality (which often result in unintended effects);
• their stability and reliability (as peoples’ trust in programmes critically affects promotional and transformational benefits);
• their costs; and
• the political economy of local, national and international relations (as both social protection and agricultural policies are highly political and often contested). More general relationships between social protection and agricultural development policies were also identified. This work has generated considerable interest and has been taken up in different ways in both ‘central’ and country work within the FAC.

In terms of core theme activities, the initial theme paper has been developed in two ways. First, a pair of short briefing papers were prepared and published on the FAC website. Second, the paper has been significantly revised, following comments from colleagues within and beyond the FAC, and submitted to the journal Development and Change; it is currently under review.

Andrew Dorward, Colin Poulton and Peter Hazell have drafted a paper on ‘Rethinking Agricultural Input Subsidies in Poor Rural Economies’ which draws on core theme work and experience from the Malawi theme work.

Thinking from the paper was the basis for discussion with FAC colleagues John Farrington and Rachel Slater from ODI in their work on social protection and agriculture.

FAO have now requested Stephen Devereux, Rachel Sabates-Wheeler, Andrew Dorward and Colin Poulton to prepare a paper and conduct a workshop in Rome in early 2008, to build on the conceptual framework developed in the theme paper. The objectives of this further work will be to document in more detail the field and policy interactions (both positive and negative) experienced in three case study countries (Ghana, Ethiopia and Malawi) in order to provide FAO with a clear framework and examples of ways to promote positive interactions between social protection and agricultural policies.

Ethiopia

Most FAC activities under the social protection theme in Ethiopia have, to date, been activities relating to the Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP), which is the main social protection programme ongoing in Ethiopia. Since there has been a very large amount of directly commissioned FAC work in relation to the regional consultations on the PSNP and the Commercialisations theme, Social Protection theme activity has been more indirect, a by-product of other engagement in influencing social protection policy and practice in Ethiopia by FAC team-members. Because of the PSNP ‘juggernaut’, FAC influence has been through contributing to this intervention, rather than leading on the agenda, but FAC
can claim that its influence has been significant, in the following ways:

1. Several FAC-members were involved in the evaluation of the first year of the PSNP. Kay Sharp and Amdissa Teshome were co-authors of the PSNP targeting study, while Stephen Devereux and Rachel Sabates-Wheeler were co-authors of the PSNP impacts survey.

2. Two FAC-members were involved in advisory work on extending the PSNP to the lowland (pastoral) areas of Ethiopia. Amdissa Teshome and Stephen Devereux were co-authors of both reports, on designing and piloting the ‘Pastoral PSNP’; Teshome took responsibility for Afar Region and Devereux took the lead on Somali Region.

3. Stephen Devereux provided comments on an IFPRI proposal to benchmark ‘graduation’ from the PSNP.

4. Amdissa Teshome, Stephen Devereux, Rachel Sabates-Wheeler and Kay Sharp will be engaged in a follow-up to the PSNP targeting and impacts surveys, scheduled for October–November 2007, which is planned to be Year 2 of an annual PSNP panel survey for the five-year duration of the PSNP, and opens up potential space for further influencing the evolution of social protection policy in Ethiopia.

5. In September-December 2007, Amdissa Teshome will be undertaking Institutional Capacity Assessment in Somali Region as part of the piloting of pastoral PSNP.

6. Amdissa Teshome has been involved in the CANGO/TANGO Community Self-Resilience study, which drew on methodological approaches devised for the FAC regional consultations.

The FAC Ethiopia team has not held a national workshop, partly because the policy space for doing this in Ethiopia is rather limited, and partly because the major opportunity to influence social protection policy in Ethiopia during this period has been through the advisory activities described above, and by making presentations at several national and regional workshops relating to the PSNP.

At the National Conference on Future Agricultures in Addis Ababa in June 2007, which was organised by the FAC Ethiopia Country Team in collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, a Future Agricultures National Working Group was established, and recommended taking forward work on the Social Protection theme. The Ethiopia Country Team has since held discussions with the State Minister for Labour and Social Affairs and the Head of Department in the Social Security Agency, in an effort to identify entry points for influencing social protection policy debates more broadly than through the PSNP.

