

Strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection: Consultative workshop¹

25-26 November 2014

Cape Town, South Africa

REPORT OF THE MEETING



¹ Organized by FAO with support from UNICEF and in collaboration with the African Institute for Health and Development (AIHD), the Africa Platform for Social Protection (APSP), the African Union (AU), New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD), World Food Programme (WFP), and the World Bank. This workshop has received funding from the European Union through the “Improved Global Governance for Hunger Reduction Programme”.

Contents

Background	iii
Day 1: Tuesday, 25 November 2014	1
Welcome and presentation of objectives and agenda	1
Setting the scene: Regional priorities.....	1
Setting the scene: Policy trends	3
Why coherence between agriculture and social protection is needed?	4
Strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection in Africa.....	9
Day 2: Wednesday, 26 November 2014.....	11
Bringing together agriculture and social protection in Latin America and elsewhere	11
Looking ahead: Plans for bringing together agriculture and social protection in Africa	13
What to look for when strengthening coherence.....	15
Closing remarks: Priority issues to address in moving forward	20
Annex - List of workshop participants.....	22

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AFIRM	Agriculture and Food Insecurity Risk Management
AIHD	African Institutes for Health and Development
AIRR	Agricultural Insurance and Rural Resilience
AU	African Union
BRAC	Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CCT	Conditional Cash Transfer
CFW	Cash-For-Work
CNAAS	National Agricultural Insurance Company of Senegal
CSO	Civil Society Organization
EPRI	Economic Policy Research Institute
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FFW	Food-For-Work
HGSF	Home-Grown School Feeding
IDS	Institute of Development Studies
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
ILO	International Labour Organization
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
MoAs	Ministries of Agriculture
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PWP	Public Works Programme
SFP	School Feeding Scheme
SPIREWORK	Social Protection Plan for the Informal Economy and Rural Workers
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
UCT	Unconditional Cash Transfer
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund World Food Programme
WFP	World Food Programme

Background

FAO with support from UNICEF and in collaboration with other members of the Agriculture and Social Protection in Africa Technical Reference Group, which include the African Institute for Health and Development (AIHD), the Africa Platform for Social Protection (APSP), the African Union (AU), New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD), World Food Programme (WFP), and the World Bank organized a two-day consultative workshop on 25 and 26 November 2014 in Cape Town, South Africa. The objectives of this workshop – which built on the sensitization process that had begun at a similar workshop held in Accra in 2013 (<http://bit.ly/152Fy7U>) – were to increase participants' understanding on:

- Two-way relationship between social protection and agriculture, including potential synergies and trade-offs between these domains.
- Rationale for considering social protection and agricultural/rural development as complementary approaches to reducing poverty and food insecurity.
- Context-specific challenges and opportunities for establishing and strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection.
- Practical entry points across policy, programme design and implementation to maximize coherence between social protection and agriculture.

Response to the workshop was very good. Fifty-three people participated, including representatives from Ministries of agriculture, social welfare and finance of 11 countries (Angola, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Mali, Malawi, Senegal, Zambia, Zimbabwe, and South Africa), regional and sub-regional organizations (African Union, NEPAD, SADC), civil society organizations (AIHD, APSP), development agencies (ILO, UNICEF, WFP, IPC-UNDP), research institutions (EPRI, IDS) and independent subject experts.

This is a summary report of workshop proceedings. Specific workshop presentations are available on the website (<http://bit.ly/1uw61kR>).

Day 1: Tuesday, 25 November 2014

Welcome and presentation of objectives and agenda

Welcome and introductions

Mary Nyamongo (AIHD), the workshop facilitator, referred to the theme of the conference and pointed out the diversity of its participants. She reminded participants of their important role as *active participants* in the workshop.

Presentation of objectives and agenda

Michael Samson (EPRI) explained how social protection is a complex issue with diverse instruments and competing objectives. He noted that agricultural policy is structured in a similar fashion. Mr Samson briefly mentioned the objectives and instruments of social protection and how they overlap with agriculture, creating a complex challenge to build coherence. He concluded by stating that this workshop should contribute to discussions on how agricultural and social protection policies can be used to achieve mutual objectives.

Marco Knowles (FAO) explained that the 2013 workshop held in Accra sensitized participants on the impacts of cash transfer programmes on agriculture; on the complexity of the issue; the importance of partnering and in initiating dialogue between some ministries. He recalled the objectives of this workshop, the importance of basing discussions on concrete country experiences and the fundamental role of partnerships in strengthening coherence for agriculture and social protection. He emphasized that the purpose of strengthening coherence is to improve food security, nutrition and poverty reduction outcomes.

Lot Mlati (FAO South Africa) welcomed participants to the meeting. He pointed out how social protection and agricultural development are both recognized as key elements of any drive to reduce poverty and vulnerability. Social protection positively impacts livelihoods to reduce vulnerability, while agriculture is a source of income for many households in the developing world. Mr Mlati explained how strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection can benefit rural livelihoods, especially with regard to food security and nutrition. Mr Mlati stressed the importance of sustainable economic growth and how this will address the long term solution to food, nutrition and security.

Setting the scene: Regional priorities

Agriculture and social protection and priority regional policy frameworks

Laila Lokosang (AU) explained that the motivation for linking social protection and agriculture is based on high levels of rural poverty and food and nutrition insecurity among small farm holders. Mr Lokosang then stated that although agriculture has the potential to address these issues, inadequate investments in agriculture have led to weak growth.

He explained the potential linkages between agriculture and social protection, identifying areas in which the agricultural value chain can stand to benefit from social protection. Mr Lokosang then stated that the continent must use agriculture-social protection interventions to create opportunities for its people, especially those who are comparatively disadvantaged (e.g. rural-based youth and women who subsist on agriculture).

Laila Lokosang also drew attention to five regional policy frameworks (Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme; Framework for Africa's Food Security; Social Protection Plan for the Informal Economy and Rural Workers; High-Level Declaration for Ending Hunger in Africa by 2025; and Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth & Transformation) and the reference these make to linking agriculture and social protection. He explained that these frameworks should be used to leverage support for action at the national level with respect to strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection. Mr Lokosang concluded by emphasizing the need for strong partnerships that promote, formulate and implement social protection measures which are in line with the policy frameworks discussed in his presentation.

The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme on managing risks to agriculture and food security: the role of social protection

Mariam Sow Soumare (NEPAD) gave a presentation on the role of NEPAD in strengthening risk management in Africa. She explained how the Agriculture and Food Insecurity Risk Management (AFIRM) aims to assist smallholders in managing risks related to agriculture and food security, such as crop failure, labour shortages, poor market performance and price volatility, weak institutions and unpredictable policies and agriculture-associated diseases. She described that one of the major challenges in Africa are the recurrent crises taking place in the agricultural sector, and how these lead to low asset accumulation and low incentives to invest. The relevance of AFIRM to CAADP is that addressing risks in agriculture should lead to the accumulation of more productive assets productivity and consequently an increase in agricultural productivity.

Mariam Sow Soumare further noted that AFIRM is being implemented in nine African countries, with capacity development workshops being offered in three regional centres. By referring to specific country examples (Ethiopia, Lesotho, Malawi and Namibia) she concluded the presentation by explaining how social protection is relevant to agricultural risk management, emphasizing that social protection programmes should be embedded with other risk management instruments.

Discussions following the two presentations pointed out that strengthened collaboration between agriculture and social protection requires a political agreement, not only a technical agreement, and on the role of risk management in helping ensure households that graduate from poverty do not slip back into poverty as the result of a shock.

