

FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT_AFRICAN POPULATION AND HEALTH RESEARCH CENTRE

Elizabeth Kimani-Murage , Antonina Mutoro , Elizabeth Mwaniki , Ajibola Ogunsola , Dickson Amugsi , Gershim Asiki , Florence Sipalla

Elizabeth Kimani-Murage , Antonina Mutoro , Elizabeth Mwaniki , Ajibola Ogunsola , Dickson Amugsi , Gershim Asiki , Florence Sipalla

©2022, ELIZABETH KIMANI-MURAGE , ANTONINA MUTORO , ELIZABETH MWANIKI , AJIBOLA OGUNSOLA , DICKSON AMUGSI , GERSHIM ASIKI , FLORENCE SIPALLA



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction, provided the original work is properly credited. Cette œuvre est mise à disposition selon les termes de la licence Creative Commons Attribution (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>), qui permet l'utilisation, la distribution et la reproduction sans restriction, pourvu que le mérite de la création originale soit adéquatement reconnu.

IDRC GRANT / SUBVENTION DU CRDI : - POLICY FOUNDATIONS, COUNTRY DIALOGUES, AND ANALYTICS FOR FOOD SYSTEM TRANSFORMATIVE INTEGRATED POLICY IN RWANDA, MALAWI, AND GHANA



Food System Transformative Integrated Policy

Final Technical Report

IDRC project number (a 6-digit number): 109698

Research organizations involved in the study: African Population and Health Research Center

Location of study: Ghana, Rwanda and Malawi

Organization: African Population and Health Research Center

By

Dr. Elizabeth Kimani-Murage

Dr. Antonina N. Mutoro

Ms. Elizabeth Mwaniki

Mr. Ajibola Ogunsola

Dr. Dickson Amugsi,

Dr. Gershim Asiki

Ms. Florence Sipalla

30th May 2022

Executive Summary

There are many challenges in African countries' food systems, including food insecurity and nutrition, which can be addressed by evidence-informed food system policies. However, there is limited evidence on the current food system situation which constrains the development and implementation of such policies. The FS-TIP initiative aims to diagnose food system challenges and identify policies and stakeholders required for the functioning of food systems in Africa, with an initial focus on Rwanda, Malawi and Ghana. The process also aimed to contribute to and inform the 2021 United Nations Food Systems Summit (UNFSS) in-country dialogues and was implemented between April and August 2021.

APHRC evaluated this process between August 2021 and January 2022 to identify enablers and barriers to successful implementation of the initiative; perceived relevance, usefulness, acceptability, willingness and readiness to adopt the FS-TIP approach; and the level of stakeholder engagement. The evaluation provided evidence that will inform adoption of a similar process in other countries. The following methods were used during the evaluation process: 1) a desk review of project outputs including reports and policy briefs was conducted in order to establish the types of stakeholders that were considered important in the running of food systems as well as their engagement in the FS-TIP process. An inter-sectorial governance framework was also used to assess the level multi-sectorial action in FS-TIP (McQueen, et al. 2012). 2) A semi-quantitative online survey and virtual key informant interviews (KIIs) were also conducted to assess perceptions of the FS-TIP process including relevance, usefulness, acceptability, willingness and readiness to adopt the FS-TIP approach. Barriers and facilitators to the process were also assessed.

A total of 25 stakeholders (Ghana-10; Malawi-6; Rwanda-7 and project management team-2) participated in the key informant interviews and 10 (Ghana-2; Malawi-5 and Rwanda-3) completed the online survey. The FS-TIP process was largely accepted among the study participants in Ghana, Malawi and Rwanda, and was considered relevant by the different stakeholders as it helped them understand food system challenges in the respective countries. The mapping process enabled identification of stakeholders who are vital for the proper running of food systems in the three countries. The FS-TIP process benefitted from: 1) Existing data and information infrastructure in the participating countries including the availability of routinely collected data and central databases; 2) The use of local experts who were familiar with the political and governance landscapes of the participating countries contributed to the speed and efficiency of project implementation; 3) Ongoing implementation of existing food and agricultural initiatives and dialogues in the participating countries catalyzed the FS-TIP process as did the UNFSS by having countries embark on the FS-TIP process with clear deliverables to a short term goal. 4) Regular meetings and feedback mechanisms during implementation facilitated the timely completion of the FS-TIP process by the project team.

