

U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Policy Analysis and Capacity (PAC)

Annual Program Statement (APS)

Mechanism Number: 7200AA19APS00003

Issuance Date: February 27, 2019

Closing Date: February 26, 2020

CFDA # and Title: 98.001, USAID Foreign Assistance for Programs Overseas

Pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, the United States Government, as represented by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), Bureau for Food Security, invites Applications for the Policy Analysis and Capacity (PAC) program.

The purpose of this Annual Program Statement (APS) is to disseminate information to prospective Applicants so they may develop and submit subsequent Applications for USAID funding under addenda to this APS. This APS: (A) describes the types of activities for which Applications will be considered; (B) describes the funding available and the process and requirements for submitting Applications; (C) explains the criteria for evaluating Applications; and (D) refers prospective Applicants to relevant documentation available on the internet.

USAID/BFS/Policy Division (POL) anticipates multiple grants and/or cooperative agreements as a result of this APS. However, publishing this APS does not commit USAID to make any awards.

The PAC APS is not a Request for Applications (RFA) or a Request for Proposals (RFP). Rather, the PAC APS requests PAC Concept Notes in response to addenda to this APS as those addenda are published. Based on those Concept Notes, USAID will determine whether to request a full Application from an appropriate partner. To be competitive under a particular addendum to this APS, Applications must be fully responsive to all directions under this APS document except when specifically noted otherwise in the addendum.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
List of Acronyms	3
List of Figures	4
Introduction: The BFS Policy Division at USAID	5
The Policy Division Objective	5
Lessons Learned	5
Development Hypothesis	6
PAC APS Funding Priorities and Programmatic Focus	7
Desired Program Outcomes and Impact	8
System Outcome: Stronger Policy Systems	8
Subsystem Outcome: Strengthened Policy Institutional Architecture	9
Subsystem Outcome: Strengthened Country Policy Agendas	10
Subsystem Outcome: Strengthened Mutual Accountability	10
Subsystem Outcome: More Powerful Foresighting	11
Funding Opportunities	11
Co-Creation, Collaboration and Communication under the PAC APS	12
Application & Award Process	13
Responding to Addenda	13
Review of Interested Applicant Responses	14
Review of Full Applications	15
Request for Additional Information	15
AO Determination	16
Final Review and Negotiation	16
Award and Implementation	16
Award Information	16
Eligibility Information	16

Standard Clauses and Provisions of Award	17
Information Protection	17
Principles for APS Evaluation	18
Other Full Application Parameters	20
Points of Contact	21
Additional Information on Award Administration	21
Annex 1. Illustrative Examples of Policies by Thematic Area	22
Nutrition Policy	22
Enabling Environment	22
Markets & Trade	22
Institutional Architecture	22
Land and Resource Tenure and Rights	22
Agricultural Risk Management and Resilience Policy	23
Agricultural Inputs	24
Annex 2: Gender Analysis Statement	24
Annex 3: Initial Environmental Examination	26
Annex 4: Gender Issues in Agriculture and Food Security Policy Development and Implementation Relevant to APS applicants	28

List of Acronyms

ADS	Automated Directive Services
AO	Agreement Officer
APS	Annual Program Statement
ARP	Office of Agricultural Research and Policy (BFS/ARP)
BFS	Bureau for Food Security
GFSS	Global Food Security Strategy
GFSR	Global Food Security Reauthorization
IP	Implementing Partner
M/B/IO	Missions, Bureaus and Independent Offices
PAC	Policy Analysis and Capacity
POL	Policy Division (BFS/ARP/Policy)
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development

List of Figures

Figure 1: Policy Analysis and Capacity Results Framework

7

Introduction: The BFS Policy Division at USAID

USAID is an independent federal government agency that receives overall foreign policy guidance from the United States Secretary of State. USAID supports international development and advances U.S. foreign policy objectives by supporting improved economic growth, food security, global health, democracy and governance, and addressing environmental and global climate change issues as well as providing humanitarian assistance in Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia and the Middle East, Latin America and the Caribbean, Europe and Eurasia. The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and its partners have been working to tackle the world's toughest development challenges for more than 50 years.

USAID via the Bureau for Food Security (BFS) also leads the United States Government's Feed the Future efforts. Feed the Future is the United States Government's global hunger and food security initiative. USAID supports research and capacity development programs in Feed the Future countries and supports country-driven approaches to address the root causes of hunger and poverty and forge long-term solutions to chronic food insecurity and undernutrition. Through Feed the Future, the U.S. Government is renewing its commitment to inclusive and sustainable agricultural-led economic growth; strengthened resilience among people and systems; and a well-nourished population, especially among women. In Feed the Future countries, the toughest current challenges to Feed the Future goals are weak policy systems and institutions.

The Policy Division Objective

The BFS Policy Division (POL) objective is *improved national, regional, and global policies that enable the transformation of food systems.*

POL has primary responsibility for the BFS agenda of strengthening policy systems in Feed the Future countries in order to accelerate inclusive agricultural growth and structural transformation that catalyzes and contributes to Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS), Global Food Security Reauthorization (GFSR), BFS, and Agency goals, including poverty reduction, improved food security, better nutritional outcomes, strengthened resilience, and increased water security. Policy is defined to be the set of legislative, executive and judiciary rules, regulations, statutes, etc. that govern the agricultural and food system, including the formulation and implementation of policy (Inter-Agency Policy Guide, 2013); the policy system also includes the social constructs and institutions related to the formulation and implementation of policy. This document refers to the collective set of agricultural and food policies and policy system covered under the GFSR, Agency Journey to Self-Reliance, and other authorizations as GFSR policy or GFSR policy system.

Lessons Learned

Experience and lessons learned from six years of Feed the Future implementation have demonstrated that significant progress towards BFS top-line goals and the Agency Journey to Self-Reliance agenda depend on good policies, public and private institutions with capacity and

resources to implement those policies, and accountability for strengthening policy systems to respond to opportunities and challenges.

Effective governance, policies and institutions can catalyze and accelerate the food and agriculture systems transformation required to reach our goal of sustainably reducing global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty. They are crucial in ensuring that countries invest strategically in their own development, strengthening the private sector enabling environment, and building evidence-based participatory processes that will advance inclusive and sustainable agriculture-led growth, resilience, and nutrition (U.S. Government Global Food Security Strategy, FY 2017-2021. September 2016, p. 29.)

Development Hypothesis

The BFS development hypothesis is that stronger policy systems catalyze agricultural and food systems transformation contributing to GFSR top-line goals of accelerated agricultural growth, better nutritional outcomes, improved food security, greater resilience, and better water security. The development hypothesis embodies the following results chains:

- Direct Policy Impacts:
 - Improved policy systems contain **improved growth, resilience, nutrition, and water policy.**
 - **Better growth, resilience, nutrition, and water policy** contribute directly to the associated GFSR top-line goals.
- Via inclusive growth processes:
 - Stronger institutional architectures, stronger mutual accountability processes, and more robust policy agendas contribute to stronger agricultural and food policy systems.
 - Stronger policy systems contribute to accelerating inclusive agricultural growth and transformation.
 - Inclusive agricultural growth and transformation contributes directly to **poverty reduction, improved nutritional outcomes, resilience, and water security.**
- Via improved investment efficiency
 - Strengthened policy enabling environments and improved agricultural growth, nutrition, resilience and water policies make public, private and civil society investment and action more efficient, more productive, and better aligned with societal goals.
 - More efficient and better aligned public and private and civil society investments and actions contribute to GFSR top-line goals, specifically **accelerated growth, improved resilience, better nutritional outcomes, and strengthened water security;**
 - More effective public, private and civil society investment and action strengthens **country self-reliance.**
- Via foresighting
 - Foresighting of opportunities contributes to more effective change in agricultural and food systems, both directly influencing top-line goals and contributing to more effective non-policy investment and programming.

- Foresighting of challenges contributes to greater sustainability of top-line achievements, including **sustained achievement of growth, resilience, nutrition and water objectives**, which are GFSR goals and also contribute to **country self-reliance**.

This APS will serve as a critical mechanism through which BFS will support improved development outcomes. Taking a country-owned, systems approach the work conducted under this APS will both contribute to policy work and bureau priorities, GFSR top-line goals, and to country self-reliance consistent with the broader Agency Journey to Self-Reliance agenda.




