

***Michigan State University  
 In partnership with the  
 International Food Policy Research Institute***

**Feed the Future Nigeria Agricultural Policy Project**

Associate Cooperative Agreement Number AID-620-LA-15-00001

**Year 2 Work Plan**

October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017

September 1, 2016

Resubmitted: October 12, 2016

<b>MSU Principal Investigator</b>	Dr. Saweda Liverpool-Tasie	<b>IFPRI Chief of Party</b>	Dr. George Mavrotas
<b>Email:</b>	lliverp@anr.msu.edu	<b>Email:</b>	g.mavrotas@cgiar.org
<b>Telephone:</b>	+001-517-432-5418	<b>Telephone:</b>	+234-8174814233

## Table of Contents

LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	4
PROGRAM COMPONENTS.....	5
Goals and objectives.....	5
Technical approach.....	6
WORK COMPONENTS.....	8
1. A Strategy for Enhancing National Agriculture and Food Security Policy Capacity.....	8
<b>Introduction</b> .....	8
Component 1: Summary of Year 1 Accomplishments: A Strategy for Enhancing National Agriculture and Food Security Policy Capacity.....	9
Component 1: Proposed Year 2 Activities: A Strategy for Enhancing National Agriculture and Food Security Policy Capacity.....	12
2. Policy driven collaborative research and analysis.....	15
<b>Introduction</b> .....	15
Component 2: Summary of Year 1 Accomplishments: Policy driven collaborative research and analysis.....	16
3. Strengthening evidence-based policy process and promoting impact.....	32
<b>Introduction</b> .....	32
Component 3: Summary of Year 1 Accomplishments: Strengthening evidence-based policy process and promoting impact.....	34
Component 3: Proposed Year 2 Activities: Strengthening evidence-based policy process and promoting impact.....	38
4. Program Management.....	41
<b>Introduction</b> .....	41
Program Management. Summary of Year 1 Accomplishments.....	42
Program Management. Proposed Year 2 Activities.....	44
Table 1: Summary Year 2 Work Calendar.....	46
Appendix B: Year 2 Indicators and Estimated Targets.....	56
Appendix C: Description of Year 2 policy driven collaborative research and analysis activities.....	58
Appendix D: Budget, inclusive of sub-award to IFPRI, USD.....	65
Appendix E: IFPRI Budget, USD.....	66
APPENDIX F.....	67

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

ABU	Ahmadu Bello University
ADWG	Agriculture Sector Donor Working Group
AFRE	MSU's Department of Agricultural, Food and Resource Economics
APRNet	Agricultural Policy Research Network
ARCN	Agriculture Research Council of Nigeria
ATA	Nigerian Agriculture Transformation Agenda
CAADP	Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Program
FGN	Federal Government of Nigeria
FMARD	Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
FSP	Food Security Policy Project
FtF	Feed the Future
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
MEP	Monitoring Evaluation Plan
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSU	Michigan State University
NGOS	Non-Governmental Organizations
NSSP	Nigeria Strategy Support Program
Re-NAPRI	Regional Network of Agricultural Policy Research Institutes of East and Southern Africa
ReSAKSS	Africa's Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System
STATA	Data Analysis and Statistical Software for Professionals
TBC/D	To be confirmed/determined
UI	University of Ibadan
UP	University of Pretoria

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

USAID's Feed the Future activities facilitate the attainment of the goals under the Nigerian Agriculture Transformation Agenda (ATA), and more recently the Agriculture Promotion Policy (APP) roadmap document released by FMARD in July 2016. In order to achieve the outcomes outlined in these strategies there is a need for the FGN, Nigerian institutions, and other key stakeholders in the policy process to:

- **Strengthen Information and Knowledge Management Systems:** Generate adequate data to inform policy dialogue, formulation and implementation. As research generates knowledge which is necessary for policy formulation, the challenge is for national institutions to determine and develop organizational practices, principles, and approaches on how knowledge can be created, harnessed, shared, tracked, and distributed among government agencies, research communities, and the public.
- **Identify and fill key knowledge gaps:** Nigeria's agriculture is predominantly a small-holder activity and therefore suffers from many constraints such as limited use of improved technologies for production, processing, storage, and transportation. These constraints are exacerbated and compounded in the Nigerian context by the extensive ecological diversity, which generates substantial knowledge gaps in production processes and marketing outlets.
- **Strengthen strategic planning through promoting participation:** A planning process requires the formulation of strategies, which involve a time-bound prioritization and selectivity, with the participation of all stakeholders. Stakeholders in Nigerian agriculture have expressed frustration with the lack of adequate consultation on the process determining what is to be done and in the making of strategic choices.
- **Build networks:** Investigate options for creating linkages among key stakeholders. A multi-disciplinary approach is necessary to address the production, processing and marketing constraints.