Barriers to the process included: 1) Lack of centralized databases from which to source data for the landscape diagnostic process, 2) Lack of data on specific indicators and conflicting data reports; 3) Difficulties in setting up meetings with different high level government stakeholders was reported as a barrier to the process as most of the stakeholders had competing interests and were therefore not able to participate in the process. 4) Project outputs were long and a lot of jargon was used, which made it difficult for the stakeholders to review and validate. 5) Limited time for implementation and stakeholder engagement was also highlighted as a barrier to the process.

The FS-TIP process identified key food system challenges in Ghana, Malawi and Rwanda and was considered relevant, acceptable and adoptable by stakeholders. The process has the potential to improve food system policies and diagnostics, but it should be government-led and embedded with existing government initiatives to ensure ownership and sustainability. Key outputs from the process evaluation will include: a project report, a briefing paper which will be shared with stakeholders in Rwanda, Ghana and Malawi and an open access peer reviewed publication.

The research problem

The significance of food systems transformation is now generally acknowledged by African governments. Food systems are the primary livelihood source for more than 60% of the population in Sub Saharan Africa (SSA) and agriculture accounts for about 15% of the region's GDP (World Bank, 2018). Further, SSA is one of the regions that is most vulnerable globally to the adverse impacts of climate change and also where many people are food insecure. At the same time, agri-food systems are still maturing in Africa and can be nudged towards a healthier and more sustainable direction to ensure their resilience to challenges such as climate change. However, to achieve the necessary transformations that African food systems require, a complex interplay of issues must be addressed, including transforming food environments for healthy diets, mitigating climate change, productively engaging the private sector, and influencing public policy priorities (Kennedy et al. 2021).

The FS-TIP initiative was launched with the aim of supporting African governments with development and implementation transformative and integrated food systems policies to ensure sustainable healthy diets for all. So far, the initiative has completed the diagnostic and landscaping analysis in three countries (Ghana, Rwanda and Malawi) between April and September 2021 and expects to continue to support these countries in their food systems journey, as well as to support new countries in conducting their own diagnostic analyses (FS-TIP, 2021).

The piloting phase of the process which involved stakeholder mapping, to identify key stakeholders in the respective food systems and their roles. This was followed by a policy mapping exercise, involving analysis of the existing food-related policies, and identification of gaps in the policies and implementation strategies. The third and final stage involved indicator mapping/identification, with the aim of highlighting potential indicators that can be used to monitor changes in food systems and evidence gaps within the three countries.

Because FS-TIP is a new and innovative process that can be adopted in other countries, there was a need to evaluate the process to understand: 1) Multi-sectoral stakeholder involvement in FS-TIP activities and, 2) Perceived relevance, usefulness, acceptability, willingness and readiness to adopt the FS-TIP approach as well as potential barriers and facilitators to successful adoption of the process for policy development.

The first phase of FS-TIP enabled a comprehensive analysis of food systems in the target countries and provided information on the key stakeholders required for proper functioning of food systems, indicators that can potentially be used to monitor food systems as well as policy gaps. Evaluation of the process enabled documentation of enablers and barriers to the process. This information can inform the implementation of FS-TIP in other countries.

Synthesis of Research results and development outcomes

FS-TIP was a fast paced process that provided information on food systems in Ghana, Malawi and Rwanda. Through evaluation of the process, enablers and barriers to the implementation of the process were identified. This information can be used to inform the design and implementation of FS-TIP in other countries. The process led to the development of strong partnerships and networks with government officials. It also exposed members of the project team to a number of activities at the national level, where they played key roles as facilitators and reviewers of reports, among other activities. The process also provided them the platform to establish new relationships with people they had never worked with before, which helped them widen their network.

"I had the opportunity to be part of the national dialogue team; I even became a facilitator for one of the thematic areas. And so, I did not just facilitate the process, but also took part in it. And then I have the chance to also help review some of the reports that were prepared by the national team working on the dialogue." (KII, non-government project team member, Ghana).

The visibility of food system experts was also enhanced as they were involved in various national dialogues and also equipped them with valuable knowledge and information for their professional development. Members of the research team gained knowledge on conducting research in different countries.