Figure 1: Policy Analysis and Capacity Results Framework

PAC APS Funding Priorities and Programmatic Focus

When USAID intends to support a variety of creative approaches towards developing methodologies to assess and implement development objective activities, the Agency may use an Annual Program Statement (APS) to generate competition for these awards. When used, USAID will publish an APS at least once a year, either with an open-ended response time or a closing date of at least six months after issuance. More specifically, the PAC APS is designed to provide a vehicle for USAID to engage with a wide variety of implementing partners broadly and creatively, across the spectrum of possible support for strengthening agricultural and food systems including but not limited to support for agricultural and food system growth, resilience, nutrition, and water sub-systems, through strengthened policy systems. Additionally, by encouraging implementing partners (IPs) to engage civil communities and the private sector

broadly across POL programmatic emphases, the PAC APS seeks to provide broad flexibility for IPs to collaborate with USAID, each other, and local institutions (including the private sector, government, and civil society organizations) to build local, regional and global partnerships around key development challenges.

BFS anticipates that ultimately the APS will contribute to GFSR, Bureau and Agency mission and objectives through successful achievement of outcomes specified in desired program outcomes and impact.

Desired Program Outcomes and Impact

System Outcome: Stronger Policy Systems

A stronger GFSR policy system is one composed of citizens, organizations, institutions and processes that is better able to support the broader agricultural and food system to contribute to sectoral and societal goals. It is a policy system that is more self-aware and self-reliant, i.e. with a greater ability to recognize and define strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities within the broad agricultural and food system and the GFSR policy system; to define appropriate actions to leverage strengths, to strengthen weak areas; and to approach opportunities proactively.

An illustrative but not inclusive list of characteristics of a strong policy system includes:

- It is based on partnership among government, civil society and the private sector;
- It is representative across the political economy and geographically of all stakeholders' concerns and grievances;
- It results in predictable policy decisions;
- It makes rapid progress in formulating and implementing priority policies;
- It is flexible and agile in responding to emerging opportunities and challenges;
- It is evidence-based, inclusive, transparent, and accountable;
- It creates a policy environment that encourages private sector investment in the agricultural and food system; and
- It not only formulates and enforces policy but co-creates strategies and implementation plans that include sufficient budgeting to achieve policy objectives.

The BFS vision is that strengthened policy systems will in turn strengthen agricultural and food systems to significantly accelerate inclusive agricultural growth, and catalyze key sector outcomes. Through improved policy systems, sufficient resources are mobilized from public and private domestic and foreign sources to effect change in agricultural and food systems to achieve sector targets for contributions to inclusive growth, resilience, improved nutrition, food and water security, and the elimination of extreme poverty.

Key intermediate outcomes include but are not limited to:

- Governments work with civil society and the private sector to unlock the potential of agriculture and food systems;

- Rural economies support a multiplicity of income opportunities for individuals, households, and communities -- especially women and youth, people with disabilities, indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities, and other marginalized groups;
- Agriculture focuses on profitable and efficient use of rural resources including land, forests, water, and rural human capital to enable rural and urban food systems to provide better, more accessible, and more affordable nutritious diets, and contribute to broader societal goals; and
- The largest risks to smallholders – agricultural production risks; (lack of) access, stability and affordability of staple foods; political risk; and market risk; – have been remediated.

Strategically, we have learned that these outcomes and impact will be best achieved in the context of the [GFSS](#) goal of strengthening country ownership (per the [Rome Principles](#)) and the Agency goal of strengthening country [self-reliance](#). In each case, ‘country’ is defined much more broadly than government, including the multiple stakeholders involved in development processes and affected by development outcomes. Thus USAID expects that implementing partners receiving funding as a result of PAC APS addenda will partner with other development actors and stakeholders to build local policy analytic, formulation and implementation capacity. This could involve direct support to local researchers, institutions, agencies, or regional associations. This may also involve working with USAID Missions to identify local potential, help unlock local resources (i.e. from host country governments, civil society, or the private sector), or foster partnerships across regions (including other developed and developing countries). USAID is especially interested in potential collaboration with civil society and the private sector to ascertain problems and issues that warrant attention, mobilize and apply civil society and private sector expertise, capabilities and resources for evidence-based policy analysis and advocacy, and build robust and inclusive development cooperation among stakeholder groups. Implementing partners are expected to engage with local communities and policy processes, which could entail engaging with policy analysts, policy-makers, and interested stakeholders early on to help define the development challenges and opportunities before activities are conducted, and focus on responding to a demonstrated need. It may also involve activities related to knowledge creation, knowledge management, expert advising, convening/facilitating, communication or engagement around key aspects of agricultural and food policy systems, or other activities as specified in particular addenda.

Subsystem Outcome: Strengthened Policy Institutional Architecture

Institutional architecture includes the formal structure of governmental policy-making and implementation as well as the informal social norms and institutions that de facto regulate how stakeholders participate in formal government processes as well as social implementation of laws and regulations. A stronger institutional architecture includes more opportunities or spaces for inclusive stakeholder engagement in formal and informal policy processes; greater capacity for stakeholders both to express their own voices and to hear the voices of others; and more robust multi-stakeholder dialog that is evidence-based, inclusive, and transparent. The desired outcome

is a greater willingness by stakeholders jointly to address development and development policy as a multi-stakeholder phenomenon to achieve shared objectives.

Illustrative examples indicating the presence of this desired outcome include but are not limited to:

- Deepened horizontal and vertical linkages among stakeholders engaged in similar issues;
- Increased capacity of government, civil society and the private sector to participate in inclusive, evidence-based, transparent policy dialog, with local leadership capacity to organize and facilitate such dialog;
- Increased participation of stakeholders, such as women, youth, indigenous communities, and other stakeholders who have been under-represented in policy processes;
- On-going capacity development services available on local market; and
- Learning and methodologies shared and applied by other development actors and stakeholders.

Subsystem Outcome: Strengthened Country Policy Agendas

The country policy agenda comprises the near term policy priorities that enable the country to take advantage of opportunities to accelerate inclusive growth processes as well as overcome policy obstacles to greater and more efficient investment in agricultural and food systems. Each Feed the Future target country has developed a Policy Matrix in conjunction with government, civil society and the private sector that articulates prioritized policy changes for that country that are anticipated to have the greatest impact on GFSS high-level objectives. A strong policy matrix is a set of SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound) policy priorities that:

- Is aligned with and supportive of the country's agricultural strategy and investment priorities;
- Is representative of civil society contributions and needs;
- Enables greater and more effective private sector investment in market systems;
- Is flexible and adaptable to respond to emerging opportunities and challenges;
- Is based on evidence and analysis;
- As a portfolio of actions, is sufficient to accelerate progress towards societal goals; and
- Helps strengthen country self-reliance to achieve system-wide change and societal goals.

Illustrative but not comprehensive policy agenda items are provided in an Annex.

Subsystem Outcome: Strengthened Mutual Accountability

The [Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness](#), the [Accra Agenda for Action](#) and the [Busan Partnership Agreement](#) have all endorsed mutual accountability as a key development process between donors and host countries. However, Feed the Future is helping countries engage civil society and the private sector in addition to development partners as part of cutting-edge mutual accountability practices. As implemented by the African Union in agricultural and food systems,

the cutting edge practice is that mutual accountability is a multi-stakeholder accountability phenomenon based on four precepts:

- An inclusive, evidence-based plan, such as a regional national agricultural investment plan (RAIP or NAIP) at the regional/national level, or an analogous plan at the industry, provincial or other level. The plan provides for alignment of stakeholder resources to strengthen agricultural and food systems for the common good;
- Voluntary, public, SMART commitments by stakeholders aligned with and in support of the plan;
- Holding oneself and others accountable for responsible execution of one's own /others' commitments; and
- All stakeholders holding themselves and others jointly accountable for ensuring that the plan and set of commitments is sufficient to make significant progress societal goals and targets.

A stronger mutual accountability system is a system that is stronger in each of these areas. Stronger mutual accountability systems are critical in a country's journey to self-reliance.