Setting the scene: Policy trends

Trends, challenges and emerging issues in social protection policy and programming, including systems approach, in Africa

Natalia Winder-Rossi (UNICEF) pointed out that support for social protection has grown significantly at global, regional and country levels and that this has strengthened political will to expand and scale up social protection programmes, operationalize comprehensive social protection systems and allocate national resources to social protection. She acknowledged that other policies and programmes can have social protection functions if they address the risks and vulnerabilities of a population.

Natalia Winder-Rossi went on to explain how substantive resources are being invested in generating evidence on the impacts of social protection (specifically cash transfers), including productive impacts at household and local economy levels.

Natalia Winder-Rossi informed participants of the current trend towards a “systems approach” to social protection, which calls for coordination between social protection programmes and between these and sectoral interventions, including agriculture, so as to better address multiple vulnerabilities faced by households and maximize impacts. She identified countries where there are opportunities for achieving synergies at policy level (Zambia and Malawi) and programme level (Ghana, Malawi, Lesotho, South Africa, Kenya, Tanzania, Ethiopia and Rwanda).

Natalia Winder-Rossi concluded the presentation by emphasizing that UNICEF’s interest in the linkages between agriculture and social protection is primarily focused on the wellbeing of children. More specifically, on how synergies between these two sectors can be used to increase a household’s ability to care for children living in the household. She also restated that there is a global, regional and country level commitment to the use of social protection as a tool for supporting productive inclusion in Africa. She emphasized the importance of linking different elements of social protection with other key sectors, especially agriculture, and that there is a need to fill a gap in evidence on how to go about operationalizing linkages at the country level.

Trends, challenges and emerging issues in smallholder agricultural policy and programming

Jonathan Kydd (Independent expert) gave a presentation on the trends, challenges and emerging issues in smallholder agricultural policy and programming in Africa. He explained that in Africa agriculture is characterized by low levels of crop yield, a focus on the production of staple crops, extreme volatility in yield prices, rising food prices, exposure to weather-related shocks and poor pest management. He also drew attention to the challenges caused by rural population growth; concentration on subsistence crops; low productivity; difficulty in mobilizing labour; soil degradation; weak markets for insurance; thin markets for inputs; and volatile crop markets. These challenges contribute to the inverse relationship between adaption and profitability.

Jonathan Kydd explained how different crop production regions require area-specific social protection and agriculture interventions to strengthen production, stabilize livelihoods, and promote income generation. He questioned whether in the longer term agriculture can provide a way out of poverty.

Drawing from the above-described challenges Jonathan Kydd identified three potential roles for Ministries of Agriculture (MoA), based on the following policy narratives:

- 1) Free market narrative: agricultural value chains should be left to the private sector. MoAs have a continuing role in regulating for food safety, biosafety and environmental responsibility.
- 2) Coordinated market narrative: MoAs can help in early stage development by “kick-starting” markets. There is scope for government coordination to pump-priming investment in value chains (input suppliers, on-farm investments, output storage, processing and marketing). At early stages, markets for farm finance are often weak/missing, so providing finance into various stages of the value chain can be a powerful intervention).
- 3) Embedded-market narrative: Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and farmer associations can intervene in markets to correct for markets and state failures. Therefore, MoA can support or work through these organizations.

Jonathan Kydd concluded his presentation by showing how agriculture currently receives more investment and financial support compared to social protection programmes. He identified potential synergies between agriculture and social protection, including the role that cash transfers can play in relaxing liquidity constraints and thereby enabling productive investments in agriculture; the potential role that social protection can play in supporting farmers in improving soil health, which is a big issue in the continent; and the potential role that agriculture can play in supporting adaptation to climate change.

Why coherence between agriculture and social protection is needed?

Why coherence between agriculture and social protection is needed in Africa?

Stephen Devereux (IDS) explained that initially there was a conceptual disarticulation between agriculture and social protection whereby livelihood protection and promotion strategies were seen as two distinct areas, with development and agricultural policies being used for promoting livelihoods and safety nets and social protection for protecting livelihoods. Since the 2000s, these are being increasingly articulated since it is recognized that smallholder farmers need to both protect themselves from risks and promote their livelihoods.

Stephen Devereux then discussed the linkages between social protection and agriculture. He began by explaining the three functions of social protection. Firstly, social protection protects people against risk. Second, social protection promotes sustainable livelihoods. Lastly, social protection prevents impoverishment. Thus *protection* includes emergency assistance; *prevention* includes social protection safety nets; and lastly, *promotion* consists of agricultural livelihood development. In terms of linkages to agriculture, current efforts to improve food insecurity are based on the new social protection agenda which targets individual households. This is different from the old food security agenda, where programmes functioned at a sectoral level and focused on stabilizing prices. Mr Devereux also differentiated between the comparatively more expensive old food security agenda, which did not directly target the poor and the new social protection agenda, the developmental success of which depends on providing the right amount of resources to the right people at the right time.

Stephen Devereux proposed to deal with food insecurity through a combination of targeted individual transfers (e.g. cash transfers) and sector-level interventions (e.g. protection of property rights). He also explained how coherence between social protection and agriculture can be achieved by focusing on households and including a livelihoods promotion component within social protection interventions.

Stephen Devereux then described how graduation models – such as the Rwanda Vision 2020 Umurenge Programme, Home-Grown School Feeding, the Ethiopia Food Security Programme and that of BRAC – are an opportunity for bringing together agriculture and social protection. Mr Devereux concluded his presentation by highlighting some of the challenges to graduating beneficiaries, which include (i) small transfer size, (ii) transfers with limited duration, (iii) inadequate support for “livelihood promotion” activities and (iv) transfer dilution. Contextual constraints of the graduation model include economics (weak markets and high sectoral unemployment), services (poor agriculture extension services) and vulnerabilities (endemic crisis and shocks can negate gains).

The discussion that followed Stephen Devereux’s presentation focused on how to keep food prices low, while still keeping the agricultural sector dynamic. He highlighted the agricultural sectors’ critical role in developing economies, especially if these countries are to achieve self-sufficiency in food security, and that investments in social protection are resulting in multiplier effects within the agricultural sector. Thus, linking agriculture with social protection is of importance. Finally, regarding graduation, Stephen Devereux stressed that it is important to not force graduation as quickly as possible, but to make sure graduation occurs in a sustainable fashion.

What issues are emerging on the inter-relationships between agriculture and social protection in the design and implementation of interventions?²

Cash transfers

Benjamin Davis (FAO) explained that the rural poor are both consumers and producers (e.g. farmers, small business owners, service providers, etc.), which means that “if they don’t produce, they don’t eat”. This inability to separate consumption from production constrains household investments in productive activities.

Benjamin Davis explained that rural households engaged in agriculture which receive cash transfers invest a portion of the grant in their agricultural activities such as: inputs, tools, hiring labour and livestock and to re-allocate labour from off-farm casual employment towards their own-business and farm activities. Cash transfers also allow households to better manage risks, avoid adverse risk-coping strategies (e.g. supply of child labour, informal employment and selling of assets), increase savings and reconnect with previously strained social networks.

Benjamin Davis also described the local economy impacts of cash transfers. He explained that when beneficiaries spend money in the community the free flow of capital allows other members of the community to increase their productive activities, either as agricultural producers or small business or service providers. This increase in economic activities and in income generates even greater demand for goods and services. In some places the local multiplier has been found to generate up to \$2.5 for

² This session was organized as a panel discussion without power-point presentations.

every \$1 invested in a social transfer. Furthermore there is a greater demand for labour as the local economy expands to serve the needs of the community.