The FS-TIP process had several outcomes:

1. The landscape analysis and diagnostics process reports helped to broaden understanding of the various food system components among the countries. For example, although participants in Ghana were aware of the various food system components, these were not viewed as occurring along a continuum. The process therefore offers countries the opportunity to examine and develop a better understanding of their respective food systems.
 - The stakeholder mapping process enabled the identification of key stakeholders required for the proper functioning of food systems
 - The policy mapping process enabled identification of policies and policy gaps which affect food systems
 - The indicator identification process led to the identification of food system challenges and indicators which can potentially be used to monitor changes in food systems. The process also enabled identification of vital indicators that currently have limited supporting data for example food waste, nutrition composition and energy.
2. The tool kit developed from the FS-TIP process provides a comprehensive guide on how to conduct the landscape analysis and diagnostics and can potentially be used in other countries.
3. Evaluation of the process used sound research methods to document the enablers and barriers of to the successful implementation of the FS-TIP process. The report generated from the process can inform future implementation of the process.
4. The policy briefs developed from the process provided comprehensive information on the FS-TIP initiative as well as the food system situation in the target countries.
5. We plan to publish a peer reviewed manuscript of the evaluation process. The publication will advance the scientific knowledgebase on policy transformation processes.

Policy influence

The FS-TIP process provided learning about food systems in the different countries. The process enabled the identification of food system policies available in the three countries as well as policy gaps which need to be addressed in order to ensure proper functioning of food systems. The process also enabled the identification of key stakeholders required for the proper functioning of food systems.

Technology development, adoption, and adaptation ***Not Applicable***

Lessons Learnt

Implementation of the FS-TIP Process

The process needs to be government led that is the government needs to lead its conceptualization and implementation to ensure buy in. More time also needs to be allocated for the implementation of such a process moving forward in order to ensure its success. Capacity building of government officials on data interpretation and use will ensure that the indicators identified will be used to inform program implementation and monitor food systems.

Evaluation of the FS-TIP process

Ethics approval should have been sought earlier to enable the evaluation process to overlap with the implementation process. A stakeholder database (stakeholders engaged in the process) should have been created to enable easy access of contacts. Instead of an online survey, phone interviews would have been a better data collection method. This would have ensured relatively higher response rates. Support from the project management office enabled easy access the stakeholders who were engaged in the process. Moving forward, there should ideally be an overlap between the implementation and evaluation process.

Project design and ethics considerations

The use of mixed data collection methods enabled us to get a comprehensive overview of the FS-TIP process including its's enablers and barriers to the process.

The evaluation process involved human participants. There was therefore a need to obtain ethics approval from the target countries. The ethics application process took a significant amount time because of the different requirements by the ethics committees. For example, in Rwanda, we were required to have affiliation with a local institution, we were also required to apply for a research permit. This led to significant delays in evaluation process.

Moving forward, plans should be put in place to ensure that vital components of the research process are attended to in advance so that there is adequate overlap between the implementation and research activities.

Organization roles

Organization	Role(s)
Boston Consulting Group	Project management (FS-TIP implementation)
Rockefeller Foundation	Supported the landscape analysis in the three countries
AKADEMIYA2063	Conducted landscape analysis in Ghana and Malawi
Tony Blair Institute	Supported the landscape analysis in the three countries
Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (Agra)	Supported the landscape analysis in the three countries
World Food Programme	Supported the landscape analysis in the three countries
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)	Supported the landscape analysis in the three countries

Progress towards milestones

Project milestone	Achievement
Commencement	We were able to kick off project activities in May 2021 after signing of the contract
Initial Payment	We received our first payment on 26 th May 2021
Submit Ghana, Malawi, Rwanda research ethics clearance data	We submitted ethics clearance certificates from Ghana, Rwanda and Malawi in November 2021.
Second payment	We received our second payment on 15 th December
Final technical report	The technical report was submitted by 30 th May 2022

Methodology

Study setting and design

The study was conducted in Ghana, Rwanda, and Malawi (Figure 3), which are all on track to achieving the Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural growth by 2025 (African Union Commission and NEPAD 2014). The countries were also selected based on the degree of top-level government support, existing alignment to the importance of creating transformative and integrated food policies, and their capabilities on-the-ground.

This was a multiple case study implementation research evaluation that employed a mixed-methods approach, involving qualitative and quantitative methods. The study paid particular attention to stakeholders and identification of the factors that influence implementation of the FS-TIP initiative.

Study population, Sampling strategy and Sample size

Stakeholders from the public, social and private sectors who are involved in food systems in Rwanda, Ghana and Malawi were included. These included top-level government officials, non-governmental organization (NGO) and civil society representatives, and industry actors.