Subsystem Outcome: More Powerful Foresighting

Foresighting encompasses the analysis of existing trends and contextual changes and prognostication of emergent behavior and conditions that will affect the functionality of agricultural and food systems including the associated policy systems. BFS has played a leadership role in the Agency, the Inter-Agency, donors, and governments in delineating and preparing for these policy influences, and proactively seeks to address them to ensure the sustainability of positive changes in agricultural and food systems and to minimize unanticipated negative side effects. Foresighting contributes to stronger policy systems by making them more agile and flexible in adapting to opportunities and challenges; helping to prepare evidence bases for upcoming policy dialogs; and more actively engaging national, regional, and global stakeholders in agricultural and food systems.

Illustrative examples of foresighting themes include but are not limited to: climate smart agriculture; policy for resilient rural communities as drivers of rural economic growth and transformation; policy for resilient subnational, national and regional systems; policy implications of youth, gender and demographic trends; policy implications of de-industrialization; the (lack of) nutrition transitions, including the pervasiveness of high-calorie-density processed foods; nationalism and policy retrenchment; inclusive growth as a social safety net; and the potential of mutual accountability processes; among others. It is anticipated that foresighting themes may shift over the course of the PAC APS as emergent behaviors and changing local, regional and global circumstances dictate.

Funding Opportunities

This APS is unfunded and represents the framework through which funded addenda will be constructed. BFS will collaborate with internal or external partners to post specific funding

opportunities through addenda to this APS that address development challenges of importance to USAID. These addenda will likely focus on particularly intractable or impactful development challenges that may occur within or across specific countries, regions, or sectors. Addenda will be the exclusive source of funding through this APS and will be posted on www.grants.gov.

Co-Creation, Collaboration and Communication under the PAC APS

A critical component of the PAC APS is the co-creation process. Past experience demonstrates that the most successful partnerships are grounded in mutually reinforcing relationships among implementing partners, local constituents and stakeholders, USAID/Washington, USAID Missions, and Inter-Agency partners. In order to most effectively facilitate these relationships under the PAC APS, USAID seeks extensive communication with prospective partners so we can jointly explore and define key challenges and problems, and then jointly develop promising solutions to those issues. The co-creation process is characterized by potentially extensive engagement and communication between USAID and any key project partner(s). Key project partners as well as organizations (public or private) who are interested in providing material, financial, or intellectual support to the proposed project may be invited to interact during the process. These co-creation processes will be implemented primarily at the time when addenda are being designed, added to the base APS, and procured.

When using co-creation, USAID teams work alongside partners and potential implementers collaboratively to define the problem, identify new and existing solutions, build consensus around areas for action, and/or refine plans to move forward with programs and projects. As its name implies, co-creation relies on collaboration with a diverse set of actors, allowing for a more equitable distribution of both the responsibility and ownership of outputs across all partners.

For Applicants under the PAC APS/associated Addenda seeking to receive USAID funding to implement the proposed activities, USAID's discussions with those Applicants will take place within the parameters of publicly available information. These parameters provide ample room for extensive, robust discussions regarding the development problem in question, best practices, lessons learned in the relevant technical sectors, and pertinent research and evaluations and various other matters.

Once a Concept Note naming the Applicant is submitted under an APS Addendum, USAID can meet with and ask the Applicant (and other partners, if the Concept Note is proposing partnerships) extensive and highly detailed questions about the content of the Concept Note. Such questions are essential to USAID's review of the Concept Note and USAID's determination of whether the proposed Concept Note warrants further discussion and development.

However, USAID cannot engage in highly specific, detailed activity design with the entity seeking an award of USAID funding until after USAID decides the Concept Note meets the minimum criteria under this APS, and any additional criteria under Addenda, and warrants further consideration and development. Submission of a qualifying Concept Note is needed.

Note: None of USAID’s communication during the co-creation process provided by this APS should be interpreted as a commitment to making an award of USAID funding. Applicants are advised that participation in the co-creation process under this APS is entirely at their own risk; the Government is not responsible for any cost incurred by the Applicant if the Applicant decides to accept the invitation to co-create with USAID. A commitment to an award of USAID funding is only made when an award agreement is signed.

Application & Award Process

This PAC APS provides a platform for the initiation of consultations by potential applicants with USAID Missions/Bureaus/Independent Offices (M/B/IOs), and reflects USAID’s interest in expanding and diversifying its implementing partner base, while supporting ideas with high potential for transformative impact. The general PAC APS is unfunded and serves as an umbrella APS, to which the Bureau and other USAID M/B/IOs can post specific addenda or funding opportunities that are focused on policy-related development challenges. An addendum highlights a specific program or activity, where technical assistance or partnership opportunities are communicated by a USAID M/B/IO. USAID addenda are time-sensitive calls for Concept Notes or other addendum-specific responses. While this APS is not supported by specific funds, funding levels and estimated numbers of awards will be specifically outlined in any subsequent addenda. **USAID will only consider Concept Notes or other Responses that are submitted against a specific addendum to this PAC APS and where the Response is in the form specified in the addendum. USAID will not accept or consider any Concept Note or other Response under this PAC APS unless it is submitted in direct response to an addendum issued under this PAC APS.**

Applicants interested in pursuing an opportunity posted as an addendum should follow the instructions and guidance set forth in that text. This APS is not supported by specific funds; therefore the amount of resources made available under this APS will depend on the scope of the specific addenda, the concepts received, and the availability of funds. POL and/or the awarding M/B/IO for specific addenda will review submissions as indicated in the addendum. Applicants should submit Concept Notes or Responses according to the timeline outlined in the specific addendum and send the Concept Notes or Responses to the POC indicated in that addendum. Information on the target response time, and on any special deadlines, will be available at www.grants.gov. The application and award process under this APS has the following steps:

Responding to Addenda

Interested Applicants may respond to a specific Addendum under this APS. **The Response MUST be prepared and submitted according to the specific instructions in the Addendum of interest in order to receive full consideration.** Applicants should submit only the information and materials specified in the Addendum. Applicants should not submit any alternative document or narrative as a substitute for the material requested in an Addendum; application materials in any other format will not be accepted or reviewed. In addition, all

Responses MUST be in English and submitted electronically according to the instructions in each specific addendum.

A Response to a specific PAC APS Addendum must be submitted to the names indicated in the specific Addendum. Responses sent by any other means (including Grants.gov) will not be considered. The submission deadline(s) for each specific PAC APS Addendum will be indicated in that Addendum. Additional information can be found at www.grants.gov. For questions, please contact the USAID staff named in the specific PAC APS Addendum.

Responses submitted under this APS are encouraged to demonstrate a cross-sectoral approach to solving a complex development challenge, possibly but not exclusively through a consortium of actors, to be led by representatives from one primary recipient of the award (Prime Recipient)¹. Additionally, these development challenges should relate directly to the PAC APS addendum to which the Interested Applicant is responding. These Responses will be evaluated based on the criteria and considerations set forth in the “Evaluation Criteria and Considerations” section.²

Review of Interested Applicant Responses

Once an Interested Applicant submits a Response to a PAC APS Addendum, USAID will conduct an initial review of the Response using the criteria outlined in the section: Evaluation Criteria and Considerations, as well as the criteria stated in the individual Addendum. The purpose of the initial review and related communication is often to determine whether USAID wishes to engage in further discussions regarding the proposed approach and activities. The initial review and communication will result in one of three outcomes:

1. An invitation to engage in more in-depth and specific co-creation discussions aimed at further developing the proposed approach and determining whether to request a full application;
2. A decision to provide the Applicant an opportunity to submit a revised Response; or
3. A decision to forego further consideration of the approach proposed in the Response.

Note: A decision to engage in more in-depth and specific co-creation discussions is NOT a commitment to funding, nor is it a commitment that USAID will request a Full Application.

If an Applicant is invited to engage in co-creation and further discussions, additional guidance with respect to expectations during the co-creation process will be provided to the Applicant.

¹ Consortia applications are welcomed under this APS; however, one eligible entity must still be identified as the Prime Recipient. The other consortia partners will serve as sub-awardees to the Prime Recipient (if the relationship is monetary in nature) or as thought partners/advisors to the Prime Recipient (if the relationship is non-monetary in nature). The Prime Recipient will be responsible for managing and coordinating its partners as it seeks to achieve the goals stated above.