The project is implemented by Michigan State University (MSU) in partnership with the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). The Associate Cooperative Agreement between USAID/Nigeria and MSU was finalized on June 24, 2015. The five year project runs from July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2020. The budget over the life of the project is US\$ 12.5 million.

The major expected outcomes of the project, categorized by objective, are:

1. Strengthened national capacity for greater evidence based policy processes in agriculture exhibited by increased capacity of Nigerian analysts to undertake and make widely available relevant evidence-based policy analysis.
2. An informed policy dialogue promoted and fostered among all stakeholders in the agricultural sector by means of an inclusive, transparent, and sustainable process at the country level, building blocks for a well-integrated and developed national policy system.
3. Improved federal and state governments' ability to plan and implement effective policy analyses and programs, as well as improved demand to absorb policy research in their policy process.

## PROGRAM COMPONENTS

### Goals and objectives

Successful implementation of any government policy (such as the Agricultural Transformation Agenda (ATA)) and more recently the Agriculture Promotion Policy (APP)) requires credible evidence in monitoring progress and in revising approaches as priorities shift with changing policy concerns on emerging issues. This means having sufficient national capacity to conduct policy analysis and research to fill key knowledge gaps. It also requires a demand for such research (by policy makers) to inform the national policy process and to improve the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the policies. Nigerian agriculture policy-making has evolved and capacity to make and implement policy has improved over time. However, shortfalls in human and institutional capacity remain and have the potential to undermine the efforts of the ministry in implementing their policies and programs. For example, an IFPRI-Africa Lead report in 2012 revealed a number of important challenges regarding the overall implementation process for ATA. These challenges are related to large capacity gaps at the institutional, organizational and individual levels. These gaps need to be filled if any national policy geared towards increased productivity, value addition, food security and poverty reduction, is to be successfully implemented.

Since the introduction of the ATA in 2010/2011, there has been increased demand from FMARD and its stakeholders for greater policy research and capacity training as Nigeria seeks to accelerate its agricultural transformation. With increased recognition of agriculture's importance in 2015 and 2016 (associated with growing demographic pressure, further food security concerns and falling oil prices) and more recently with the Agriculture Promotion Policy roadmap of the Buhari Administration, this increased demand is expected to continue. One key reason to readjust Nigeria's agricultural policy according to the APP is that the country is not food secure. Wastage levels remain high in production areas reducing supply of feedstock to processing factories, requiring them to keep importing supplies. The net effect is limited job growth across the agricultural value chain from input production to market systems as well as continued misuse of foreign currency to import vast quantities of food. Moreover, other African countries seek to learn from Nigeria's policy innovations and practices. The proposed activities will ensure that IFPRI, MSU and their Nigerian partners are equipped to respond effectively in a timely manner, to the added demands. In the process, they will ensure that all partners meet the growing expectations of the positive role that national and international research can play in supporting the capacity, knowledge and information needs of FMARD and other key stakeholders involved in agricultural policy in Nigeria. More specifically, it will focus on three integrated objectives as follows:

**OBJECTIVE 1:** To strengthen the **national capacity** for greater evidence based policy processes in agriculture by increasing the capacity of Nigerian analysts to undertake and make widely available relevant evidence-based policy analysis.

**OBJECTIVE 2:** To promote and foster informed **policy dialogue** among all stakeholders in the agricultural sector through an inclusive, transparent, and sustainable process at the country level, building blocks for a well-integrated and developed national policy system.

**OBJECTIVE 3:** To help federal and state governments improve their **capacities to plan and implement** effective policy analyses and programs, and demand and absorb policy research in their policy process.

### Technical approach

FSP is a well-established international consortium with objectives that are entirely consistent with the proposed approach of Feed the Future Nigeria Agricultural Policy Project. Second, the FSP consortium combines the strengths of three reputable research and academic institutions: Michigan State University (MSU), the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), and the University of Pretoria (UP). Thirdly, the FSP consortium is able to leverage on IFPRI's experience with implementing the Nigeria Strategy Support Program (NSSP) over the past eight years (2007-2014). Doing so will help assure continuity and trust among local stakeholders and partners while further enriching the past efforts to increase national capacities for generating and informing future agricultural and food security policies. Together, the three institutions and their extensive research and alumni partner networks in Nigeria and across countries in several continents, bring depth and breadth to evidence-based and inclusive approaches for national capacity building and improved policy formulation and implementation.