The study was not a population level study and is therefore not intended to be generalizable. As such, sample size calculation was not conducted. More importantly, the parameters needed for sample size determination are not available for this type of study population. The sample obtained is therefore meant for basic descriptive analysis.

Purposive sampling was used for both the quantitative and qualitative studies. Participants in both components were selected based on their previous participation in the FS-TIP process. For the quantitative study, a list of stakeholders was obtained from respective country partners. Participants for the qualitative study were selected based on their institutional affiliation, knowledge and experience or the perceived critical role they played in food systems.

Data collection

Qualitative data on country experiences during the project, particularly relating to potential adoption of the evidence-based policy formulation and integration, as well as potential barriers and facilitators to policy development and implementation in each country, were collected using a structured interview guide (Link to survey: [link-https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/KPZNMSK](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/KPZNMSK)). Key informant interviews were conducted virtually and in English by experienced members of the research team (appendix 1). The interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim to ensure completeness. Each interview

was conducted by a moderator, assisted by a note-taker who was present during the virtual meeting with the respondent.

Quantitative data was also collected virtually using a self-administered, semi-structured questionnaire, which captured data on the relevance and appropriateness of the FS-TIP outputs. The questionnaire also assessed the relevance and usefulness of the evidence-base and tool kit generated by the partners. With support from our in-country partners in the three countries, the online questionnaires were sent to stakeholders, who were expected to complete and return them to the research team. The respondents were provided adequate instructions and guidance to ensure clarity and accuracy of the information collected.

Analysis

Quantitative data was analyzed using the software, R version 4.0.5. The characteristics of study participants were summarized using descriptive statistics. Country-specific qualitative audio files were transcribed verbatim, anonymized and stored in digital format (Microsoft Word compatible). Data was imported into the qualitative data management software NVIVO, for coding and analysis. A codebook was developed and used to guide the coding. Key content areas and codes in the codebook were determined deductively based on anticipated barriers and facilitators in development and implementation of integrated food policies.

The transcribed word files were imported into NVIVO 12 software (QSR International Pty Ltd, Don Caster, Victoria, Australia) for coding and further analysis. Additional codes that came up during the analysis were also included. Data was coded and a quality assessment of the coded data was conducted by the team. Final checks for consistency of the application of the codes was undertaken by a member of the research team

Desk review

To complement the qualitative and quantitative data, we conducted a desk review of project documents/outputs, including minutes of stakeholder meetings, reports and the tool kit. An inter-sectoral governance framework was used to assess multi-sectoral action in the engagement process. We assessed governance structures including those at the level of the central government, parliament civil service and funded agencies, as well as mechanisms for engagement outside government with other sectors. We were keen to note the level of engagement of governance structures knowing that these play different roles in initiating or facilitating a policy process and its implementation. We looked further into experts' institutions from each country and sought to understand the relevance and the level of involvement of participants and key stakeholders who engaged in the FS-TIP process. These were then compared with stakeholders who were identified as key to the functioning of the food system in each country.

Merits of the data collection and analysis methods

The use of both qualitative and quantitative methods enabled us to quantify responses and get detailed views about the FS-TIP process. The quantitative survey was administered on an online platform (survey monkey). We approached 55 participants but only managed to get 10 responses mostly because people tend to shy away from online surveys. This was despite several attempts to follow up. Moving forward, such a tool will be best administered via phone or in person to ensure a high response rate. An inter-sectoral framework was used to assess the stakeholder engagement with an aim of establishing the range of stakeholders and the different sectors that were represented in the process.

Project Outputs

Project outputs will include a comprehensive report highlighting project findings. The report will be converted into a manuscript which will be submitted to an open access peer review journal for publication. We plan to submit findings from the study in BMC Public Health which is an open access journal. Given that we are based in a middle income country, we are eligible for a publication waiver. Publication fees will not apply in our case. A briefing paper will also be developed and disseminated to the different stakeholders involved in the process. The report and brief will also be made available on the APHRC website and links to the documents will be shared on our social media handles.

Project findings were presented to different stakeholders including government officials from the Rwanda, Ghana and Malawi, non-government organization officials and researchers. The dissemination meeting was held on the 16th of May 2022. Other outputs from the project included policy briefs, a toolkit, landscape analysis and diagnostic reports. Some of these outputs have been made available on the websites of the implementing institutions.