² Concepts Notes and other Responses will be evaluated according to the criteria and considerations set forth in this PAC APS and any additional criteria indicated in the pertinent PAC APS addendum.

There is no guarantee that participation in the co-creation phase will lead to an award from USAID. This is a collaborative process and the outcome may be that all, some, or none of the participants will be asked to submit a Full Application. If a formal co-creation workshop is held, it will be viewed as an opportunity to team up, brainstorm and prepare the initial skeleton of a project/activity that may or may not be funded.

If more in-depth discussions enable the partners to jointly develop and design (or further clarify) a promising, high impact approach, and/or the M/B/IO decides a Full Application is immediately warranted, USAID will inform the Applicant of that determination. If subsequent in-depth and specific discussions do not result in the identification and development of an activity worthy of further pursuit, the M/B/IO will not request a Full Application and will instead inform the Applicant that USAID is no longer interested in the proposed activity.

If an M/B/IO decides a Full Application is warranted, Full Application instructions and/or templates will be provided to Applicants by the M/B/IO. Full Application instructions and/or templates are expected to vary based on specific M/B/IO needs and project objectives. Consistent with the co-creation focus of this APS, USAID will continue to have robust communication with Applicants, potential partners, and other key stakeholders regarding the technical substance of the evolving approach, as well as the identity and roles of proposed or additional partners. This will include USAID and partner communication regarding the content of the Full Application, including but not limited to the program description to be included in the possible resulting RFA and subsequent application.

Review of Full Applications

After receipt, all Full Applications will be reviewed for their technical merit by a decision panel, anticipated to comprise POL staff, other Agency experts, and staff from the requesting M/B/IO. USAID may request Applicants to present their Application to the decision panel via teleconference or videoconference, or to travel to USAID/Washington (if local/within 50 miles of USAID Headquarters). The decision panels will only meet with Applicants when they determine a meeting is appropriate; applicants should not contact USAID to schedule a presentation.

Request for Additional Information

Consistent with the co-creation objectives of this PAC APS, the decision panel may suggest revisions and additions to the proposed project as well as potential partners and resources. The decision panel, working in collaboration with POL and the relevant M/B/IO may also seek additional information regarding the technical approach, capacity, management and organization, past performance, budget, representations, and certifications of the applicant and partners.

AO Determination

If the decision panel selects an Application for funding, its review will be shared with the Agreement Officer (AO) for final approval and award negotiation. Based on the criteria outlined in the specific addendum, the decision panel will recommend which Full Application(s) be advanced to the AO for the relevant M/B/IO for award instrument negotiation and finalization. Depending on the nature of the lead partner and the activities to be conducted, the instrument will be an assistance award structure as appropriate.

Final Review and Negotiation

The AO will engage in final review, negotiation, and determinations of assistance award instrument type, responsibility, and cost realism, and will craft an assistance award instrument with the Apparently Successful Applicant. If the Apparently Successful Applicant and USAID cannot arrive at a mutually agreeable arrangement, the AO will cancel the proposed activity at no cost to the U.S. Government.

Award and Implementation

The USAID AO will award the instrument, and the Awardee(s) will begin implementation, in collaboration with the USAID M/B/IO, according to the terms and scope of the award instrument.

Actual award times for Concept Papers or other specified Responses leading to Applications that USAID wishes to fund, as well as award times for the Applications themselves, will vary based on addenda, the co-creation process and other factors.

Award Information

We anticipate that the opportunities provided under this APS will be of high interest to the global development community and therefore may result in a high number of Concept Note submissions. However, given anticipated funding levels, USAID may only be able to fund a small portion of the ideas that are offered. Again, all Applicants are advised that submission of a Concept Note under this APS is entirely at their own risk; the U.S. Government is not responsible for the cost of Application preparation (at any stage in the process), nor is the U.S. Government committed to funding any Concept Notes or Full Applications that may be submitted under this APS. Awards under this APS will be made on the basis of evaluation criteria and considerations specified in the section Evaluation Criteria and Considerations, and on additional specification of criteria and considerations in the addenda.

Eligibility Information

Addenda under this APS may request Concept Notes/Responses/Full Applications (in cases where only a Full Application is requested) from all types of organizations. All Responses must be determined to be responsive to the APS as well as the specific addenda to which the Concept

Note is being submitted and must come from organizations that can be determined to be sufficiently responsible to lead the final award. The recommendation or selection of an Application for award does not in any way guarantee the award. The AO must evaluate the risks posed by applicants before making the award. The AO must evaluate risk in accordance with the principles established by USAID and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) (see 2 CFR 200.205). In order for an award to be made, a USAID Agreement Officer must make an affirmative determination that the applicant is “responsible,” as discussed in ADS 303.3.9.

Local Engagement: Applicants are encouraged to demonstrate a clear understanding of the role that local organizations and institutions are playing or can play in promoting objectives of this APS. Where the primary applicant is not a local organization, it is strongly encouraged that the applicants demonstrate knowledge of and/or consultation with local actors who stand to benefit from the proposed program. In cases where an international applicant does not consider it in the program’s best interest to understand or engage with local actors, the applicant must clearly explain why that is the case.

New Partners: USAID encourages applications from new partners. Resultant awards to these organizations oblige USAID to undertake necessary pre-award reviews of these organizations to determine their “responsibility” in regards to fiduciary and other oversight responsibilities of the grant/cooperative agreement.

Prior to making an award under this competition, USAID may perform a pre-award survey for organizations that are new to working with USAID (“NUPAS”) or for organizations with outstanding audit findings. Accounting systems, audit issues and management capability questions may be reviewed as part of this process. If notified by USAID that a pre-award survey is necessary, applicants must prepare in advance the required information and documents. A pre-award survey does not commit USAID to make an award to any organization.

The bureau reserves the right to adjust these timelines as the number of applicants and other scheduling may require.

Standard Clauses and Provisions of Award

Information regarding clauses and provisions will be offered to the Apparently Successful Applicant when the award instrument is drafted. The standard clauses or provisions for awards are generally prescribed by law and regulation. Organizations are encouraged to consider providing reasonable cost sharing, leverage, or other exchange of resource arrangements, and are encouraged to suggest creative approaches to resourcing projects.

Information Protection

USAID’s goal is to facilitate the research and development that will lead to innovative, and potentially commercially viable, solutions. Understanding the sensitive nature of submitters’ information, USAID will work with organizations to protect intellectual property. Concept Notes

should be free of any intellectual property that the Applicant wishes to protect, as the Concept Note may be shared with USAID partners as part of the selection process. However, once Applicants have been invited to engage in further discussions, Applicants will work with USAID to identify proprietary information that requires protection.

Therefore, organizations making submissions under this APS grant to USAID a royalty-free, nonexclusive, and irrevocable right to use, disclose, reproduce, and prepare derivative works, and to have or permit others to do so to any information contained in the Concept Note submitted under the APS. If USAID engages with the organization regarding its submission, the parties can negotiate further intellectual property protection for the organization's intellectual property.

Organizations must ensure that any submissions under this APS are free of any third party proprietary data rights that would impact the license granted to USAID herein.

Principles for APS Evaluation

USAID sets several topline principles for this APS as articulated below, which will be complemented by specific Evaluation criteria under each Addenda for both Concept Notes and Full Applications. Any Concept Note or other Response submitted under an Addendum to this APS should propose an approach that satisfies these principles and exhibits the characteristics set forth below. **Note:** In addition to the following principles and considerations, there will be additional criteria highlighted in the specific APS addendum.

Principle 1: Alignment with M/B/IO Strategic Objectives and Programming Priorities

The Concept Note or other specified Response must align with:

1. The Global Food Security Strategy;
2. The targeted M/B/IO's strategic plan (including Regional/Country Development Cooperation Strategies and/or Project Appraisal Documents) and programming priorities as outlined in the addendum; and
3. The POL Results Framework or other framework specified in the addendum.