Strengthening coherence between agriculture and cash transfers

Benjamin Davis concluded his presentation by describing how improvements in the design and implementation of cash transfers can strengthen coherence between agriculture and social protection. Some of the strategies that can be used include:

- i. Increasing the size of the transfer for greater impacts.
- ii. Making the transfers regular and predictable deters beneficiaries spending the money as a windfall, instead opting to invest in productive assets. Mr Davis qualified the statement by acknowledging that the administrative costs of delivering regular payments coupled with the cost of collecting the transfers – especially in areas with poor infrastructure – can make regular payments impractical.
- iii. Including behavioural conditions in the design of transfers can strengthen coherence. For example, cash transfers conditioned on households participating in skills development programmes that aim to increase agricultural productivity. Benjamin Davis stated that these conditions may be unnecessary since households tend to be responsive to messages on how to spend the transfer. He pointed out that both conditional and unconditional cash transfers have their merits, and so the choice should be based on contextual factors as well as the objectives of the programme.
- iv. Complementing cash transfers with interventions that increase access to productive assets and services (e.g. financial instruments, agricultural technologies and inputs). Although cash transfers have significant developmental impacts, combining instruments generates more enhanced impacts. This integrated approach may require inter-ministerial collaborations if the programmes are implemented by different ministries.

Input subsidies

Jonathan Kydd (Independent expert) gave a presentation on the use of fertilizer subsidies in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), where low crop yields persist. Although a global study by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) cautioned against the use of fertilizer subsidies, these subsidies have been found to boost agricultural yields, especially in regions where smallholder farming is characterized by low adoption of more productive practices.

Jonathan Kydd identified four reasons for providing fertilizer subsidies: (i) they can be used to demonstrate the benefits of improved technologies, in the form of higher yields; and (ii) they can be used to fill knowledge gaps on the fertilizer needs of different crops. This is important in the African context, where cropping systems are diverse and three-quarters of the rural population live in semi-arid, subhumid and humid zones; (iii) market failures in many developing countries mean that poor farmers cannot access the capital they need to invest in production. There is therefore a need for government to intervene to compensate for this market failure; and lastly, (iv) providing subsidies to boost domestic food production is preferred to having to import food from foreign producers due to shortages in supply.

Jonathan Kydd encouraged participants to promote agricultural growth that is driven by sustained increases in smallholder farmers' productivity. Mr Kydd went on to state that despite: (i) declining

shares of total public expenditure; (ii) inadequate technical personnel and equipment; (iii) conflicting views on the value of specific programmes/policies; and (iv) weak control over parastatal enterprises, Ministries of Agriculture (MoAs) should support agricultural growth. He also advised MoAs to support smallholder farmers by facilitating the development of strong and inclusive agricultural value chains.

Jonathan Kydd drew attention to Malawi's Farm Input Subsidy Programme (FISP). Evidence shows that the FISP has reached many poor farmers, improved the technologies being used by resource-poor smallholder farmers and boosted maize yields. He acknowledged that there are cases where the FISP has had a distortionary impact with some commercial sellers of agricultural inputs being adversely impacted by high displacement rates, which occurs when subsidized sales replace unsubsidized sales.

Jonathan Kydd concluded his presentation by identifying cases in which synergies between social protection and agriculture can be used to promote agriculture. For example, providing cash transfers close to planting season can relax the financial constraints that prevent households from investing in productive inputs. School feeding programmes (SFPs) increase the demand for agricultural products, especially if the food is procured locally. Public works programmes (PWPs) provide regular wages which can be used to invest in own agricultural and non-agricultural activities. In response to questions posed by the participants, Jonathan Kydd acknowledged that the fertilizer starter packs are very small, which means that they do not have a significant impact on production. Another participant asked whether subsidized inputs are a social protection instrument or an agricultural intervention. Jonathan Kydd responded that agricultural spending is socially protective if it assists poor smallholder farmers by providing inputs, credit or direct market interventions. Mr Kydd also stated that government must play a regulatory role in the farm input market, especially in markets where margins along the value chain inflate prices.

Public works

Stephen Devereux (IDS) gave a presentation on public works programmes (PWPs) and their impact on agriculture. PWPs provide short-term employment to rural workers and can take the form of Food-for-Work (FFW) or Cash-for-Work (CFW) programmes. Studies have shown that PWPs reduce rural-urban migration, promote human capital development and increase investments in more productive assets. PWPs can also be used for managing natural resources (e.g. terracing) and for developing rural infrastructure (e.g. roads and irrigation schemes) that support agricultural production and livelihoods.

Stephen Devereux highlighted some of the controversies surrounding the use of PWPs: i) to promote self-targeting by the poor, PWPs pay wages set below the local market wage, which some argue weaken PWPs' potential impact on hunger and poverty; ii) FFW programmes discourage local producers from investing in agricultural activities if the distributed food is procured from other regions; iii) PWPs make small investments in skills development which makes it difficult for workers to transition to jobs outside of the project; iv) in some cases PWPs create assets that benefit the elite; and v) PWPs have led to child labour being used to compensate for the adult work hours being allocated away from own-farm activities.

Stephen Devereux stated that some of the issues conveyed above can be addressed by ensuring that PWPs apply principles of decent work. However there is little evidence from large-scale programmes showing that public works programmes, plus skills training, help enhance beneficiaries' employment prospects. There is some evidence from NGOs, but it is not rigorous. Mr Devereux went on to state

that it is important to ensure that there is gender equality in PWPs and that the PWPs do not harm those who participate in them.

Stephen Devereux concluded his presentation by identifying two-way synergies between agricultural and social protection. He explained that investments in agricultural development can (i) reduce the budgetary requirements for social protection; (ii) promote pro-poor economic growth and rural poverty reductions; and (iii) increase resources for financing social protection programmes. On the other hand, investments in social protection can strengthen agriculture-based livelihoods and agricultural production by (i) reducing seasonal cash-flow bottlenecks; (ii) expanding assets for self- and mutual insurance; (iii) using productive assets more efficiently; and (iv) by adopting higher return livelihood activities. All of the above facilitate improved agricultural production.

In response to questions from a participant, Stephen Devereux clarified that no evaluations exist on the social protection-agriculture synergies of large-scale government-run programmes. This knowledge gap, he stated and especially the lack of a framework through which synergies can be evaluated, must be filled before developing countries invest in scaling up programmes.

Local procurement

Billy Mwiinga (World Food Programme - WFP) gave a presentation on the WFP's home-grown school feeding (HGSF) programme. In Mozambique, the WFP procures at least 50 percent of the food for the school feeding programme locally. This procurement model supports smallholder farmers because it creates structured demand for their agricultural production. Billy Mwiinga also explained that the more improved returns have encouraged farmers to expand local production by adopting more productive agricultural practices and investing in agricultural inputs (10 to 12 percent of the returns to farmers are spent on agricultural inputs).

Home-grown SFPs exemplify the synergies that can be exploited between agriculture and social protection. These programmes boost agricultural production and improve the livelihood status of smallholders, while improving human capital investments in vulnerable children – for better education, health and nutrition outcomes. Mr Mwiinga suggested that synergies can be strengthened if farmers selling food to the WFP were enrolled in farmer schools that develop participants' skills ranging from how to utilize more advanced agricultural techniques, better managing shocks and entrepreneurship development. He also encouraged smallholder farmers to increase their market power by forming producer organizations that advocate for their interests and negotiate on their behalf.

In response to questions from participants, Billy Mwiinga suggested that an information system be incorporated into local procurement monitoring systems, which would provide the required information for better targeting poor smallholder farmers for procurement. He also stated that the WFP procures from areas with surpluses of food, so as to avoid distorting market prices.

Strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection in Africa

What is being done, achievements and challenges faced in strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection.