From the time of its inception, the NSSP was fairly successful in achieving many of its objectives. Over its eight years in Nigeria, NSSP has responded to changing priorities and new demands for research and capacity support. However, this was not without difficulties. The most difficult challenge has been the absence of a functional policy analysis or technical unit within FMARD. This absence has contributed to the insufficient capacity of the ministry to absorb the research and technical outputs of local researchers and NSSP, as well as, in articulating its specific knowledge gaps and information needs. Despite being a long recognized problem among all partners involved (FMARD, the donor community, IFPRI, Nigerian universities and think tanks) little has been done to address this challenge. Additionally, there are weak links between local knowledge generators (e.g. universities and research think tanks) with demand among policy makers more generally, and with FMARD in particular. This in turn has made it exceptionally challenging for programs such as the NSSP to establish strong technical ties with ministry personnel in order to strengthen FMARD's own internal capacity for evidence-based policy making. As a result, the policy process and implementation of FMARD's ATA strategy during the last few years has often lacked access to timely information and evidence being generated by policy research.

The FSP consortium builds on decades of experience in increasing national capacity through working with national research institutes, government ministries and institutions of higher learning across sub Saharan Africa. For example, MSU's Department of Agricultural, Food and Resource Economics (AFRE) is known for its applied research and capacity building, with a focus on African agricultural and food system development, food security and related food system policy. In the last 15 years, the Department's faculty has engaged in collaborative research, policy dialogue, and capacity building throughout Africa, including projects in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. These projects have established a strong track record of working successfully with partners including government ministries and policy makers.

In all these activities, MSU has demonstrated the ability to provide sustained capacity-building support for the institutions it has worked with. In most of its work with National agricultural policy institutes in East and Southern Africa, MSU has strengthened the capacity of researchers and leveraged on their links with African public universities. These national policy research institutes are locally managed, have local executive boards drawn from local private and public sector stakeholder organizations, and are organized to provide policy-relevant analysis for all stakeholders.

In addition to these country-level programs, MSU has recently initiated the development of a regional network of national research organizations through the Regional Network of Agricultural Policy Research Institutes of East and Southern Africa (ReNAPRI). Consequently, FEED THE FUTURE NIGERIA AGRICULTURAL POLICY PROJECT can leverage MSU's experience with building networks among stakeholders at a national and regional level as it works in Nigeria. FEED THE FUTURE NIGERIA AGRICULTURAL POLICY PROJECT can equally leverage MSU's experience coordinating training and research activities across various stakeholders in its work with National agriculture research institutes in Nigeria, the ministry of agriculture and various institutions of higher learning.

IFPRI has a long history of undertaking policy research and capacity strengthening activities in Africa, as well as expanding its reach by engaging with local research institutions, organizations, and policy making bodies. For example, IFPRI's reach on the continent has included the establishment of two regional offices in Africa – in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia and Dakar, Senegal – as well as several country strategy support programs in Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria and Malawi. Locating research staff in all these countries has been a key part of IFPRI's capacity strengthening strategy to enable local knowledge providers including policy analysts to help inform and shape agricultural development priorities for policy impact. IFPRI's facilitation of the ReSAKSS program ([www.resakss.org](http://www.resakss.org)) and the AGRODEP ([www.agrodep.org](http://www.agrodep.org)) in support of CAADP are just two examples of this type of engagement at the regional level. Even more importantly, the presence of IFPRI's NSSP program in Nigeria will allow the consortium to build on the programs' own lessons with conducting evidence-based policy research and capacity building in support of the country's committed goals under the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Program (CAADP) of the Africa Union, and more recently, the country's ATA framework.

An IFPRI in-country team led by Dr. George Mavrotas and an MSU campus based team led by Dr. Saweda Liverpool-Tasie will bring the strengths of both of these institutions to work on this project.

## WORK COMPONENTS

The work that will be done is described here, organized according to the three project objectives noted above for project Year 2 (October 2016 through September 2017).

### 1. A Strategy for Enhancing National Agriculture and Food Security Policy Capacity

#### Introduction

The Feed the Future Nigeria Agricultural Policy Project is a robust approach enhancing skills, training, and institutional capacities to meet the demands for policy analysis by FMARD and the national food security and agricultural policy process. In order to achieve this, the project engages in training collaborations with FMARD, academic institutions and other key stakeholders. It strives to strengthen the links between various actors and to foster the development of a network of institutions that can independently interact during the policy process.