Principle 2: Strengthen commitment and capacity at all levels of society. PAC APS partnerships should be based on mutual accountability and a demonstrated commitment to achieving results. Work under this APS with country (local) partners will articulate shared goals and objectives, clear cost-sharing arrangements, and specific policy and governance milestones, as appropriate. Proposals should seek ways to strengthen local partner capacity and utilize partner country systems, where possible, to empower governments and country stakeholders to own and manage their own development. Efforts should engage local actors as co-designers, co-implementers, and co-owners of their own development outcomes, while strengthening their capacity, and holding all partners accountable for achieving and sustaining results.

Principle 3: Empower country partners to resource their own development efficiently, accountably, and transparently. Efforts under the PAC APS should aim to increase the capacity of country institutions and organizations - the private sector, government, and civil society - to generate greater public and private revenue and harness domestic and international financial and non-financial resources that can further development needs in the agriculture and food system. This means that country organizations will make a credible commitment to ensuring that these resources are committed and spent in an accountable, transparent, and effective manner. Evidence of this commitment might include co-financing development efforts through cost share arrangements, the replication and scale of successful investments, etc.

Principle 4: Catalyze enterprise-driven development and sustainable results by engaging strategically with the private sector and civil society. Support from an active and engaged civil society combined with enterprise-driven development is a key catalyst of self-reliance and sustainable growth. Efforts under this APS should partner more strategically and effectively with the private sector and civil society to ensure that societally-supported, market-based solutions are integrated across the work to align our objectives and efforts in ways that share risks and rewards and increase impact. This APS takes an expansive view of the private sector - U.S. and international companies, start-ups, and small and medium enterprises (SMEs) that includes a partnership with civil society - to extend gains across the society. It also takes an expansive view of civil society that includes but is not limited to non-governmental organizations, think tanks, universities and other organizations with evidence-gathering and policy analytic capacity, women's organizations, smallholder organizations, rural business organizations, and non-profit industry organizations, among others.

While the above Principles are largely focused on local context and capacity, BFS recognizes that addenda procured under this APS may also have a focus on deliverables that are highly relevant to and supportive of central decision-making processes in Washington DC related to the implementation of activities toward achievement of GFSS global and country objectives. Illustrative programmatic activities include providing information relevant to GFSS and GFSR strategies in terms of evidentiary support, analytical findings, policy modeling, capacity building, or programmatic best practices. Such activities should still be conducted according to the Principles. For example, evidence gathering and policy analysis could be conducted by think tanks, universities, or other local civil society organizations per Principle 4, yet with key support from a US-based Prime Contractor. As another illustrative example, policy analysis of a proposed country policy action, e.g. youth employment in agriculture and food systems, should have meaning and content relevant to the country but also for GFSS programming both centrally and in other countries with similar contexts and circumstances. These examples are illustrative,

and all legal and viable arrangements that meet the deliverables specified while respecting the Principles may be considered.

Gender equality and women's empowerment are a Cross-cutting Intermediate Result of the GFSS and a critical aspect for APS design and evaluation of design as well as alignment with Principle 1. USAID requires that a gender analysis inform all activity and project designs. Concept Notes/Applications that demonstrate an evidence-based plan and partner capacity for ensuring gender integration in programming and fostering female empowerment in response to a PAC APS addendum will be viewed favorably.

A full description of USAID's Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy can be found [here](#). Guidance on gender integration in GFSS programming can be found in the [Global Food Security Strategy Technical Guidance on Advancing Gender Equality and Female Empowerment](#).

Anticipated relevant areas for gender integration for the PAC (described in detail [here](#)), include but are not limited to:

- Formulation of policy research questions/hypotheses of particular relevance to women's empowerment and gender equality;
- Building gender-responsive research, analytic capacity and other skills within partner institutions and other stakeholders in policy systems;
- Policy implementation approaches and activity implementation approaches for the PAC APS itself that increase the likelihood of better gender-related outcomes and minimize gender biases; and
- Strengthening social institutions and norms that condition the equitable formulation and implementation of policy.

Other Full Application Parameters

USAID reserves the right to fund any or none of the Full Applications submitted. USAID seeks to select projects across a wide range of technical and regional areas, but with geographic emphasis on Feed the Future target countries, Resilience focus countries, and other Bureau priority countries or geographies. USAID will not fund Applications that, in its view, will result in the use of U.S. taxpayer funding in a duplicative or redundant manner. This includes activities determined to not be in the best interest of the United States Government. If USAID identifies opportunities to strengthen or fund a Full Application by connecting with other USAID mechanisms, other potential funders, and/or external partners, USAID may make the Full Application available internally or externally for appropriate consideration, with the consent of the applicant and partners.

Points of Contact

For any questions regarding this general APS, contact PolicyAPS_Responses@usaid.gov. Questions regarding specific addenda, including Concept Notes, must be submitted to the contact listed in that addendum. The Agreement Officer (AO) for this APS is Charles Jackson at chajackson@usaid.gov and Assistance Specialist is Kelly Miskowski at kmiskowski@usaid.gov, in USAID's Office of Acquisition and Assistance (OAA) in the Bureau for Management. If a Full Application is awarded, the AO will appoint an Agreement Officer's Representative at that time to provide technical and administrative oversight of the specific award.

Additional Information on Award Administration

- Award Solicitation, Award Process and Standard Provisions for U.S. organizations and Non-U.S. Non-governmental Organizations: <http://www.usaid.gov/who-we-are/agencypolicy/series-300>
- Grant and Contract Process: <http://www.usaid.gov/work-usaid/get-grant-orcontract/grant-and-contract-process>
- Standard Provisions (Non-U.S. Non-Governmental Organizations): <http://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/300/303mab>
- Intellectual Property and Other Issues: http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/textidx?SID=d3769da5cf0d02900f539c8deb2cd59c&mc=true&n ode=se2.1.200_1448&rgn=div8
- USAID's Gender Equality Policy: <http://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1870/GenderEqualityPolicy.pdf>
- Environmental Compliance Background Information: http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/environment/compliance
- USAID Open Data Policy: <https://www.usaid.gov/data/frequently-asked-questions>
- Information on how the Agency will ensure environmental soundness and compliance in design and implementation when required by the 22 CFR 216 determination: <http://www.usaid.gov/who-we-are/agency-policy/series-200>
- Branding and Marking Policy and Resources: <https://www.usaid.gov/branding>
- Feed the Future Branding Guidelines <https://www.feedthefuture.gov/branding-guidelines/>

[END OF APS # 7200AA19APS00003]

Annex 1. Illustrative Examples of Policies by Thematic Area

This Annex provides an illustrative, non-exhaustive list of policies in each of the seven thematic policy areas of the Policy Agenda.

Nutrition Policy

- Enabling environment for production of nutrient-dense crops and foods
- Food waste policy
- Food safety policy
- Fortification and bio-fortification policy
- Food and nutrient labeling policy
- Nutrition education policy
- Nutrition-specific policies, e.g. policy regarding complementary food for infants & children, nutrition policy for women of child-bearing age, etc.

Enabling Environment

- Financial policies
- Credit policy
- Savings policy
- Business formation policy
- Private business ownership policy (restrictions on government ability to nationalize a business)

Markets & Trade

- Barriers to trade
- Food Safety
- International Quality Standards
- Agricultural input import policy

Institutional Architecture

- A Guiding Policy-Framework
- Policy Development and Coordination
- Inclusivity and Stakeholder Consultation
- Evidence-Based Analysis
- Policy Implementation
- Mutual Accountability

Land and Resource Tenure and Rights

- Formalization of land tenure
- Land security, and land as security (collateralization)
- Water Rights
- Water Pricing
- Household Water Insecurity Policy
- Gendered access to land, water and resources

- Pastoralist rights

Agricultural Risk Management and Resilience Policy

- Safety Nets
- Self-Reliance
- Crop insurance
- Price insurance
- Savings instruments

Agricultural Inputs

- Varietal registration policy
- Inputs import policy
- Inputs subsidy policy/removal
- Gender-equitable inputs access
- Input quality policy

Annex 2: Gender Analysis Statement

The Policy Analysis and Capacity APS has been thoroughly reviewed by Kristy Cook and Krista Jacobs as required by ADS 205.3.4 and the USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy. The review included suggestions throughout the base APS document, and a recommendation for the addition of a Gender Policy Annex; these suggestions have been incorporated. The resulting APS document complies with all relevant gender guidelines. The gender approach taken in the APS is summarized as follows.