Kenya

About 30 per cent of Kenya’s 34–35 million people are regularly food insecure. About 46 per cent of the population lives on less than one dollar per day (the poverty line). Therefore, food insecurity and various forms of deprivation are widespread in the country. In response to this, a large number of different agencies are involved in social protection activities in Kenya and there is concern that social protection programmes may actually be either competing or conflicting with or duplicating the efforts of others. The focus of the FAC work was to delve into the range of social protection activities of different actors and assess the extent of competition or conflict. This was done by holding discussions with key informants and representatives of different organisations that are engaged in social protection work.

Findings show that there are many organisations engaged in diverse social protection activities. These activities are concentrated in reducing vulnerability or human suffering in five major spheres, namely (i) hunger and extreme poverty, (ii) child education, (iii) disease (e.g., HIV/AIDS) or human health, (iv) shelter (e.g., children homes), and (v) human settlement in various forms (land tenure and its inequitable distribution are very emotional issues in Kenya). There are basically three levels of interventions through (i) policy reforms, (ii) financing/investment efforts and (iii) programme implementation.

Despite the diversity of activities, further discussions showed that (i) there are overlaps and duplications of effort, especially at programme implementation level, (ii) pilferage and leakages of aid occur (both cash and materials, including food), (iii) there are huge variations in seasonality and effects on food insecurity, and (iv) there is limited monitoring of programme activities.

This highlights the importance of coordination mechanisms in relation to social protection policy responses (or the lack of them). Focal areas for further work include responses to both chronic and emergency (drought-related) food insecurity and information flows during bad seasons. The FAC work provides an overview of these issues and feeds its findings into the current drafting of a new National Food and Nutrition Policy (NFNP). John Omiti and his KIPPRA colleagues attended several meetings to discuss the draft policy in the course of 2006–2007. The NFNP process is nearing completion.

A presentation of FAC findings was made to a national consultative workshop in Nairobi. Participants were drawn from public agencies, non-governmental organisations and donors. A workshop report and a final background paper were submitted before September 2007. John Omiti produced a paper on social protection and agriculture and then facilitated three in-country workshops with the FAC/SP budget. He has produced a report of these workshops. He has re-structured the technical background paper in line with the FAC social protection and growth theme paper. This paper has generated considerable interest amongst researchers, policy makers and planners. There is growing demand for action-oriented research in the area of social protection, particularly to respond to food insecurity, seasonality and their budgetary or investment implications.

As a result of the workshop, it became clear that the government of Kenya does not have a comprehensive policy on social protection although programme-related work has been going on in different government departments and ministries. It was noted that social protection policy is a doorway into shaping a core of social policy that responds to the reality of poverty and vulnerability as voiced by people themselves and from human rights and social justice perspectives. However, there is a need to properly demarcate the boundaries between social protection and poverty reduction strategies or development activities in order to prioritize and implement social
protection programmes. Issues of sustainability of social protection programmes should also be dealt with.

The social protection work thus has a strong interface with FAC Policy Process and Commercialisations work in Kenya and also with ongoing and imminent detailed evaluation work. There is also considerable potential for linking these themes and activities with the very active evaluation work being undertaken by FAC-members as part of other activities in Ethiopia and Malawi.

Possible ways of taking Kenya work forward, with maximum policy relevance and impact, include:

1. Testing the analytical framework linking social protection and growth under a range of plausible scenarios. It would be useful to debate the critical success factors under a range of programming settings. Low-hanging fruits include action-oriented research on input subsidies, public works programmes (cash transfers, food aid or labour) or a mix of both.

2. Linking seasonality and agricultural production. For eastern Africa, agriculture is largely rain-fed and is often bimodal. This implies many farming decisions are related to perceptions and actual patterns of weather regimes, as are social protection programmes.

Malawi

The FAC has been able to make a significant contribution to social protection and agriculture policy evaluation and debates in Malawi by adding its Malawi social protection budget to funding from DFID Malawi and USAID for a major evaluation of the 2006/7 Malawi Agricultural Inputs Subsidy Programme (AISP). A team led and dominated by FAC-members (Dorward, Chirwa, Kydd, Poulton and Slater) submitted the winning proposal. The FAC budget contribution has allowed the evaluation to increase the professional time allocated to the study and the scope of focus group discussions conducted in the study, and also has provided the FAC with a unique opportunity to engage with government and donor policy makers. This work also complements other World Bank funded work conducted by Rachel Slater and Maxton Tsoka. An initial report on the implementation of the 2006/7 programme, with a summary of the 2005/6 programme, was very well received by the government, donors and other stakeholders, and has been highly influential in changes to the design of the programme for 2007/8.