Agricultural insurance and the rural resilience programme in Senegal

Mouhamadou Moustapha Fall (National Agricultural Insurance Company of Senegal - CNAAS) gave a presentation on Senegal's Agricultural Insurance and Rural Resilience (AIRR) programme. The programme was launched in 2008, in response to a promise made by the government of Senegal to provide social protection to those involved in the agricultural sector. Political support for the programme increased after a series of droughts highlighted the vulnerability of farmers, and underlined the need to provide subsidized insurance so as to increase coverage. Mouhamadou Moustapha Fall explained that the state set up a limited liability company responsible for providing insurance to farmers and pastoralists. The corporation was established as a public-private partnership in which 36 percent is owned by the state, 6 percent is owned by beneficiaries, and the remainder by the private sector. This corporation provides insurance against drought, flooding, wild animals and other sources of agricultural risks.

In response to questions from participants, Mouhamadou Moustapha Fall described how the insurance company has a network of private veterinarians. The Ministry of Agriculture provided registration numbers to these veterinarians and they are the only ones allowed to mark insured livestock. The company will not insure livestock unless they have a certificate of health from one of these veterinarians. The company will also not pay out unless the cause of death is determined by one of the veterinarians. Mouhamadou Moustapha Fall admitted that the company faces severe infrastructure constraints in isolated areas where farmers and pastoralists are unable to access veterinary services. A similar issue arises with compensation in the event of a drought or low rainfall. The company has rain meters which measure rainfall across Senegal, but most of them are located 10-12 kilometres from insured farmers. This affects the accuracy with which farmers are compensated since the company calculates the expected yield for each variety of grain in relation to the amount of rainfall measured for each area.

Mr Fall also spoke about pilot projects being run in which health insurance is being provided to people who are involved in the agricultural sector. The costs of offering this provision to farmers are normally covered by offering similar products to workers in the processing industries. The programme offers a 70 percent subsidy for health coverage at local and village level, although he foresees employers having to pay a greater portion of the premium. This presents an opportunity for further coordination between health insurance and agricultural interventions – in order to build resilience – since livestock and crop insurance can be offered alongside health insurance. They could be provided in the form of micro-insurance products offering premiums that are affordable to farmers. These risk management strategies are expected to improve agricultural productivity since they facilitate savings and increase investments in agricultural inputs.

Mouhamadou Moustapha Fall concluded his presentation by stating that in Senegal droughts lead to a serious deterioration in living conditions, and that social safety nets alone will not solve this problem. There need to be community-level infrastructure programmes that support soil and water conservation

activities. He added that an institutional and regulatory framework must be put in place for the health system. There is also a need for social protection capacity building in Senegal that emphasizes multisectoral frameworks and interventions.

Strengthening coherence between social protection and rural development within a long-term development framework: the case of South Africa

Michael Samson (EPRI) gave a presentation on strengthening the coherence between agriculture and social protection in South Africa. He began by stating that one of the main objectives of South Africa's agricultural policy is to create an integrated and inclusive rural economy, where individuals have better opportunities to overcome poverty and participate fully in the economic, social and political spheres. He explained that in order to achieve this objective the South African government is committed to: (i) implementing agricultural development strategies that create jobs in rural communities, (ii) ensuring access to quality health care, education and basic services, (iii) promoting self-reliant sustainable development, (iv) enhancing services and programmes for labour market activation and (v) addressing poverty-induced food insecurity, hunger and malnutrition.

Michael Samson described four movers (human capital development; risk management; direct production interventions; and local economy effects) of coherence between agriculture and social protection. By drawing from the case of South Africa, he explained how these four prime movers have implications for the rural labour market. With regard to labour supply, these drivers impact a household's short-term labour supply decisions. In the long term, these drivers raise effective labour supply by making workers more adaptable and productive. The drivers also increase the rate at which the rural economy diversifies – through increased demand for agricultural and non-agricultural goods and services – which has serious implications for labour demand. The overall effect is an employment-centred structural transformation of the rural economy and the creation of decent rural employment.

Michael Samson also stated that although the South African government has no explicit policy linking agriculture and social protection, coherence between these two areas has been strengthened implicitly by focusing on programmes that promote pro-poor and inclusive development. He went on to say that it is important to look at the impacts of social protection in a comprehensive way because silo-based, single-sector approaches are not the solution. He illustrated this point by using a developmental matrix that depicts how policy instruments can be used to achieve different objectives and that integrated interventions have multiplied short- and long-term impacts on a range of government objectives.

Day 2: Wednesday, 26 November 2014

Bringing together agriculture and social protection in Latin America and elsewhere

Moving towards productive inclusion: strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection

Benjamin Davis (FAO) gave a presentation on productive inclusion. He began the presentation by describing how productive inclusion addresses the inequitable distribution of resources and market failures, by: (i) increasing access to assets, (ii) increasing access to liquidity, (iii) increasing access to credit, (iv) reducing the burden of care and (v) improving the ability of households to manage risk.

Benjamin Davis explained that cash transfers are not the silver bullet for poverty reduction and identified examples of interventions in sub-Saharan Africa that are seeking to implement cash transfers with complementary programmes for a more integrated rural development strategy. He identified two options (not mutually exclusive) through which these complementarities can be achieved: (i) better coherence and coordination of existing large-scale agricultural programmes, rural development interventions, and social protection programmes; and (ii) combining cash transfers with complementary interventions.

Mr Davis drew attention to the graduation model which brings together complementary interventions in a staged approach. The graduation module – which has been applied by BRAC in Bangladesh – focuses on bringing people out of extreme poverty by providing a one-time productive asset transfer, cash or food support, access to savings mechanisms, skills training and health care. Impact evaluations from Bangladesh show positive results and the model is being replicated in another eight countries.

Benjamin Davis also compared evidence on the impacts of cash transfers and the graduation model. These show that the two have broadly similar impacts on food consumption and life satisfaction and on increased savings, loans, housing improvements and business ownership. Whereas the graduation model has much stronger impacts on value and ownership of assets, cash transfers have a stronger impact on health and education outcomes. Mr Davis explained that no single programme can be defined as the ultimate complementary intervention since effectiveness of interventions depends heavily on contextual factors. Nevertheless, taking existing social protection programmes as a base, he praised the graduation model as a framework which identifies possible solutions to relieving major constraints faced by households.

Conditional Cash Transfers and agricultural interventions in Latin America and the Caribbean: an overview

Fabio Veras (UNDP - Government of Brazil International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth) gave a presentation on the impacts of programmes that combine Conditional Cash Transfers (CCTs) and agricultural interventions in Latin America. Fabio Veras gave an overview of the similarities (targeting mechanisms, co-responsibilities, transfer types and rationale) and differences (permanent welfare policy or short-term safety net and emphasis on human capital accumulation vs. poverty reduction) across conditional cash transfers in Latin America.

Fabio Veras explained that programmes complementing CCT include (i) existing programmes being implemented by other ministries/agencies but from which CCT beneficiaries do not necessarily benefit; (ii) existing programmes already being implemented by other ministries/agencies that grant preferential access to CCT beneficiaries; and (iii) tailor-made programmes, specifically designed for non-beneficiaries and implemented by the same agency that is responsible for CCT. Fabio Veras then drew attention to the cases of Brazil, Peru and El Salvador, where CCTs are being complemented by agricultural interventions. He explained the different rationales behind the programmes, institutional set-ups and programme components. Impact evaluations show that the programmes are having positive impacts on production, asset accumulation, income generation and financial inclusion. Mr Veras concluded the presentation by citing the key question raised by these programmes, which is, how to effectively integrate CCTs, rural development and agriculture interventions for greater impacts.