Agricultural policy formulation and implementation provide important opportunities to improve gender equality where they:

- Incentivize and/or enable equal access to productive resources (land, inputs, credit, etc.)
- Identify and reduce barriers to equality due to agricultural policies
- Foster a legal and regulatory framework that “levels the playing field”
- Account for and mitigate social and cultural norms that disadvantage women

The approach taken in the base APS is that systemic changes in agriculture and food security policies will be necessary in order to effectively address the gender-based constraints in each target country, as well as at regional and global levels.

The base APS directs that implementing partners should aim to influence global, regional and national policy that advances gender issues in policy systems in multiple ways:

- Formulation of policy research questions/hypotheses of particular relevance to women’s empowerment and gender equality;
- Building gender-responsive research, analytic capacity and other skills within partner institutions and other stakeholders in policy systems;
- Policy implementation approaches and activity implementation approaches for the PAC APS itself that increase the likelihood of better gender-related outcomes and minimize gender biases; and
- Strengthening social institutions and norms that condition the equitable formulation and implementation of policy.

Details for potential Applicants and Implementing Partners are contained in an Annex to the Base APS: “**Gender Issues in Agriculture and Food Security Policy Development and Implementation Relevant to APS applicants**”. This Annex describes how GFSS agriculture and food security policy investments and the partners implementing policy activities under the GFSS strategy can and should ensure improved gender outcomes. The prime implementers for agriculture and food security policy programs should demonstrate strong gendered agriculture and food security policy capacities; however, it is recognized that there will be more limited capacities among national and sub-national policy research, advocacy and implementing organizations.

The BFS Policy Team and Gender Advisors will collaborate to provide more specific guidance and evaluation as the APS process moves forward.

Annex 3: Initial Environmental Examination



BUREAU FOR FOOD SECURITY INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EXAMINATION (IEE)

PROJECT/ACTIVITY DATA

Project/Activity Name:	Policy Analysis and Capacity--Annual Program Statement (APS)
Geographic Location(s) (Country/Region):	Global, emphasizing FTF focus countries
Implementation Start/End Dates (FY or M/D/Y):	6/1/2019-5/31/2024
Solicitation/Contract/Award Number:	TBD
Implementing Partner(s):	TBD
BFS Tracking ID:	BFS-18-12-004

ORGANIZATIONAL/ADMINISTRATIVE DATA

BFS Implementing Office:	BFS/ARP/POL
Other Involved Operating Units:	N/A
Funding Account(s) (if available):	N/A
Original Funding Amount:	Unfunded base APS
Prepared by:	James F Oehmke
Date Prepared:	12/18/2018

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW DATA

Analysis Type:	Initial Environmental Examination (IEE)
Environmental Determination(s):	Categorical Exclusion:
IEE Expiration Date:	5/31/2024
Additional Analyses Required:	None at this point, however a CRM may be needed in an Amendment

BFS INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EXAMINATION

PROJECT/ACTIVITY SUMMARY

The BFS Policy Division (POL) objective is improved national, regional, and global policies that enable the transformation of food systems. Consistent with the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS), the POL development hypothesis is that stronger policy systems catalyze agricultural and food systems transformation contributing to GFSS top-line goals of accelerated agricultural growth, better nutritional outcomes, improved food security, greater resilience, and better water security. To support the POL objective via the development hypothesis, POL seeks to put in place an Annual Program Statement (APS) mechanism that conducts policy analyses and

USAID/BFS IEE BFS-18-12-004

capacity-building program to strengthen agricultural and food policy systems. The Policy Analysis and Capacity Base APS is an unfunded base APS that is intended to serve as an umbrella mechanism for POL investments in policy systems, which will be made through Addenda to the Base APS. The desired immediate outcomes from work conducted under the Base and its Addenda include strengthened country, regional, and global processes for policy formulation and implementation, prioritized policy changes, and better accountability for policy implementation and impact. The work conducted under this APS is analytic and human or institutional (not physical) capacity-building in nature: It is not anticipated that there will be any bio-physical investments or actions that would have any direct impact on the environment.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATIONS

All project activities are currently fully covered under clear Categorical Exclusions, as indicated below, and are not expected to have a negative environmental impact.

TABLE 1: ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATIONS

Projects/Activities	Categorical Exclusion Citation
Policy Analysis and Capacity, base APS	\$216.2(c)(2)(i) Education, technical assistance, or training programs
	\$216.2(c)(2)(iii) Analyses, studies, academic or research workshops and meetings
	\$216.2(c)(2)(xiv) Studies, projects or programs intended to develop the capability of recipient countries


Upon approval of this document, the determinations become affirmed, per agency regulations (22CFR216).


CLIMATE RISK MANAGEMENT


No Climate Risk Management Analysis is required at this time.


IMPLEMENTATION

In accordance with 22CFR216 and Agency policy, the conditions and requirements of this document become mandatory upon approval.

Approval:  1/30/2019
 Jennifer Long, BFS Office Director Date

Clearance:  1/28/19
 James Oehmke, Activity Manager Date

Clearance:  1/28/19
 Courtney M Buck, AICOR Date

Concurrence:  1-31-2019
 William Thomas, BFS Bureau Environmental Officer Date

Annex 4: Gender Issues in Agriculture and Food Security Policy Development and Implementation Relevant to APS applicants

This Annex describes how GFSS agriculture and food security policy investments and the partners implementing policy activities under the GFSS strategy can and should ensure improved gender outcomes. Additional general guidance on gender integration in GFSS programming can be found in the [Global Food Security Strategy Technical Guidance on Advancing Gender Equality and Female Empowerment](#).

1. Why gender matters for agriculture and food security policy

Gender equality and female empowerment are included as an explicit Intermediate Result (CCIR 3) of the Global Food Security Strategy³: “Our programming, policy, and research efforts will engage women, men, communities, and institutions to regularly identify and address gendered needs and barriers throughout design, implementation, and monitoring, evaluation, and learning⁴. The strategy proposes that changes in agriculture and food security policies will be necessary in order to effectively address the gender-based constraints in each target country.

Agriculture and food security policy are laws, regulations and other government actions taken to achieve objectives in these sectors. To be sufficiently impactful and to do no harm, policies need to work for both women and men. Even when written in gender-neutral language, agricultural policies can have differential impacts on women, men, and other groups. Policies such as increases or reductions in government expenditures, land tenure reform, subsidies, regulations, etc. almost all create gainers and losers. For example, Rwanda’s initial round of land tenure regularization begun in 2007 resulted in documented land ownership for men and for legally married women but was associated with a decline in documented ownership among informally married women⁵. Where there are differential gender impacts, particularly on women, there can be negative impacts not only on the welfare of the household, but also on the rural economy at large.

³ US Government Global Food Security Strategy FY17-2

<https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1867/USG-Global-Food-Security-Strategy-2016.pdf>

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/682321468336670055/pdf/WPS5765.pdf>

Agricultural policy formulation and implementation can also be an opportunity to improve gender equality where they⁶:

- Incentivize and/or enable equal access to productive resources (land, inputs, credit, etc.)
- Identify and reduce barriers to equality due to agricultural policies
- Foster a legal and regulatory framework that “levels the playing field”
- Account for and mitigate social and cultural norms that disadvantage women

2. Approaches to addressing gender issues for policy investments

For investments seeking positive policy outcomes, implementing partners should aim to influence global, regional and national policy that advances gender issues in policy systems in four ways:

1. Formulation of policy research questions/hypotheses of particular relevance to women’s empowerment and gender equality;
2. Gender-responsive research, analytic capacity and other skills within the implementing partner(s);
3. Promotion of gendered aspects of the policy system and particularly policy implementation (How should/might the activity be implemented increase the likelihood of better gender-related outcomes and minimize gender biases? How should policies be implemented to increase the likelihood of better gender-related outcomes and minimize gender biases?);
4. Strengthening those social institutions and norms that condition the formulation and implementation of gender policy greater equality, and building the capacity to do so.