A major workshop is planned in Malawi for November 2007, with presentation of the results of a household survey conducted as part of the study. This will include explicit consideration of the social protection–agricultural policy linkages in the input subsidy programme, and will represent the FAC Malawi theme workshop. Although this is later than planned under the FAC programme, this timing fits in with the policy debates in Malawi, and is strongly demand-led.

Work presented in the interim report has already moved forward debates about agriculture–social protection policy interactions. It argued that the subsidy programme in Malawi has had major and cost-effective social protection benefits, through its impact on low and secure maize prices and maize access, while at the same time raising productivity of poor people's key resources (land and labour). It also pointed out, however, that there are significant risks and gaps in current policies, relating to the risks and effects of bad weather and maize price policies, and there is room and need for improvement in both policy scope and implementation. Presentations along these lines have been made to government-, donor-, and civil society representatives in Malawi and led to lively debate at the DFID livelihood, environment and infrastructure advisers' retreat in July 2007. These issues will be further explored in analysis that is currently under way using household data that was collected in June 2007, which will be presented in workshops and reports from November 2007.

The AISP report has also contributed to work by the Regional Hunger and Vulnerability Programme to improve the ability of southern African countries to anticipate food crises, and to act on vulnerability and food insecurity information with respect to both the improved short-term response to shocks and to the long-term promotion of policies that could help to reduce vulnerability in the future.

Based on experience over the last two years, the Malawi AISP is now being cited in some circles as a major success as part of an African Green Revolution. The in-depth analysis being done by the FAC team on the programme's livelihood, market, economic, social protection and poverty reduction impacts, effectiveness and efficiency will have a major impact on continent-wide debates about the potential and requirements for an African Green Revolution, involving CAADP and major private donors as well as IFIs, bilateral donors, and African governments. Ephraim Chirwa and Andrew Dorward have been requested by the Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System for Southern Africa (ReSAAKS-SA) to write a briefing paper on the Malawi AISP and any wider lessons that may be drawn from it.

The formal evaluation of the AISP has been complemented by an analysis of the processes, politics and challenges of social protection policy in Malawi, prepared by Blessings Chinsinga.

Another area where FAC-members have been able to contribute to policy analysis and debates on social protection in Malawi has been through an externally funded evaluation of a cash transfer project conducted by Wadonda Consult.

Cross-theme linkages

All the case studies presented at the WDR workshop on Policy processes at IDS-Sussex highlighted the interactions between policy process and social protection. Blessings Chinsinga has written a paper on social protection policy process in Malawi. The analysis in Malawi has also stressed the importance of linkages between social protection and agricultural and non-agricultural diversification and labour markets, key themes being addressed in the Commercialisations theme. Future work will bring these topics together more closely to deepen the coherence of the research findings and contextualize the different recommendations from different themes.

Complementary work

An important aspect of FAC work is its leverage of and engagement with other work. As noted earlier above,
‘core’ FAC activities in this theme linked up early on with ODI work on agriculture and social protection and latterly the research department at FAO have contracted Rachel Sabates-Wheeler, Andrew Dorward, Colin Poulton and Stephen Devereux to conduct some follow-up work to their FAC Social Protection and Agriculture paper. FAO was sufficiently impressed with the paper that they want FAC to look at concrete cases of growth linkages in social protection and agriculture, provide recommendations and run a workshop for them in January 2008. This is a clear spin-off from our FAC work and has implications for influencing donors and governments on social protection and growth.

IDS is also involved with some research for DFID that investigates how policy influencing occurs around social protection (specifically social transfers). The overall objective of this research is to learn lessons about more/less successful strategies for influencing policy change and implementation approaches. Malawi and Ethiopia were chosen as the two case country studies. A report is available.


In Ethiopia FAC team-members are playing a major role in the PSNP evaluation, as described above. Similarly, in Malawi, FAC team-members’ leadership of the AISP evaluation has provided significant leverage for FAC inputs into national and donor policy thinking, but also the opportunity to take lessons from Malawi and apply them to wider debates.