During the first year of project implementation, significant progress was made to build the fundamentals for such an approach at the federal and the state level and in connection with various stakeholders in academic universities. This was despite the publicity embargo during most of Year 1, and substantial delays within the Ministry regarding senior management appointments incl. the key senior advisors to HMA. A National Advisory Committee for the project was established and various project activities proposed under this component in the work plan for year 1 were successfully implemented. Table 1 provides a summary of these activities while Appendix A presents the project's performance in terms of targets achieved building on the lessons learned from Year 1, the project now is well positioned to pursue its activities for Year 2 (following recent removal of the publicity embargo by USAID) to further benefit key beneficiaries of the project, namely FMARD, state ministries of agriculture, and the broad network of all those involved in agricultural research and its policy implementation in the country. NAPP intends in Year 2 to further strengthen its existing interactions with several state ministries of agriculture while broadening its interactions with other State Ministries of Agriculture. Concerning workshops and seminars organized, the project makes a great effort to ensure a proper representation from diverse stakeholders in the agricultural sector. The project also places great emphasis on government participation in such events. Representation by government in such events ensures that information is delivered firsthand to key personnel in the government who are likely to share lessons learned with the rest of their colleagues. Additionally, the project shares with the Ministry and other stakeholders, key reports and presentation materials as they are available. This section focuses on the activities geared around establishment and effective engagement of an advisory committee towards achieving the project's objectives. It also discusses activities centered around stakeholder consultation meetings and dissemination/outreach.

Component 1: Summary of Year 1 Accomplishments: A Strategy for Enhancing National Agriculture and Food Security Policy Capacity<sup>1</sup>

	Milestones/Benchmarks	Year 1 targets	Achieved Numbers	Deviation +- %	Notes/ Comments	Lessons Learned
<b>Activity 1.1: Formation and operation of Advisory Committee</b>						
	1.1.1 Meeting with USAID with regards to setting up advisory committee	1	1	0%		
	1.1.2 Invite potential members to serve on the advisory committee	1	1	0%		
	1.1.3 First advisory committee meeting to set the stage for the project	1	0	-100%	Due to the cancellation of the launch and the publicity embargo by USAID, the advisory committee, though constituted could not be inaugurated before the draft work plan was developed. Inauguration is planned for September 27 and the committee will meet before the end of year 1	
	1.1.4 Annual Advisory committee meetings	1	0	-100%	Same comment for 1.1.3	
<b>Activity 1.2: Stakeholder consultation meetings</b>						

<sup>1</sup> Please note that the table of accomplishment does not include accomplishments related to activities in quarter 4 of year 1. Relevant information is currently being processed towards the preparation of quarter 4 of year 1 report/year1 annual report.

1.2.1 Program Launch meeting	1	0	-100%	This was cancelled because of the delay in getting the publicity ban by USAID on the project lifted	
1.2.2 Meeting with various stakeholders in the policy process- (APRNet)	4	4	0%		These interactions have been positive and useful in enhancing APRNet's capacity for promoting research for evidence-based agriculture and rural development policies in Nigeria
1.2.3 Identify associations that would enable project to reach more broadly the Ag. Econ community in Nigeria e.g. Nigerian Ag Economics Association	1	1	0%	Interactions with the Nigerian Ag Econ association have been positive and we hope to work more with them in the future. The Feed the Future Nigeria Agricultural Policy Project will be hosting a session at the association's annual conference in Owerri in October, 2016	
1.2.4 Meeting with various stakeholders in the policy process- Agriculture Research Council of Nigeria (ARCN)	4	4	0%		
1.2.5 Meeting with various stakeholders in the policy process identified during the course of the project (ADWG)	6	5	-17%	On track. One further meeting is scheduled before end of year 1 on September 21, 2016	
1.2.6 Attend stakeholders' meetings (these include ABU, UI, FMARD, APRNet, ARCN, ADWG among others)	At least 10	71	+610	The project management team has been very proactive in networking with various key stakeholders (despite the publicity embargo) and this resulted in substantially more meetings than expected ex ante.	

<b>Activity 1.3: Dissemination/ Outreach</b>					
1.3.1 Large project dissemination activity and conference	1	1	0%	This activity is on course and scheduled for September 2016, before year 1 of the project ends.	
1.3.2 smaller project dissemination activities	8 to 10	12	+20%	The project managed to do very well on that front too (see seminars organized), thus exceeding the initial target for the year.	
1.3.3 Interaction with the press	6	0	-100%	The projects publicity embargo was lifted end of June 2016 and the project scheduled to launch on 27 September 2016. The activity will highly involve the press. More press activities to follow once the program has been officially launched.	