Bringing together agriculture and social protection in Mexico: the Productive Territories Pilot

Gustavo Gordillo (Independent advisor to Mexico’s Anti-Hunger Programme) was unable to attend the workshop, so Benjamin Davis (FAO) delivered the presentation on his behalf. Benjamin Davis began by acknowledging the “Latin America Paradox” (sic), whereby agricultural growth has not been pro-poor even in countries with strong economic growth and a strong track record of poverty reduction. Mr Davis related this to characteristics of the agricultural sector in Latin America, such as the skewed landownership whereby a large amount of land is owned by a relatively small number of landowners; agricultural growth linked to enterprises that generate low and bad employment; and regressive public expenditure because of elite capture of agricultural policies.

Benjamin Davis then described Mexico’s *Productive Territories* programme which aims at increasing agricultural productivity, production and incomes by refocusing agricultural programmes so that these better reach smallholders and complement social protection interventions. The programme includes articulated targeting criteria designed to reach territories with an unexploited agricultural potential, high poverty rates and presence of a cash transfer programme. The programme invests in local organizations and in public goods which can relieve constraints faced by smallholders.

The discussion following Fabio Veras’s and Gustavo Gordillo’s presentations centred on whether approaches similar to those presented from Latin America may be feasible in Africa. The resulting discussion focused on the differences between Africa and Latin America that might hinder the success of a similar programme. Finally, the impact that social movements can have on policy makers, especially in rural areas, were highlighted through an example from Brazil.

Looking ahead: Plans for bringing together agriculture and social protection in Africa

What is being done? Achievements and challenges faced in strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection.

The Malawi National Social Support Programme- Harry Mwamlima

Harry Mwamlima (Government of Malawi) gave a presentation on Malawi's National Social Support Policy (NSSP). The goal of the NSSP is to “reduce poverty and enable the poor to escape from poverty and vulnerability” through welfare support, asset insurance, increasing the productive capacity and asset base of poor and vulnerable households and establishing coherent and progressive social protection synergies. Harry Mwamlima explained that declining productivity, coupled with weak extension service delivery, uncoordinated implementation and systematic market failures, have led to calls for more explicit links between social protection and smallholder agricultural interventions. This approach would involve a rural development strategy that is complemented by services such as (i) productivity enhancement (modern inputs, methods and diversification); (ii) access to markets; (iii) skills training; (iv) value chain additions; (v) savings and credit schemes; (vi) agricultural insurance (natural disasters or crop yield); (vii) contributory social insurance (pensions, maternity, disability, etc.); and (viii) sustainable management of the environment and natural resources.

Harry Mwamlima then reiterated the need for an integrated rural development strategy that utilizes a range of interventions, and presented some recommendations for ways in which this comprehensive approach may be put into practice. Firstly, the food security and resilience of cash transfer beneficiaries can be enhanced if they are also offered farm input subsidies. Second, a school feeding programme can have broader impacts if local procurement systems are established. Finally, public works programmes (PWPs) that improve rural infrastructure facilitate better access to work opportunities and markets. Beneficiaries of farm input subsidies will benefit heavily from PWPs that involve activities such as building small multipurpose dams, forestry and agroforestry management, soil stabilization and road constructions (or rehabilitation).

Harry Mwamlima informed participants of a social protection pilot that is currently operating in four districts in Malawi, with support from the United Nations Country Team (UNCT), the Local Development Fund (LDF), UNICEF and the Irish and German governments. An integral part of the pilot is the streamlining of institutional local arrangements and interventions (at district and local levels). The pilot aims to bring all resilience initiatives under one single committee (at both district and local levels), so as to harmonize institutional activities as well as to better target the poor and vulnerable. A single registry of beneficiaries in these areas was also constructed. This registry allows beneficiaries to be linked to other livelihood enhancing programmes.

In response to questions posed by the participants, Mr Mwamlima clarified that Malawi does not have one fund. He also stated that although there is no coordination across districts under current arrangements, the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development Planning is focused on improving coordination at all levels. This ministry is also focused on strengthening the coherence between social protection and agriculture, primarily through the national social protection steering committee.

The discussion following Harry Mwamlima's presentation included questions regarding how to ensure that resources will be reinvested in the same area they were saved from. Participants from Zambia stated that this has failed to take place in their country, and that it has strained relationships between departments which has hindered inter-departmental coordination on programmes that have the potential to complement one another. Another central discussion point was how to rectify the issue of missing markets for agricultural products. According to Mr Mwamlima, this issue was largely due to the monopolistic nature of the agricultural input sector where, quite simply, the only fertilizer available to farmers was at a given price (which was exorbitant). There is therefore a need to develop a market for agricultural products.

Social protection in the policies and strategies of Mali

Mohamed Bassirou Traore (Government of Mali) gave a presentation on the social protection policies and strategies of Mali. First, there have been two major national health care reforms in 2008 which made provisions for mandatory medical and health cover for indigent populations or individuals lacking basic needs due to poverty and who account for 55 percent of the population. Only 22 percent of the targeted population are covered. The government is facing big challenges in improving coverage, especially in rural and isolated areas, and is working towards achieving total coverage by 2015.

The World Bank has also contributed a grant of \$70 million to assist the Malian government introduce the *Jigisémejiri* ("Tree of hope") emergency social safety net programme. This programme targets food-insecure households in Mali's Sikasso, Segou, Mopti, Koulikoro and Kayes regions and in the Bamako District. The *Jigisémejiri* programme provides 62 000 poor households with FCFA 10 000 (approximately \$20) monthly cash transfers for three years. The government has also established a Commission in the Office of the President to improve food security in Mali. There have been initiatives to improve food security by providing smallholder farmers access to quality agricultural inputs. This intervention aims to increase food production in Mali where 90 percent of all agricultural production is carried out by smallholder farmers, so that rural farming households are able to produce enough food or generate enough income to purchase food. Other strategies involve distributing animal feed to pastoralists in areas struck by famine, rebuilding grain bank inventories and community food reserves in vulnerable areas.

Mohamed Bassirou Traore also described how the Mali government – with the assistance of UNICEF and the World Bank – is consolidating data on beneficiaries of social grants. The overall objective is to have a central registry of the target population so as to better link these people to other beneficial programmes. For example, beneficiaries of food security interventions can be targeted for health care coverage. There is also a need to coordinate all programmes under a common intervention framework. This may require the establishment of a directorate that monitors the programmes being implemented in Mali.

What to look for when strengthening coherence

What are some of the policy and programme design and implementation features, institutional set-ups and political economy issues to look out for when strengthening coherence?

Improving coherence between social protection and agriculture- Maja Gavrilovic (FAO)

Maja Gavrilovic (FAO) gave a presentation on the lessons which are emerging from the FAO's work into strengthening the coherence between agriculture and social protection. The OECD defines policy coherence as "the systematic promotion of mutually reinforcing policy actions across government departments and agencies creating synergies towards achieving the agreed objectives". In this context, Maja Gavrilovic explained that the coherence between agriculture and social protection can be assessed across the following dimensions: (i) interdependent objectives: the objectives of one sector are unlikely to be achieved without the other; (ii) complementary roles: social protection programmes contribute to agricultural production outcomes and agricultural interventions boost incomes (e.g. PWPs and cash transfers contribute to livelihood promotion, especially when productive assets are purchased); (iii) integrated interventions (e.g. home-grown school feeding and integrated livelihoods programmes); and (iv) potential conflicts and trade-offs: land acquisition policies can exacerbate farmer's vulnerability to poverty.

Maja Gavrilovic added that synergies between programmes can occur even if they do not target the same population, especially if the instruments' functions overlap or the instruments simultaneously adopt multiple functions. Maja Gavrilovic expanded this point by stating that there need to be more systematic approaches to strengthening multi-sectoral coherence at policy and programme level. For example, agricultural interventions can boost household income, while social health insurance programmes reduce the likelihood of catastrophic health expenditures in these same households.³

What design and delivery features must be considered when seeking to strengthen coherence at programme level:

- Clarity and alignment of objectives
- Conditionalities and messaging
- Effective targeting
- Transfer size and type
- Regularity and predictability
- Timing of transfer
- Referral system
- Complaints and feedback mechanisms

Maja Gavrilovic also stated that although policy coherence is not essential, it allows for the opportunity to establish long-term political and economic support for the development of complementary policies. This should provide guidance to stakeholders designing and implementing coordinated programmes. It also creates an enabling environment for cross-sectoral coordination and integration, which should lead to the more efficient use of resources.