In Kenya, complementary work by one of the FAC partners (KIPPRA) on food security in the Nile Basin countries (Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda), with funding from the World Bank, offers opportunities to link emerging research findings with the requisite policy and investment proposals. Building on the interest generated by the country-level background paper on social protection and agricultural growth, and consequent interest among researchers, policy makers and planners for action-oriented research, the recently developed National Food and Nutrition Policy provides another avenue to support the range of arguments around social protection theme in the country.

**Key outputs and events**

**Written outputs**


**Presentations**


and social protection. Existing datasets from ongoing processes and impacts in the country studies. These will feed into country and theme papers for the FAC Nairobi workshop in February.

Opportunities will also be sought to promote cross-country learning and exchange. There is considerable interest in other countries in the Ethiopian and Malawian experiences with PSNP and agricultural input subsidies respectively. Comparisons of the different objectives, contexts, strengths and weaknesses of these two programmes will be particularly valuable. Visits between consortium members in these two countries and Kenya may be particularly fruitful, and opportunities will be sought to promote such visits subject to policy makers’ interests in learning from and sharing experiences. The Kenya government is also intending to launch a national accelerated input project (NAIP) to facilitate greater input usage for different enterprises in various regions of the country. Initially, it is thought to involve fertilisers, seed and agro-chemicals. This and the Kick Hunger Out of Kenya (Njaa Marufuku Kenya) project, funded by FAO, offer opportunities to examine design, targeting and implementation issues, as well as demand for cross-country learning and exchange.

FAC initiatives should engage with regional efforts such as CAADP as they strive to promote country strategies and investment programmes, facilitate greater re-alignment and harmonisation of development efforts, and encourage regional peer monitoring and review. John Omiti and colleagues are involved in the review of the CAADP process in Kenya, and Ephraim Chirwa and Andrew Dorward are involved with ReSAAKS in Malawi.

Future Directions: FAC Phase II

In the next phase, we will continue to develop and test, in different contexts, the framework developed in the first phase. The first element of this work will be a programme around the identification of synergies between welfare-promoting and growth-promoting social protection and agricultural policies. This work will involve empirical analysis on comparative programme costs, where this is feasible. The research agenda will develop a methodology for comparing the costs and effectiveness of different growth and social protection strategies and instruments in different contexts in order to identify combinations of instruments that can best promote both agricultural and non-agricultural growth and social protection. Existing datasets from ongoing engagements in Ethiopia, Kenya and Malawi will be used to evaluate different options for different settings. Key policy messages on the role of the ‘social protection through agriculture’ approach will be developed and discussed with key stakeholders in a series of country-level workshops, culminating in an Africa-wide event in 2010.

The second element of this work area will be on changing patterns of agricultural seasonality and how this impinges on livelihoods through
impacts on agricultural production and different forms of vulnerability in Africa. The pattern of seasonality is a key context for any growth or social protection policy option. Seasonality is responsible for a great deal of food insecurity, especially in smallholder households that strive for food self-sufficiency but face annual production deficits. In the past, African governments responded to seasonality by implementing a range of measures that today would be labelled as ‘productive safety nets’ or ‘social protection’. These included fertiliser subsidies, ‘strategic grain reserves’ to smooth food supplies and prices across seasons, and pan-territorial and pan-seasonal food prices. Most of these subsidies and ‘open market operations’ were abolished under agricultural liberalisation reforms in the 1980s and 1990s. Millions of rural Africans were once again exposed to production deficits, market failures and the annual household-level food crisis that inevitably follows depleted granaries and escalating food prices, and current social protection policies generally address symptoms rather than fundamental causes of seasonality problems.

Work on seasonality will address the key question of how patterns of seasonality have changed for the rural poor, and how this has affected both patterns and potentials of production and growth on one hand and vulnerability and social protection on the other – and, critically, the dynamic interactions between them. This strand of work will involve an analysis of the relationship between agricultural seasonality and ongoing or planned social protection interventions in all FAC countries, as well as a major workshop with the provisional title ‘Seasonality Re-revisited’. Recent datasets from Malawi, Ethiopia and Kenya will be used to investigate the relationships between seasonality, vulnerability and food security and the implications these have for agricultural growth and social protection.
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