Component 1: Proposed Year 2 Activities: A Strategy for Enhancing National Agriculture and Food Security Policy Capacity

	Milestones/Benchmarks	Lead (MSU/IFPRI)	Sites/ location	Dates	Year 2 performance targets	Outputs/ outcomes	Matching indicators
<b>Activity 1.1: Operation of Advisory Committee</b>							
	1.1.1 Advisory committee meeting to discuss the project	MSU/IFPRI	Abuja/Virtual	Throughout the year (January 2017 and June 2017)	2	Promoting stakeholder consultation in the project and improving likelihood of program buy in and success	NA
<b>Activity 1.2: Stakeholder consultation meetings</b>							
	1.2.1 Meeting with various stakeholders in the policy process- (APRNet)	IFPRI/MSU	Various locations, Nigeria	Quarterly	4	Promoting stakeholder consultation in the project and improving likelihood of program buy in and success	NA
	1.2.2 Engage with associations that would enable project to reach more broadly the Ag. Econ community in Nigeria e.g. Nigerian Ag Economics Association	IFPRI/MSU	Various locations, Nigeria	October/November 2016	1		NA
	1.2.3 Meeting with various stakeholders in the policy process- Agriculture Research Council of Nigeria (ARCN)	IFPRI/MSU	Abuja	Quarterly	4		NA
	1.2.4 Meeting with various stakeholders in the policy process identified during the course of the project (ADWG)	IFPRI/MSU	Various locations, Nigeria	6 times per year (see ADWG meetings)	6		NA

				- November, Jan., March, May, July September)			
1.2.5 Attend stakeholders' meetings (these include ABU, UI, FMARD, APRNet, ARCN, ADWG among others)	IFPRI	Nigeria, various locations	Quarterly	40			NA
1.2.6 Stakeholder consultations	IFPRI	Nigeria, various locations	Yearly	1			NA
<b>Activity 1.3: Dissemination/ Outreach</b>							
1.3.1 smaller project dissemination activities	IFPRI	Abuja or city where collaborating universities are	2016/2017	10	PARTICIPANT LIST AND INFORMATION/outreach, policy dialogue, dissemination of research findings and best practices, evidence based policy recommendations by Nigerian researchers, student demonstration of learning		1) Number of policy research and best practice papers generated 2) Number of stakeholder learning forums held where findings/best practices are presented
1.3.2 Interaction with the press	IFPRI	NA	Every 2 months	6	NEWSPAPER ARTICLE OR NEWS RECORDING/promoting stakeholder consultation in the project and improving likelihood of program buy in and success, outreach, policy dialogue, dissemination of research findings and best practices, evidence based policy recommendations by		2) Number of stakeholder learning forums held where findings/best practices are presented

					Nigerian researchers, student demonstration of learning	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

## 2. Policy driven collaborative research and analysis.

### Introduction

The policy driven collaborative research and analysis component directly supports the knowledge needs of the policy process and is sub-divided into two sub-components: a research and a policy analysis component. The research component involves research teams composed of NAPP researchers and Nigerian researchers, with a keen focus on young Nigerian scholars. Priority topics are identified in consultation with FMARD, state ministries of agriculture, development partners, and other key stakeholders. These researchers and their networks are expected to be called upon to inform policy debates with empirical evidence as they increase interaction between the supply of information (Nigerian researchers) and the demand for information (FMARD and other stakeholders). At least 10 policy stakeholder-learning forums will be organized during the second year (in second, third, and fourth quarter) to increase interaction between the supply of information and the demand for information. In addition, inclusion of Nigerian graduate students (from the collaborating Nigerian Universities) in the research teams strengthens the capacity of the future generation of Nigerian researchers, thus serving stakeholders in the research and policy process and adding further to the sustainability of the project. Inclusion of students into research teams has already been carried out for ongoing research topics. For new topics, inclusion will occur as early as the first quarter of the program implementation in year 2. Identified research topics for special focus so far included, land governance, drivers of public agricultural expenditures, political economy issues, issues related to seed varieties and irrigation and the effect of climate change on farmer resilience among others. While some of the topics were identified prior to finalization of the APP, it is worth noting that these topics are in line with many of the topics and priorities established in the APP and are of great relevance to the key policy areas in the new Agriculture Promotion Policy of FGN. Two new research topics will be included in Year 2 to replace two topics which will not continue from Year 1 (one to be successfully completed as planned end of September 2016 and the other due to the fact that its research lead and key expert will not be available in Year 2 since he is leaving IFPRI).

The policy analysis component, on the other hand, is meant to be more focused on demand driven and shorter-term policy analyses that originate from requests of FMARD, state ministries of agriculture and their development partners. In addition to linking FMARD with various actors in the national research system throughout the year, the project will actively engage and collaborate closely with policy analysts at FMARD and other government institutions charged with informing the policy process when undertaking policy relevant analyses on a revolving demand basis. This particular sub-component is expected to be of key importance in Year 2 for the project in view of the recent publication of the APP roadmap by FMARD and the expected demand from the Ministry for technical support and advice in connection with the two Units to be established within the Ministry to coordinate the implementation process of APP. This section focuses on the activities geared around engaging in policy driven collaborative research and analysis.