Maja Gavrilovic explained that different mandates and the institutional and political balance of power determine the extent to which there is high level coherence. At the programme level, the layering and sequencing of interventions in a particular way can maximize synergies between agriculture and

³ Another example offered by Maja Gavrilovic is that of asset transfers coupled with a social safety net. She also added that land redistribution has proved itself as a positive asset-transfer program because land ownership becomes a positive risk management tool.

social protection. The design and delivery modalities of programmes can also be used to strengthen coherence.

Maja Gavrilovic also highlighted factors that undermine coherence. These include programmes being overburdened by too many objectives, fragmented targeting leading to gaps in coverage and leakages of benefits and transfers not being aligned with the needs of beneficiaries. The lack of complementary goods and services or monitoring and evaluation (M & E) mechanisms which track the impact of programmes also weaken synergies. Maja Gavrilovic then highlighted how conflicts at the local level can weaken potential synergies. For example, households that are eligible for multiple programmes may only benefit from one programme because of notions of fairness at the community level.

Maja Gavrilovic concluded the presentation by explaining the importance of operational systems that improve coordination between programmes. This can involve multisectoral platforms (e.g. inter-ministerial committees) that monitor all programmes being implemented for coordination entry points. The implementation of M & E systems will support these ministries since these systems will gather information on how programmes interact. A unified digital registry of all programme beneficiaries, or of targeted populations, can also assist with synchronizing the targeting of programmes for the purpose of strengthening coherence. This registry will also reduce costs because instead of having every programme conduct its own separate targeting procedure, all the programmes will go through the same targeting phase (perhaps with slight adjustments as needed).

Group discussion: The priority issues to be addressed in strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection

Drawing from the issues discussed over the two days, participants were divided into four groups to deliberate on several questions. Below is a summary of the feedback received from the groups on key issues and questions.

Group 1: Policy

- 1. Reflecting on existing/upcoming regional and national frameworks/processes relevant to coherence between agriculture and social protection, what are the key challenges in ensuring that these policies support coherence, and what opportunities (at regional and country level) exist for strengthening this coherence?*

Participants identified the following challenges:

- There is inadequate evidence of synergies between social protection and agriculture. The lack of a strong evidence base makes it difficult to motivate in favour of policies that aim to strengthen coherence between the two sectors.
- Even though the return per dollar investment is high, social protection programmes are relatively expensive.
- The lack of national level strategies to strengthen coherence.
- The lack of platforms through which different sectors can establish shared objectives. These platforms can also be used to facilitate coordinated or complementary programmes.

Weak institutional arrangements for the strengthening of synergies often lead to sectors being driven by specialized mandates. This tends to result in sectors prioritizing their individual, rather than a shared, mandate. Participants identified the following opportunities:

- There is a global momentum and an emerging awareness of the productive impacts of social protection on agriculture.
 - The majority of African countries did not meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) targets. This provides an opportunity for a shift towards the Social Development Goals and also for strategies that require multisectoral interventions rather than silo-based interventions.
 - There is increased donor interest and support for strengthening coherence between social protection and agriculture.
 -
2. *What can be done to mobilize political support in favour of coherence between agriculture and social protection? In particular, how can we motivate a) ministries of agriculture to realize the importance of working with ministries of social welfare, and b) ministries of social welfare to realize the importance of working with ministries of agriculture?*
- The generation of an evidence base on the benefits of strengthening coherence between social protection and agriculture. This evidence can be disseminated to policy makers and can be used to show that coherence provides value for money.
 - Increased advocacy for strengthening coherence, especially connecting ministers with seasoned technocrats.
 - Having high-level political buy in at the regional level will make it easier to apply principles at country level, especially if there is support from development partners.
 - Engaging with the media in order to build popular support for strengthening coherence.
 - Create strategic alliances between various stakeholders to put pressure on the political leadership to identify and strengthen links between social protection and agriculture.
 - Engage directly with parliament and the treasury since these sectors have substantial influence on budget allocations.
3. *Reflecting on your country's experience, what else needs to be done at the policy level to support coherence between agriculture and social protection?*
- Zambia: There is a need for common platforms for information sharing.
 - Kenya: There needs to be more engagement with the Ministry of Finance at the early planning stages of any programme and with parliamentary committees.

Group 2: Programme design and implementation

1. *Briefly list existing programmes that contribute to strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection.*
- Malawi: There is a link between public works programmes and fishing, with PWP salaries being used to invest in fishing activities.
 - Zambia: Cash transfers are linked to agricultural production, with the Ministry of Agriculture being involved at the local level.
2. *Given the examples shared at this meeting, what are the key issues to address in programme design and implementation of social protection and agricultural programmes? Consider the role of political economy.*
- That households have varying needs and stakeholders therefore need to come together to decide on how to best provide for the vulnerable.
 - There needs to be more cross-sectoral coordination in the targeting of programme beneficiaries.

- There needs to be more capacity building within ministries to raise awareness of links between social protection and agriculture. This should cause a shift away from silo-based interventions and facilitate cross-sectoral strategies in achieving joint objectives.
- There needs to be an increase in south-to-south collaborations.
- The importance of coordinated payment schedules. For example, cash transfers provided during the planting season being used to invest in agricultural inputs.
- Institutional and administrative arrangements can strengthen coherence by facilitating the joint implementation of complementary programmes.
- Monitoring and Evaluation systems can be used to trace the impacts of programmes.
- The need to use existing working groups and committees, but with new guidelines that focus on improving coordination and strengthening coherence.

3. *Reflecting on your own country's experience, what are some of the challenges of design and implementation at the national and sub-national levels? What support is necessary at national and sub-national levels to ensure that synergies are operationalized at the programme design and implementation levels?*

- Lack of coordination: Development partners need to facilitate policy dialogue between ministries with conflicting policies.
- Donors have differing agendas: Donors and development partners need to have a unified voice in order to avoid creating conflicts at the country level.
- Competing for resources: Conflicts exist when different ministries compete for the same resources. This leads to a lack of coordination because ministries fear funds will be allocated to other ministry. Jointly designing social protection and agriculture policies for proper coordination should reduce this conflict.
- Lack of knowledge: Set up informal settings to disseminate information to the various stakeholders on existing and potential linkages between social protection and agriculture, including various ways to strengthen these links.

Group 3: Institutional arrangements

1. *Reflecting on your country's experience, who are the key players and how can they be made part of the process? What are some of the key institutional arrangements for them to be able to collaborate more closely? Consider the role of political economy.*

The group members were from Ghana, Kenya and Lesotho. These participants stated that there is a need for one leading agency or department that coordinates all social protection programmes. At this time there are different departments providing social protection which makes it difficult to have coordinated strategies or effectively promote synergies.

2. *What incentives can be put in place to encourage interministerial collaboration?*

In Ghana, all ministries implementing programmes have to report to a common committee, whereas in Kenya each ministry's mandate is drawn from a core mandate which reduces likelihood for interministerial conflicts. In South Africa, clear performance requirements for each ministry diminish the likelihood of conflicts occurring.

3. *What are some of the key steps necessary to ensure grassroots engagement in building synergies between social protection and agriculture?*

- Community level sensitization to social protection and agriculture links.
- Strong community level arrangements.

4. *What support is necessary to facilitate these processes?*

- Knowledge building.