2.1 Formulation of Gender Policy research questions/hypotheses

Gender-responsive agricultural policy involves the identification of questions that are informed by and relevant to women’s and men’s roles, responsibilities, participation in, and benefits from agricultural systems; the ability to collect and analyze data to answer those questions; and the ability to engage with and communicate findings to policy and advocacy stakeholders. Some constraints to good gender analysis include lack of time and effort toward completing the gender analysis in face of large data sets and competing objectives. Another constraint is a lack of experience with or commitment to appropriate models such as intra-household decision-making.

There are relevant gender-related research hypotheses in most if not all policy areas. The first step is for researchers and program implementers to anticipate and pose these questions. These include ensuring that analysis considers differential outcomes across men and women,

⁶ **FAO, Policy Assistance Division, “Policy Highlights. Gender in Agricultural Development Policies” January 2006. (Accessed 1/7/16: http://www.fao.org/docs/up/easypol/353/gndr_agric_dv-pol_030en.pdf)**

incorporates the differences in initial conditions that face men and women, and seeks to consider different pathways of policy impacts. A starting point for relevant research questions is provided in a non-exhaustive list in Annex Table 1.

Effective gender analysis requires a complementary set of qualitative and quantitative methods on the research team. Knowledge of social and cultural norms and beliefs are also important inputs to good gender analysis. There are some widely accepted methods for improving data for gender research⁷. Agriculture and food security policy research is more likely to pose relevant gender-specific hypotheses and improve an understanding of gender impacts if the research organizations involved have a culture and structure that is gender-sensitive. Organizational and technical gender capacities that a lead/prime organization will need to possess, and develop in partner organizations is discussed in greater detail in the following section.

2.2. Organizational capacities supportive of effective policy development and implementation for improved gender outcomes

To effectively implement a gender-sensitive program, the primary implementer should address significant gender-related issues within its own organization.

2.2.1 Characteristics of the Lead/Prime Organization for Gender-Responsive Policy Work

Critical issues to assess the gender capacity of the primary implementer include:

- 1) What gender policies / strategies does the organization have? Are they relevant/referred to/implemented? Has there been a gender audit? Is there gender balance in professional staff and in leadership, and if not, why?
- 2) Is there a gender research/programming agenda⁸? Are there specific gender issues in agriculture and food security which the organization is research or programming? Are

⁷ Some of the more specific skills include gender issues in data collection, analysis and dissemination. Data collection is a key area where attention to gender is critical in both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. It is impossible to detect gendered impacts without sex-disaggregation of data, regardless of the size and scale of the collection process and tools. Interviewing both men and women, especially those in the same households, raises the time and cost of data collection, so tradeoffs must be evaluated. However, it is increasingly clear that interviewing male spouses as proxy for women in the household does not provide accurate data. There is considerable research in this area that can be drawn upon to produce more gender-responsive research.

⁸ Methods of sex and gender analysis to be integrated in all stages of basic and applied research are outlined here:

<https://genderedinnovations.stanford.edu/terms/dimension.html>

there gender issues within broader implementation agenda themes that have been identified?

- 3) Are there gender research/programming capacities? Do the researchers/programmers have the skills to analyze gender issues, pose gender-relevant hypotheses, develop gender-relevant programming? Are there incentives to do so?

2.2.2 Building Gender-Responsive Policy Capacity

In strengthening the capacity of institutions to support formulation and implementation of gender-responsive policy, successful Applicants should also address organizations' abilities to identify relevant gender policy questions and carry out rigorous analysis to answer them, collect and analyze sex-disaggregated and other data, and engage women and men as participants in and users of policy analysis. Gender-responsive capacities for policy organizations may include but are not limited to:

- Identify and describe people's roles and access to institutions in agriculture and food systems relevant to key policy areas by sex, gender, age, and other intersecting social and economic factors
- Understand and apply gender analysis to policies, including identifying key stakeholders, potentially different impacts by sex, and potential for unintended consequences
- Build and maintain an awareness of existing agricultural policy debates from a gendered perspective
- Foster relationships with civil society organizations, women's groups, and other institutions that represent the interests of a variety of women and other marginalized populations to improve the exchange of information among researchers, policymakers, and the women and men farmers, traders, businesspersons and other stakeholders to support a demand-driven programming process and to create wider awareness of and support for policy issues.
- Communicate gendered needs, perspectives, and impacts to diverse stakeholders, ranging from smallholder farmers to local women's groups to businesspersons to government officials in agriculture, natural resources, trade, gender, women, and finances
- Make recommendations for feasible policy actions that aim to improve gender equality and women's empowerment

The prime implementers for agriculture and food security policy programs need to have solid gendered agriculture and food security policy capacities; however, it is recognized that there will be more limited capacities among national and sub-national policy research, advocacy and implementing organizations. Many of these organizations will be subject to broader gender-related policies and strategies within other organizations or their countries⁹. An understanding

⁹ See <https://genderedinnovations.stanford.edu/terms/dimension.html>

of this context will be necessary for any primary policy implementer and it is expected that the aim will be to strengthen these gender policies and strategies that directly relate to the policy work conducted.

2.3. Gender implications for implementing food security policy research.

Laws and policies are often written in gender-neutral and even gender-sensitive language, but are not implemented in a gender-sensitive way. Gender equality objectives tend to disappear during policy implementation often because of insufficient political will, capacity, and funding (Giovarelli, Wamalwa, and Hannay (2013¹⁰)). Two differing examples of how limitations on the implementation of laws that uphold women’s land rights include:

- “[In Rwanda] the formal legal system and land law provide equal rights to land for women, However, a study in Bugesera district, the area with the highest number of cases of women involved in land disputes, found that the most common cause of disagreement was women trying to enforce their right to inherit land. The study shows that the majority of defendants in the disputes were male relatives and spouses of the women (Rwanda Women Network, 2010).”
- In South Africa, in spite of an extensive statutory framework (10 laws, seven policies, 5 guidelines and seven international commitments) difficulties such as inadequate costing and budgeting, no legal obligation for Departments to provide legally required services, limited understanding by dutybearers¹¹ of the legal provisions and their roles in implementation as well as inefficient and underfunded administrative systems¹².

As organizations improve their internal gender-responsive capacities, gender-sensitive implementation is more likely. As described above, staff in the implementing organizations need to have relevant gender experience and skills.

2.4 Strengthening social institutions and norms

Strengthening those social institutions and norms that condition the formulation and implementation of gender policy greater equality is critical to the success of policies that promote gender equality and gender-equitable growth, resilience, food security and nutritional security, and water security. A lack of social institutions that not only promote but insist on gender equality affects policy formulation and implementation in multiple ways

- Policies and social conceptions of policy success are not gender-equitable. For example, an informal discussion of key informants in the Senegal River Valley indicated that most men were happy with the improved irrigation schemes, and wanted policy to support

¹⁰ <https://www.land-links.org/issue-brief/land-tenure-property-rights-and-gender/>

¹¹ <https://www.unicef.org/gender/training/content/resources/Glossary.pdf>

¹² <https://www.soulcity.org.za/projects/advocacy/gbv/resources/understanding-gender-policy-and-gender-based-violence-in-south-africa-a-literature-review>

additional irrigation schemes that could bring more land under irrigated production. In contrast the women, who struggled to gain access to land at the end of the irrigation channel with uncertain levels of irrigation wanted, wanted policy to focus on improving the quality of irrigation channels and water access within the existing irrigation schemes. Women's access to land, financial mechanisms, and other means of economic opportunity may also be restricted legislatively.

- Government enforcement of gender-equity policies may be conditioned by social context. Most if not all Feed the Future countries have legislation against physical violence against women and are putting place sanctions on economic violence against women, but enforcement is largely lacking. The South African example of a lack of funding (section 2.3) is one type of the lack of enforcement; difficulty accessing legal processes to enforce women's rights including land rights, personal privacy, access to agricultural inputs and markets, access to financial markets, and many others rights are also commonly reported. However, with little or no societal pressure on governments, stricter enforcement is not a priority. For example, women who are informal cross-border traders (ICBTs) commonly report that they are asked/forced to trade sexual favors for easier access to the border and/or better prices for their products in the cross-border market, despite many countries having laws against trading sexual favors for border access.
- Social enforcement of gender-equity policies augments government enforcement. Social opprobrium of those engaged in gender discrimination can be as effective as legal sanctions and often is brought to bear far more quickly. It also conditions government enforcement: it is perhaps not surprising that women ICBTs are subject to physical abuse with little government enforcement of legal protections in cultures where a majority of men and women believe that a man is justified in beating his wife if she burns the food (DHS).