Component 2: Summary of Year 1 Accomplishments: Policy driven collaborative research and analysis<sup>2</sup>.

	Milestones/Benchmarks	Year 1 targets	Achieved Numbers	Deviation +- %	Notes/ Comments	Lessons Learned
<b>Activity 2.1 Formalizing institutional partnerships.</b>						
	2.1.1 signing MOU with University of Ibadan	1	1	0%		Signing MOUs are good but not absolutely necessary for us to achieve our objective. Given the amount of time needed and bureaucracy involved, it is important for the project to modify its approach to institutional partnerships.
	2.1.2 signing MOU with Ahmadu Bello University	1	0	-100%	This MOU signing was postponed in Year 1 in view of the publicity embargo for the project and the relevant advice received by USAID. It will be signed in Year 2.	

<sup>2</sup> Please note that the table of accomplishment does not include accomplishments related to activities in quarter 4 of year 1. Relevant information is currently being processed towards the preparation of quarter 4 of year 1 report/year1 annual report.

2.1.3 Initiate discussions with University of Nsukka, University of Port Harcourt/ Rivers State University, University of Agriculture, Makurdi and any other institutions identified in the first year	3	5	+66%	<p>In year 1, discussions were held with all proposed universities apart from Makurdi which did not express interest when contacted. We plan to get in touch again with them in Year 2 for possible collaboration. Abeokuta University however expressed strong interest in training courses and we responded accordingly.</p> <p>In addition, discussions began with other institutions that responded positively to the program goals; University of Jos, Oyo State College of Agriculture &amp; Technology, Ebony State University and Covenant University.</p>	
<b>Activity 2.2 Climate change and agricultural resilience in Nigeria.</b>					
2.2.1 Identification of professor and student pair	1	1	0%		
2.2.2 Research Team Meetings	6	15	+150%	<p>The research team met as needed. Extra meetings were held for data analysis to meet the skills gap in data analysis that was identified in the student members at University of Ibadan</p>	<p>Due to varied location of members, the team leveraged on technology to hold numerous discussions between subsets of the team while members in the same location had further meetings/deliberations. These have not all been captured in the numbers reported here. Going forward meetings of subsets of team members will be documented and reported In order to deliver its mandate, the NAPP team provides additional resources whenever needed</p>

2.2.3 Research team field work: Participatory session to inform analysis	1	1	0%		
2.2.4 Research team analysis	6 meetings	9	+50%	Data analysis skills gap required more meetings and closer guidance on research than expected.	
2.2.5 Research team results presentations	2	0	-100%	Results from this work will be presented at the NAPP conference on September 28, 2016 and also at the Nigerian Ag. Econ. Association meeting at Owerri in October 2016.	
<b>2.3 Exploring how the implications of climate change on cropping systems interact with the broader food system in Nigeria (particularly poultry and/or, fish and/or livestock production)</b>					
2.3.1 Identification of professor and student pair	1	1	0%		
2.3.2 Research Team Meetings	6	7	+16.67%	Research team met as needed.	In order to deliver its mandate, the NAPP team has found collaborators willing to provide additional resources in terms of time whenever needed. Series of meetings of subsets of research teams also held which are not included in the recorded number.
2.3.3 Field work: Scoping activity by research team to understand poultry value chain	1	1	0%		
2.3.4 Research team analysis	6 meetings	7	+16.67%	Analysis was done as needed. The team leveraged on digital communication to facilitate extra sessions.	

2.3.5 Research team results presentations	2	1	-50%	Results from research team findings were shared at a USAID organized roundtable on 'Cities and Agriculture' in Washington DC. A presentation of the study results will also be made at the meetings of the African Association of Ag. Econ in Addis Ababa Ethiopia in September, 2016. Thus target will still be achieved in year 1.	
<b>2.4 Understanding the landscape for land access in Nigeria and its relation to food security within the realm of various global factors</b>					
2.4.1 Identification of professor and student pair	1	1	0%		
2.4.2 Research Team Meetings	1	6	+500%	As a new research team formed in the third quarter of year 1, with members spread out across 3 institutions, it was necessary to meet more frequently than every 2 months, as prescribed.	
2.4.3 Research team analysis	1 meeting	1	0%		
<b>2.5 Potential for the generation and diffusion of modern and improved seed varieties</b>					
2.5.1 Identification of professor and student pair	1	1	0%		
2.5.2 Research Team Meetings	6	6	0%		
2.5.3 Research team field work: Field Work	1	1	0%		