- Promoting coordination at national and local levels.
- Gaining political support for coordination.
- Having technocrats engaging with the policy development and programme design process.
- Developing alliances between key ministries, especially the ministry of finance.
- Formation of a committee to promote synergies.

Group 4: Francophone countries

1. What are the policy formulation, programme design and implementation opportunities and challenges for strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection?

The participants identified the following opportunities:

- There needs to be an increased commitment to strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection.
- More organized networks need to be developed.

The participants identified the following challenges:

- Low level of ownership in designing social protection programmes.
- Low technical and financial knowledge on how to design and implement social protection programmes that are well-designed and properly implemented.

2. Identify key entry points for building synergies (use country examples).

- Extend consultative framework to civil society. This should ensure that resolutions go beyond national structures into regional levels.
- Build capacity at the national and local level. This should foster policy and programme coherence at the national and regional levels.

3. Identify concrete measures to enhance synergy between social protection and agriculture at the policy formulation, programme design and implementation stages, and institutional arrangements.

- Develop a single national register of beneficiaries for better targeting.
- Develop cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms, with adequate evaluation mechanisms.
- Develop a strategy for increasing awareness and improving stakeholders' understanding of synergies between social protection and agriculture. This should improve ownership of programmes.
- Harmonize objectives across the different sectors.

Closing remarks: Priority issues to address in moving forward

Comments from experts

Jonathan Kydd (Independent expert) spoke about the importance of soil health, and how input subsidies and cash transfers could be conditioned on measures that improve soil health. He stated that in Latin America most of the returns from agricultural policies accrue to better-off groups owing to leakages and subversions. This presents an opportunity for social protection programmes since they reach the poor more effectively and are less susceptible to leakages. Mr Kydd also spoke about the importance of information (on eligible beneficiaries) to the development of programmes that target the poor. The poor are not a homogeneous group. There is growing inequality among the poor with some growing poorer while others become less so. Therefore, it is important to think about how agricultural and social protection policies are contributing to these inequalities. For example, if the Malawi fertilizer subsidies programme is abandoned there are a significant number of smallholder farmers who will not be able to access fertilizer. This may lead to land being transferred into the hands of farmers who are “better-off” and who can cultivate the land more productively.

Duncan David Samikwa (SADC) stated that this meeting could not have come at a better time given that SADC's new agricultural policy recognizes the importance of social protection in agriculture. This year SADC focused on regional food security and identified social protection as one of the strategies that can be used to improve livelihoods and well-being. A number of policies and strategies which have social protection programmes explicitly included within them have been approved, and are now moving towards programming and implementation. There is, therefore, the opportunity to collaborate in ensuring that social protection is concretely included in these programmes.

Mariam Sow Soumare (NEPAD) stated that Africa has one of the highest growth rates but is also becoming the continent with the highest level of inequality. She went on to state that Africa faces many challenges, ranging from food insecurity and malnutrition to high youth unemployment. In addition, producers are not benefiting from high food prices; instead, intermediaries in the value chain are those who are accruing high returns. Thus there is a need for policies and programmes that engender inclusiveness and greater equity. It is also important to strengthen cross-sectoral linkages between programmes, given the complexity of the developmental challenges. Coherence between agriculture and social protection presents opportunities for innovative ideas and instruments. However, any programme that is implemented must be embedded with a monitoring and evaluation (M & E) system that at minimum ensures that the programme is doing more good than harm. Mariam Sow Soumare concluded by stating that many old policies are still valid, especially if combined with measures and policies that are appropriate in the given context.

Laila Lokosang (AU) explained that heads of state of member countries of the African Union have recognized the need to achieve greater coherence between agriculture and social protection, as can be seen from the June 2014 Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods. As a way forward, Laila Lokosang recommended constructing a conceptual framework and a strategy for strengthening coherence between social protection and agriculture. These frameworks need to be underscored by a shift from buffering against vulnerability to building resilience. She also called for new partnerships to be built between private sector organizations, regional bodies, developmental partners and governments for the purpose of building strong links. These partnerships can then evolve into joint action groups and the FAO can

continue being the facilitator and moderator. Finally, Laila Lokosang referred to the Africa Solidarity Trust Fund (ASTF), which mobilizes resources from African countries to fund projects in Africa, and stated that the ASTF can be used to fund projects concerning social protection and agriculture links.

Natalia Winder Rossi (UNICEF) called for more engagement across different sectors and countries to build evidence on the linkages between social protection and agriculture, and to understand how to translate these linkages into policies. She went on to state that although social protection has multiple cross-sectoral impacts it will not unilaterally solve problems. Households and individuals have multiple vulnerabilities which mean that a comprehensive package of interventions is required. It is also important to not focus on one outcome but, rather, different sectors should work towards the common goal from different perspectives. Natalia Winder Rossi identified a research gap in the added value of integrating various instruments. This is not an easy task because it will require discussions on framework, methodological approaches and working through any methodological issues that emerge.

Marco Knowles (FAO) thanked participants for two days of extremely rich discussions. He told participants that FAO has noted the recommendations for follow-up identified by participants, which converge around four main areas: (i) knowledge generation; (ii) awareness raising; (iii) capacity support; and (iv) developing alliances. FAO, together with the African Institute for Health and Development (AIHD), the Africa Platform for Social Protection (APSP), the African Union (AU), the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD), UNICEF, the World Food Programme (WFP) and the World Bank, is a member of the Agriculture and Social Protection in Africa Technical Reference Group. This group is already working on some of the recommended follow-up actions such as guidance material on how to go an about strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection.

Annex - List of workshop participants

Angola

Mr Goncalves Jose Rodrigues
Agricultural Engineer
Ministry of Agricultural Development
(MINAGRI)
E-mail: kinda45@hotmail.com
Tel 1: +244 91 491 4864
Tel 2: +244 93 063 9821

Belgium

Mr Fabio Veras Soares
IPC Research Coordinator
UNDP, IPC
E-mail: fabio.veras@ipc-undp.org
Tel 1: +32 424 678 343

Botswana

Mr Duncan David Samikwa
Coordinator RVAA
SADC Secretariat
E-mail: dsamikwa@sadc.int
Tel 1: +267 318 7324
Tel 2: +267 72 112 031

Burkina Faso

Mr Pale Remy
Chargé d'études Secretariat Permanent
Coordination Politiques Agricoles
Ministère de l'Agricole
E-mail: remy390@yahoo.fr
Tel 1: +226 78 395 088
Tel 2: +226 70 052 840

Mr Diallo Soabou
Directeur de la planification stratégique et
sectorielle
E-mail: dsobou@yahoo.fr
Tel 1: +226 70 296 460

Ethiopia

Mr Laila Lokosang
African Union
E-mail 1: lblokosang@gmail.com
Email 2: Lokosangl@africa-union.org

Ghana

Mr Richard Akuetteh Adjetey
SSDO-SP
Ministry of Gender, Children and Social
Protection
E-mail: richmedadjetey@gmail.com
Tel 1: + 233 24 680 2133

Kenya

Dr Mary Amuyunzu-Nyamongo
Executive Director
AIHD
E-mail: mnyamongo@aihrint.org
Tel 1: +254 722 850 401
Tel 2: +254 733 366 229

Ms Rose Marienga
Regional Manager
Ministry of Labour Social Security and Services
E-mail: marieng.r@nssfkenya.co.ke
Tel 1: +254 73 656 0696
Tel 2: +254 02 272 9911

Ms Esther Ndirangu
Deputy Chief Economist
Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Services
E-mail: endirangu84@yahoo.com
Tel 1: +254 72 258 8557
Tel 2: +254 27 279 804