Problems and Challenges

We experienced significant delays with the ethics application process in the three countries. In Rwanda for example, we were required to seek affiliation with a local institution, identify a local supervisor and apply for a research permit, which took a significant amount of time. We were able to approach a contact at the University of Rwanda who offered to be our local supervisor. This enabled us to proceed with application process with relative ease.

A number of the experts and project members were engaged as consultants on short-term contracts which had ended by the time the evaluation was conducted. It was therefore difficult to trace and engage some of them due to conflicting interests, however we were able to engage a handful of them with support from the project management office. Accessing experts who participated in the FS-TIP process was also a challenge due to time-zone differences. Moving forward, plans should be put in place to ensure that vital components of the research process are attended to in advance so that there is adequate overlap between the implementation and research activities.

Administrative Reflections and Recommendations

The IDRC team was very supportive throughout the project implementation period. They provided the required information and guidance when needed. The quarterly check in meetings with the team were useful to the team as they enabled us to update on progress and challenges faced during the project period.

Appendix 1

FOOD SYSTEM TRANSFORMATIVE INTEGRATED POLICY: Establishing the Policy Foundation and Supporting Food System Country Dialogues and Analytics

Qualitative tool

Hello and welcome to this interview. We would like to get your views on the FS-TIP process as you are one who has participated in it in one way or another. We shall seek your views on the different steps of the process. Please feel free to give us your thoughts as this will compliment how a similar process should be undertaken in other countries in the continent.

In Country team/experts and other stakeholders

1. Description of components of the food system.

- In your view, how was the concept of “system approach” food received by the stakeholders you were working with?
- What did you have to do to ensure that this concept was well understood and appreciated by those you were working with?
- What worked well in this process?
- What was challenging during this process? Why?

2. One of the initial steps in the process was in gathering country data on national targets and supra indicators.

- What was your view on the indicators as set out by the FS-TIP process?
- What are your thoughts on the supra-indicators provided?
- How did you go about the process of collection this data?
- What worked well in this process of data collection?
- What was challenging during this process? Why?
- Which data was most challenging to find?
- How can this kind of high level rapid assessment been done differently for?

3. Mapping food system policies and policy gap identification

- How did you go about mapping FS policies and their gaps for your country?
- How was the process of generating challenges and opportunities in the food system in your country carried out?
- What worked well in this process? What else facilitated the success of this process?
- What did not work well? Why do you say so?
- What challenges did you experience in this process?
- What would you recommend be done differently in a similar process?

4. Stakeholder mapping

- How did you go about mapping FS stakeholders in your country?
- How was the process of connecting these stakeholders to the challenges and opportunities in the food system in your country?
- In your view, how inclusive was the multi-stakeholder mapping? Why do you say so?
 - consider asking about willingness/receptiveness of the stakeholder mapping process
- What key lessons did you come across through the stakeholder and policy mapping for your country?
- What worked well in this process? What else facilitated the success of this process?
- What did not work well? Why do you say so?
- What would you recommend be done differently in a similar process?
- How useful do you think the stakeholder mapping is going to be in food systems transformation in African process

5. Government and other stakeholder engagements

- How did you identify stakeholders? Do you think the relevant stakeholders were engaged? Who else should have been engaged?
- How did you go about having in-county dialogues with stakeholders in your country?
- How were these meetings coordinated?
- What worked well through these dialogues?
- What did not work well during these dialogues? Why do you say so?
- What kind of feedback did you give/receive from these meetings?
- What would you recommend be done differently when scaling this process to other countries?

PMO Coordinators questions to assess their experience across the stages:

1. Could you please tell me briefly about yourself and your role in the FSTIP process?
2. What were your initial expectations of the FS-TIP process?
3. What has been your experience in coordinating and steering and managing this collaboration? Why do you say so?
4. What has worked well?
5. What has facilitated your successes in the entire process of coordination activities across the three countries?
6. What informed the selection of in-country coordinators?
7. What of your expectations were not met? What was the main challenge/gap? How can this be addressed?
8. What has not worked well? Why?
9. Are there other key lessons that this process has presented that are important in extending FS-TIP into other countries?
10. How useful do you think the toolkit/evidence base created through the FS-TIP process is going to be in food systems transformation in African process?
11. What would you recommend be done differently as FS-TIP were to be extended to other countries?