2.5.4 Research team analysis	6 Meetings	6	0%	Final draft of the work on improved seed varieties has been submitted	
2.5.5 Research team results presentations	1	0	-100%	On track. Results of the research will be presented at the first NAPP conference in Abuja on September 28	
<b>2.6 Potential for expanding and improving irrigation systems</b>					
2.6.1 Identification of professor and student pair	1	1	0%		
2.6.2 Research Team Meetings	6	6	0%	Numerous other virtual meetings have taken place among team members	
2.6.3 Research team field work: Field Work	1	1	0%		
2.6.4 Research team analysis	6 Meetings	8	+33%	Numerous other meetings have also taken place virtually hence exceeding the target. A final draft paper on irrigation coauthored with a local collaborator has been submitted	
2.6.5 Research team results presentations	1	0	-100%	Results were supposed to be presented at a seminar in Ibadan in Q3 but Dr. Takeshima's planned visit to Nigeria was postponed to Q4 due to last minute unavailability of local collaborators. On track	
<b>2.7 Potential for modernizing food processing through agro-industrial clustering</b>					
2.7.1 Identification of professor and student pair	1	1	0%		
2.7.2 Research Team Meetings	5	3	-40%	On track. Further research team meetings to take place in Q4	
2.7.3 Research team field work: Field Work	2	1	-50%	On track further field work will continue in the current quarter	

2.7.4 Research team analysis	1	0	-100%	On track. A descriptive overview of the of the milling sector in Nigeria is being undertaken	
2.7.5 Research team results presentations	2	1	-50%	Not on track at this stage due to the delay with the preparation of the final paper	
<b>2.8 Land governance and investment - implications for sustainable and more effective land tenure administration systems</b>					
<b>Sub-Activity 2.8.1. Mid-term impact evaluation of the pilot systematic land tenure regularization (SLTR) program:</b>					
2.8.1.1 Scoping Study	1	1	0%		
2.8.1.2 Data Collection and training of government employees	1	1	0%	A Computer Assisted Personal Interview-CAPI" training undertaken for 45 (35 males and 8 females) state-level trainees from Federal College of Agriculture Akure, Ondo state bureau of Statistics, and Ondo state land record bureau	
2.8.1.3 Analysis	1	1	0%		
2.8.1.4 Presentation	1	1	0%	Preliminary results of the study presented at a seminar at the Abuja office on 14 June 2016	
<b>Sub-Activity 2.8.2. Assessment of the land administration service delivery in Nigeria</b>					
2.8.2.1 Identification of professor and student pair	1	1	0%		
2.8.2.2 Identification of Study area	1	1	0%		
2.8.2.3 Scoping Study	1	1	0%		

2.8.2.4 Data Collection	1	1	0%		
2.8.2.5 Analysis	1	1	0%		
2.8.2.6 Presentation	1	2	+100%	Draft paper on “Effective land administration services delivery in Nigeria a prerequisite to economic development “was presented at the 2016 annual World Bank Conference on land poverty on March 2016 in Washington DC. Another seminar presentation was delivered at the IFPRI Abuja Office on June 14, 2016 attended also by FMARD senior advisors among other stakeholders.	
<b>2.9 Drivers of public agricultural expenditures in Nigeria</b>					
2.9.1 Identification of professor and student pair	1	1	0%		
2.9.2 Research Team Meetings	11	15	+36%	In addition to physical meetings, several other meetings have taken place virtually among the research team members.	
2.9.3 Research team field work: Field Work	1	1	0%		
2.9.4 Research team analysis	11 meetings	13	+18%	Draft paper on role of political and budget institutions submitted	
2.9.5 Research team results presentations	1	1	0%	Seminar presentation delivered at the IFPRI Abuja office on 18 February 2016	
<b>2.10 Political Economy of Policymaking in Nigeria: Applying the Kaleidoscope Model</b>					
2.10.1 Identification of professor and student pair	1	1	0%	Numerous physical and virtual meetings has taken place between team members	

2.10.2 Research Team Meetings	12	12	0%		
2.10.3 Research team field work: Field Work	2	1	-50%	Overall on track. Further field work is expected to take place during October 2016	
2.10.4 Research team analysis	12 meetings	8	-33%	On track. Research team lead currently working with research team	
2.10.5 Research team results presentations	2	1	-50%	Preliminary results presented at a seminar at the IFPRI Abuja office on 30 June, 2016	

Component 2: Proposed Year 2 Activities: Policy driven collaborative research and analysis.