The recommended approach is to recognize that gender is a social construct, and therefore the formulation and implementation of gender-equitable policy also has a significant social component. Implementing partners should have the capacity for a gendered analysis of the social context in which policies may or may not improve gender equity, and to build local capacity both for this analysis and to strengthen the social institutions and norms that will significantly move the needle towards greater gender equity.

3. Implications for the Policy Analysis and Capacity Applicants

The prime implementers for agriculture and food security policy programs need to have solid gendered agriculture and food security policy capacities. In light of the above implications of

gender in agriculture and food security policy research, development and implementation, bidders under the PAC APS should consider the following in their applications:

- Articulate gender-specific expected results in the proposal.
- Articulate and/or describe a process to identify gender-focused policy research questions and gender-responsive questions the applicant will research (if relevant).
- Describe how the applicant will research and promote approaches to policy implementation to improve gender equality (if relevant).
- Outline a plan for assessing, developing, and measuring changes in gender-responsive capacities among participating organizations. Key capacities include identifying relevant gender aspects of issues; collecting, analyzing, or recognizing appropriate data to address the issues; communicating gendered lessons; and engaging relevant policy stakeholders, including civil society and the private sector, as partners.
- Demonstrate their own strong capacity for gender-responsive programming and/or research (including identify, collect, analyze, communicate, engage relevant parties).
- Follow the Feed the Future & USAID monitoring and evaluation requirements for reporting sex-disaggregated data.

Annex

Table 1: Gender considerations and illustrative policy questions/actions across GFSS Policy Areas

Policy Area	Gender Considerations	Illustrative Questions / Actions
<p>Risk & Resilience</p>	<p>Men and women may have different access to social services, e.g. payments may be transferred to husbands and benefits not extended to wives.</p> <p>Transfers may affect the risk of gender-based violence</p> <p>Potential gender-biased transfer mechanisms (e.g. electronic)</p> <p>Barriers to access to credit and insurance</p> <p>Differing laws and practices around asset ownership, control, and transfer may increase risk for women (e.g. land and asset inheritance).</p> <p>Due to relative high poverty levels, women are often more seriously affected by agricultural shocks.</p> <p>Men and women may have different repositories of knowledge about local resources, wild foods, etc. and gender roles in management of assets on the part of individuals with differing risk profiles may differ (e.g.</p>	<p>Assess risk management tools and technologies for gendered impacts.</p> <p>Document gendered risk management strategies.</p> <p>Propose strategies to mitigate gender-biased program strategies (e.g. transfer mechanisms)</p> <p>What are gendered impacts of agricultural shocks? (How) do these impacts depend on gendered resilience capacities?</p> <p>What are gendered costs and benefits of different models of targeted social safety nets in rural areas?</p>

	livestock).	
Agricultural Inputs	<p>Men and women often have differential access to inputs due to mobility, finance, or time constraints.</p> <p>Laws and regulations in the inputs area rarely have explicit gender biases, however their implementation may lead to inequitable access.</p> <p>Many policies developed to affect inputs supply, availability and prices have differing impacts on men and women.</p>	<p>What are potential gender impacts of different agricultural inputs policy? For example, in studying the impacts of fertilizer subsidies, do these differ across men and women (at different socio-economic levels)?</p> <p>What policy approaches improve the levels and equity of women's and men's access to agricultural inputs?</p> <p>How do vouchers or seed distribution policies differentially affect women's and men's access to and use of improved varieties?</p> <p>If there are differences in men and women's use of types of seeds (OPV or hybrid) or crops, what are the gendered impacts of policies impacting incentives to use seeds or grow specific crops?</p>
Land and Natural Resource Rights and Governance	<p>Land tenure research tends to focus on a small number of countries, lack longitudinal studies, and insufficiently assess the gendered effects of interventions and policies.</p> <p>There is a general need for</p>	<p>How does joint registration impact gendered use of, access to, and decisions over investments on agricultural land and women's and men's control over the produce or earnings?</p> <p>To what extent and under what</p>

	<p>improved sex-disaggregated land data and information, and large-scale studies of women’s land rights.</p>	<p>conditions does improved land tenure security increase women’s use of improved agricultural practices, technologies, credit, and other investment and conservation behaviors? To what extent do these changes improve agricultural productivity and/or sustainability?</p> <p>For large-scale land-based investments, what are inclusive investment models that support women’s agency and share in benefits?</p> <p>How can agricultural policies, programs, and administrative processes be designed and/or coordinated with land formalization and administration processes to ensure rural women are able to leverage improved tenure security into improved livelihoods?</p>
<p>Enabling Environment for the Private Sector</p>	<p>Men and women may face differing legal and regulatory access to private capital and finance</p> <p>Norms and customs may influence women’s ability to establish and grow a business.</p> <p>Participation in the private sector may carry different time burdens and security risks for women and men.</p> <p>Gender discrimination in land and</p>	<p>What policy, regulatory, organizational development, or other approaches ease gender-related barriers to business development? To participation in and benefits in higher-value portions of value chains?</p> <p>To what extent would joint registration of land impact access to credit for women?</p> <p>Do digital financial service regulations create gender barriers to access to finance?How might regulations on digital financial services improve</p>

	<p>natural resource rights and tenure contributes to gender constraints in areas such as finance and credit.</p> <p>Collateral restrictions and Know Your Customer (KYC) requirements may restrict access for women.</p> <p>Research in this area would need to consider the implications of policies and regulations for gender access in order to understand policy impacts.</p>	<p>equitable gender access to financial services?</p>
<p>Nutrition</p>	<p>Agricultural policies have distributional effects on food productivity, supply, and access by different populations, and can differentially impact women, men, girls, and boys.</p> <p>Extent to which national nutrition fora, commitments, and funding take account of women’s and men’s voice, knowledge and needs</p> <p>Relative role of women’s influence over policy decisions regarding food fortification, supplementation, and WASH investments and decisions.</p> <p>Institutions reinforce nutrition as a female responsibility disempowering men and emphasizing the dichotomy of men and women’s roles</p>	<p>Improve the evidence base on nutritional impacts from policies promoting gender equality and from agricultural policies.</p> <p>How have community-led or local-government-led nutrition efforts engaged women and men? How has this affected allocation of resources, local feeding and/or WASH practices, etc.?</p>

<p>Trade</p>	<p>Women entrepreneurs hampered by lack of credit, trade in smaller volumes. Small volumes combined with burdensome regulations and tariffs reduce profit margins and curtail cross-border trade.</p> <p>Limited access to information — from customs and quotas to policies — means women miss opportunities and fail to, or are unable to, comply with processes and procedures.</p> <p>At the border, women encounter other barriers, including harassment and discrimination.</p> <p>In some countries, the right to own a passport or laws that limit a woman’s independence or mobility effectively cut off their ability to participate in cross-border trade.</p> <p>Additional challenges for women can include being unable to enter into a contract on their own behalves or limitations and/or risks to work at night</p>	<p>Increase the availability of sex-disaggregated data in trade and markets</p> <p>Mapping or inventory of gendered participation in & returns to export agriculture markets</p>
<p>Institutional Architecture</p>	<p>Men and women have differing ability to voice concerns, issues and preferences in stakeholder dialogues and political fora.</p> <p>Men and women are represented differently within and by stakeholder groups, for example</p>	<p>How and to what extent do different models of community-based or local-government resource governance influence women’s benefit from natural resources? From cooperative membership?</p> <p>An examination of rural women’s and</p>

<p>many farmer associations are managed and run by men with limited roles for women.</p> <p>Organizations and institutions researching and advocating for women's role and voice in policy are often understaffed and funded.</p>	<p>men's access to & use of local public development funds</p> <p>Landscape (or more targeted) assessments of women's role and voice in political discussions and decision-making can provide programmatic recommendations for policy change.</p>
---	---