Appendix 2

FOOD SYSTEM TRANSFORMATIVE INTEGRATED POLICY: Establishing the Policy Foundation and Supporting Food System Country Dialogues and Analytics

Quantitative tool

Country

- ☒ Malawi
- ☐ Rwanda
- ☐ Ghana

4. What is your **age bracket**:

- ☐ 1. less than 24 years
- ☐ 2. 25-34- years
- ☐ 3. 35-44 years
- ☐ 4. 45-54 years
- ☐ 5. 55-64 years
- ☐ 6. 65 years and above

5. What is your **highest level of education**?

- ☐ 1. Less than primary school
- ☐ 2. Primary school
- ☐ 3. Secondary/High school
- ☐ 4. College/Pre-university/University
- ☐ 5. Post graduate degree

* 6. **Sector**

- ☐ Health
- ☐ Agriculture
- ☐ Trade
- ☐ Academia
- ☐ Transport
- ☐ Finance

Other (please specify)

* 7. **Type** of Organization

- ☐ Government
- ☐ Non-governmental organization
- ☐ Private company

* 8. **Department** \ Division

9. Position \ **Role** (optional)

* 10. Number of **years in service**?

- ☐ Less than 4 years
- ☐ 4 years to 8 years
- ☐ 9 years to 11 years
- ☐ 12 years or more

* 11. The Food System Transformative Integrated Policy, FS-TIP is a long-term endeavor aiming to contribute to food system transformation, achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals and sustainable healthy diets for all, primarily through policy. The process involves;

- (i) **Identification of key indicators** required to track food system progress;
- (ii) **A diagnostic and landscape analysis and mapping**, which aims to identify food system policy challenges and key stakeholders in the food systems;
- (iii) **The development of a tool kit** that can be used to implement the process in other countries.

Question: Which aspect of FS-TIP process did you engage in? (Tick as many)

- ☐ 1 Identification of indicators in the food system
- ☐ 2 Policy mapping
- ☐ 3 Stakeholder mapping
- ☐ 4 Review of the outputs
- ☐ Other (please specify)

* 12. **How were you engaged** in each of the steps you have ticked above?

- 1 Identification of indicators in the food system
- 2 Policy mapping
- 3 Stakeholder mapping
- 4 Review of the outputs

* 13. What are **your general thoughts** about the intentions of the FS-TIP process?

* 14. Do you **Strongly agree (1), Agree (2), Neither agree nor disagree – i.e Undecided (3), Disagree (4), or Strongly disagree (5)** that the FS-TIP approach:

	1. Strongly Agree	2. Agree	3. Undecided	4. Disagree	5. Strongly disagree
1. Aligns with country needs					
2. Engaged relevant stakeholders from different sectors					
3. Defined food system priority areas for my country					
4. Is relevant for my country					
5. Is helpful/useful for my country					
6. Is easy to implement					

* 15. Question: **The FS-TIP approach was guided by the following principles** (Designed with the policy-maker in mind, Outcome oriented, Anchored in existing structures, Aligned to existing food systems frameworks, Tailored to Africa and country-context):

Do you **Strongly agree (1), Agree (2), Neither agree nor disagree – i.e. Undecided (3), Disagree (4), or Strongly disagree (5)**

NOTES:

***Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program CAADP**-is a framework that has inspired and energized African agricultural research institutions, farmers' associations, African governments and the private sector who believe that agriculture has a pivotal role in development. It aims to boost investment to stimulate growth in the agricultural sector. This means bringing together the public and private sectors and civil society – at the continental, regional and national levels – to increase investment, improve coordination, share knowledge, successes and failures, encourage one another and to promote joint and separate efforts.*

***\$UN FSS Action Tracks:** offer stakeholders from a wide range of backgrounds a space to share and learn, with a view to fostering new actions and partnerships and amplifying existing initiatives. Each Action Track is designed to address possible trade-offs with other tracks, and to identify solutions that can deliver wide-reaching benefits. They include: (i) Ensure access to safe foods for all; (ii) shift to sustainable consumption patterns; (iii) boost nature positive production; (iv) advance equitable livelihood; (v) Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress*

	1. Strongly Agree	2. Agree	3. Undecided	4. Disagree	5. Strongly disagree
1. Designed with the policy-maker in mind: presenting an interface that is concise, compelling and intuitive					
2. Outcome oriented: linking indicators that reflect the outcome of food systems transformation to the drivers that policy-makers can influence to realize the transformation					