Mr Edmond Odaba
Programme Manager
African Platform for Social Protection
E-mail: edmondodaba@gmail.com
Tel 1: +254 722 961 963

Mr David Ombalo Otieno
Principal Agricultural Officer
Ministry of Agriculture Livestock & Fisheries
E-mail: dombalo@yahoo.com
Tel 1: +254 71 117 0726
Tel 2: +254 20 271 8870

Ms Natalia Winder Rossi
Senior Social Protection Advisor
UNICEF/ESARO
E-mail: newinderrossi@unicef.org
Tel 1: +254 715 833 714

Italy

Ms Giulia Calcagnini
Policy and Programme Officer
FAO
E-mail: Giulia.Calcagnini@fao.org

Mr Vito Cistulli
Senior Policy Officer
FAO
E-mail: vito.cistulli@fao.org
Tel 1: +39 065 705 3132

Ms Cecilia Costella
Policy Programme Officer
World Food Programme
E-mail: cecilia.costella@wfp.org

Mr Benjamin Davis
Deputy Director
FAO
E-mail: benjamin.davis@fao.org
Tel 1: +39 345 033 8983

Mr Marco Knowles
Economist, Policy and Institutions
FAO
E-mail: Marco.Knowles@fao.org
Tel 1: +39 340 920 1369
Tel 2: +39 065 705 4108

Lesotho

Mr Sekitlane Cosmos Mokone
Senior Economist
Department of Policy and Strategic Planning
E-mail: scmokone@gmail.com
Tel 1: +266 62 502 709

Ms Mathoriso Molumeli
Director
Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
E-mail: mathorisomm@gmail.com
Tel 1: +266 57 879 110
Tel 2: +266 22 316 391

Mr Itumeleng Mosala
Senior Economic Planner
Ministry of Social Development
E-mail: Mosalagp23@gmail.com
Tel 1: +266 58 706 178

Malawi

Mr Osmund Hussein Chapotoka
District Agriculture Development Officer
Ministry of Agriculture
E-mail: osmundhc@gmail.com
Tel 1: +265 999 766 739
Tel 2: +265 884 050 825

Mr Benson Laurent Kansinjiro
Social Welfare Officer
Ministry of Gender, Children, Disability and
Social Welfare
E-mail: laurentkansinjiro@gmail.com
Tel 1: +265 993 811 380

Ms Maja Gavrilovic
Social Protection Consultant
FAO
E-mail: maja.gavrilovic@fao.org
Tel 1: +39 331 163 1771

Ms Susan Kaaria
Senior Gender Officer
FAO
E-mail: susan.kaaria@fao.org
Tel 1: +39 327 464 8182

Ms Sarah Kohnstamm
Programme Officer
World Food Programme
E-mail: sarah.kohnstamm@wfp.org

Rwanda

Ms Attaher Maiga
FAO Representative
FAO
E-mail: attaher.maiga@fao.org
Tel 1: +250 788 305 747
Tel 2: +250 252 58 3735

Senegal

Ms Maguette Ndiaye Diop
Chaife de Programme
Ministère de l'Économie, des Finances et du Plan
E-mail: maguetten@yahoo.fr
Tel 1: +221 338 23 7092
Tel 2: +221 77 553 0465

Mr Mouhamadou Moustapha Fall
Deputy Director General
Compagnie Nationale d'Assurance
Agricole du Senegal (CNAAS)
E-mail: moustapha.fall@cnaas.sn
Tel 1: +221 33 869 7800 /7803
Tel 2: + 221 77 665 8814

Mr Harry Mwamlima
Director – Poverty Reduction & Social Protection
Ministry of Economic Planning and Development
E-mail: mwamlimaharry@yahoo.co.uk
Tel 1: +265 88 885 9013
Tel 2: +265 178 8888

Mali

Mr Mohamed Bassirou Traore
Directeur de la Protection Sociale
et de l'Économie Solidaire
Ministère de la Solidarité de l'Action
Humanitaire et de la Reconstruction du Nord
E-mail: traormbt@yahoo.fr
Tel 1: +223 20 228 520
Tel 2: +223 66 785 874

Mr Alpha Oumar Kergna
Reseacher/Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture
E-mail: akergna@yahoo.fr
Tel 1: +223 76 356 748

South Africa

Mr Zibusiso Dlamini
Department of Agriculture
E-mail: zibusisod@daff.gov.za
Tel 1: +27 82 921 9382

Mr Michael Samson
Director of Research
EPRI
E-mail: msamson@epri.org.za
Tel 1: +27 21 671 3301

Mr Stephen Devereux
Fellow
IDS
E-mail: S.Devereux@ids.ac.uk
Tel 1: +27 72 317 2639

Mr Omar Seck
Conseiller Technique
Ministère de l'Agriculture de l'Équipement
Rurale
E-mail: bayoucolle@gmail.com
Tel 1: +221 77 685 7649

Mr Cuthbert Kambanje
Consultant
FAO
E-mail: cuthbert.kambanje@fao.org
Tel 1: +27 78 427 2975

Mr Amadou Fall Canar Diop
Conseiller Technique
Delegation General à la Protection Sociale et à la
Solidarité
E-mail: afcdiop@gmail.com
Tel 1: +221 77 589 6363
Tel 2: +221 77 685 4649

Mr Lot Mlati
Assistant FAO Representative
E-mail: lot.mlati@fao.org
Tel 1: +27 82 453 3199
Tel 2: +27 12 354 8528

United Kingdom
Mr Johnathan Kydd
Director
Broadstone Economics
E-mail: j.kydd@broadstone-economics.co.uk
Tel 1: +44 79 589 15504
Tel 2: +44 12 337 12431

Dr Nadia Goodman
International Consultant
WSP Brazil Centre of Excellence
Against Hunger
E-mail: nadia.goodman@wfp.org

Zambia
Mr Cosmore Mwaanga
Chief Policy Analyst
Ministry of Agriculture
E-mail: cbbmwaanga@yahoo.com
Tel 1: +260 97 721 1735
Tel 2: +260 21 125 0532

Ms Mariam Sow Soumare
NEPAD Principal Officer
E-mail: mariams@nepad.org
Tel 1: +27 82 553 6518
Tel 2: +27 11 075 5017

Mr Manzunzo Zulu
Senior Social Welfare Officer
Ministry of Community, Development, Mother
and Child Health
E-mail: manzunzo@yahoo.co.uk
Tel 1: +260 97 675 835
Tel 2: +260 21 123 5342

Mr Mokutule Kgoboko
Deputy Director General
Department of Agriculture Forestry/Fisheries
E-mail: mokutulekgoboko@daff.gov.za
Tel 1: +27 72 471 2046
Tel 2: +27 12 319 6168

Mr George Okech
FAO
E-mail: george.okech@fao.org
Tel 1: +260 975 533 547

Mr Siphon Innocent Ntombela
Deputy Director General
Department of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries
E-mail: ntombelas@daff.gov.za
Tel 1: +27 82 886 7790
Tel 2: +27 12 319 7225

Zimbabwe

Mr Laxon Chinhengo
Deputy Director for Policy and Planning
Ministry of Public Service, Labour, and Social
Welfare

E-mail 1: lchinhengo@zimnapovc.co.zw

E-mail 2: munyachinhengo@yahoo.com

Tel 1: +263 775 669 797

Tel 2: +263 4 794 564

Mr Kumbirai Blessing Nvamwena
Principal Agricultural Economist
Ministry of Agriculture

E-mail 1: kbyamwena@gmail.com

E-mail 2: nyamwenak@moa.gov.zw

Tel 1: +263 77 282 7125

Tel 2: +263 479 0358

Mr Luis Frota
Social Protection Specialist
ILO
E-mail: frotal@ilo.org
Tel 1: +27 73 859 7353