	1. Strongly Agree	2. Agree	3. Undecided	4. Disagree	5. Strongly disagree
3. Anchored in existing structures: building on existing resources and structures with strong buy-ins, such as Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP)* biennial review report and adding new elements only where required					
4. Aligned to existing food systems frameworks: connecting to UN FSS Action Tracks\$ for its outcome orientation and covering all components of the food system					
5. Tailored to Africa and country-context: adapting indicators to the countries' context, leveraging local data sources and reflecting local ambitions (developing together where non-existent)					

* 16. **What else could have been done** to make the process more:

- 1 User friendly
- 2 Outcome oriented
- 3 Anchored in existing structures
- 4 Aligned to existing food systems frameworks
- 5 Tailored to the country context and Africa

* 17. Landscape and diagnostic analysis, stakeholder and policy mapping

The FS-TIP approach followed several process including:

1. **Identification of key indicators** required to track food system progress
2. **A stakeholder mapping exercise** which aimed to identify key stakeholders required for a functional food system
3. **A policy mapping exercise** which aimed to identify policies required for proper functioning of a food system.

Question: How satisfied are you with the key steps of the FS-TIP Approach?

	1. Very Satisfied	2. Satisfied	3. Neutral	4. Dissatisfied	5. Very Dissatisfied
1. Identification of key indicators required to track food system progress					
2. Stakeholder mapping					
3. Policy mapping					

* 18. Under each of the following areas what **worked well and why?**

1. Identification of key indicators for the food system
2. Stakeholder mapping

3. Policy mapping

* 19. Under each of the following areas what **did not work well and why?**

1. Identification of key indicators for the food system

2. Stakeholder mapping

3. Policy mapping

* 20. What can be done to **improve the process for scale up** of?

1. Identification of key indicators for the food system

2. Stakeholder mapping

3. Policy mapping

Question Title

* 21. The **processes** (Identification of key indicators for the food system, stakeholder and policy mapping) **and their outputs** were relevant to my country context.

Do you **Strongly agree (1), Agree (2), Neither agree nor disagree – i.e. Undecided (3), Disagree (4), or Strongly disagree (5)**

	1. Strongly Agree	2. Agree	3. Undecided	4. Disagree	5. Strongly Disagree
1. Identification of key indicators for the food system					
2. Stakeholder mapping					
3. Policy mapping					

* 22. The **processes** (Identification of key indicators for the food system, stakeholder and policy mapping) **and their outputs** were **useful in helping to understand** the current food systems challenges.

Do you **Strongly agree (1), Agree (2), Neither agree nor disagree – i.e. Undecided (3), Disagree (4), or Strongly disagree (5)**

	1. Strongly Agree	2. Agree	3. Undecided	4. Disagree	5. Strongly Disagree
1. Identification of key indicators for the food system					
2. Stakeholder mapping					
3. Policy mapping					

* 23. The **processes** (Identification of key indicators for the food system, stakeholder and policy mapping) **and their outputs** were **representative of the actual situation** on the ground

Do you **Strongly agree (1), Agree (2), Neither agree nor disagree – i.e. Undecided (3), Disagree (4), or Strongly disagree (5)**

	1. Strongly Agree	2. Agree	3. Undecided	4. Disagree	5. Strongly Disagree
1. Identification of key indicators for the food system					
2. Stakeholder mapping					
3. Policy mapping					

Question Title

* 24. **Are you willing to adopt** outputs from the following processes?

	Yes	No
1. Identification of key indicators for the food system		
2. Stakeholder mapping		
3. Policy mapping		

* 25. What are your **reasons for your responses** in 25 above i.e. for yes, why, for no, why not?

1. Identification of key indicators for the food system
2. Stakeholder mapping
3. Policy mapping

* 26. **Are you ready to adopt** outputs from the following processes?

	Yes	No
1. Identification of key indicators for the food system		
2. Stakeholder mapping		
3. Policy mapping		

Question Title

* 27. What are your **reasons for your responses in 27 above** i.e. for yes, why, for no, why not?

1. Identification of key indicators for the food system
2. Stakeholder mapping
3. Policy mapping

* 28. The final output of the FS-TIP process was a **food systems analysis tool kit**, which aims to guide all those interested in food systems to conduct a systematic, thorough and comprehensive **diagnosis** and **landscaping analysis of the food system** of a country by using a set of tools, which include

1. Tools provided for identification of key indicators
2. A policy landscaping tool
3. A stakeholder mapping tool

Question: Are you familiar with the toolkit?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No