	Milestones/ Benchmarks	Lead (MSU/ IFPRI)	Sites/ lo- cation	Dates	Annual perfor- mance targets	Outputs/ outcomes	Matching indicators
<b>Activity 2.1 Enhancing Institutional Collaboration and Partnerships</b>							
<b>Activity 2.1.1 - Enhancing Engagement with Government (Federal and State) towards</b>							
	2.1.1.1 Engagement Events with Ebonyi State Government and the State Ministry of Agriculture	MSU	Abakaliki	October/November 2016 and Third quarter(April-June, 2017)	2	Minutes of meetings and reports./Plan for engagement of state professionals and researchers in the project	NA
	2.1.1.2 Engagement Events with Kaduna State Government and the State Ministry of Agriculture	MSU	Kaduna	November/December 2016 and March-May 2017	2	Minutes of meetings and reports./Plan for engagement of state professionals and researchers in the project	
	2.1.1.3 Engagement Events with Oyo State Government and the State Ministry of Agriculture	MSU	Ibadan	January-March 2017 and April- June 2017	2	Minutes of meetings and reports./Plan for engagement of state professionals and researchers in the project	
	2.1.1.4 Engagement Events with Rivers State Government and the State Ministry of Agriculture	MSU	Port Har- court	October/November 2016 and March-May 2017	2	Minutes of meetings and reports./Plan for engagement of state professionals and researchers in the project	
<b>Activity 2.1.2- Enhancing Engagement and collaboration with Nigerian Universities (Public and Private)</b>							
	2.1.2.1 Signing MOU with Ahmadu Bello University	IFPRI	Zaria, Ni- geria	2017 Second quarter	1		
	2.1.2.2 Engagement Events with Nigerian Universities and Select Ter- tiary Institutions and Collaborate	MSU/IF PRI	Ibadan, Za- ria, Aba- kaliki, Nsukka,	3 in 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter and 3 in 4 <sup>th</sup> quar- ter	6	Minutes of meetings and reports./Plan for en-	

	with Faculty of these Institutions towards the delivery on capacity strengthening of Nigerian analysts to undertake and make widely available relevant evidence-based policy analysis		Port Harcourt Abeokuta			gement of state professionals and researchers in the project	
<b>Activity 2.2 Climate change and agricultural resilience in Nigeria.</b>							
	2.2.1 Research Team Meetings	MSU	Virtual, Abuja, East Lansing, Ibadan, Zaria	Every 2 months	6	MINUTES/research summary, Literature review, draft paper, minutes, Better understanding and of research problems and methodology	1) Number of policy research and best practice papers generated 2) Number of stakeholder learning forums held where findings/best practices are presented
	2.2.2 Research team field work: Taking preliminary results from the systems dynamics model to stakeholders	MSU	Abuja, Kano, Ibadan	February-August	1	DATA/research summary, Literature review, draft paper, minutes, Better understanding and of research problems and methodology	
	2.2.3 Research team analysis	MSU	Virtual, Abuja, East Lansing, Ibadan, Zaria	Every two months	6	research summary, Literature review, draft paper, minutes, Better understanding and of research problems and methodology	
	2.2.4 Research team results presentations	MSU	East Lansing, Ibadan, ABU, etc.	4 <sup>th</sup> quarter	1		
<b>2.3 Exploring how the implications of climate change on cropping systems interact with the broader food system in Nigeria (particularly poultry and/or, fish and/or livestock production)</b>							
	2.3.1 Research Team Meetings	MSU	Virtual, Abuja, East Lansing, Ibadan, Zaria	Every two months	6	MINUTES/research summary, literature review, draft paper, minutes, Better under-	1) Number of policy research and best practice papers generated 2) Number of stakeholder learning forums held

2.3.2 Research team analysis	MSU	Virtual, Abuja, East Lansing, Ibadan, Zaria	Every 2 months	6	standing and of research problems and methodology	where findings/best practices are presented
2.3.3 Research team results presentations	MSU	East Lansing, Ibadan, ABU, etc.	4 <sup>th</sup> quarter	1		
2.3.4 Research team field work	MSU	Ibadan/Zaria	January to June	1	DATA/research summary, Literature review, draft paper, minutes, Better understanding and of research problems and methodology	1) Number of policy research and best practice papers generated 2) Number of stakeholder learning forums held where findings/best practices are presented

#### 2.4 Understanding the landscape for land access in Nigeria and its relation to food security within the realm of various global factors

2.4.1 Research Team Meetings	MSU	Virtual, Abuja, East Lansing, Ibadan, Ota, Nsukka	Every 2 months 2017	6	MINUTES/research summary, Literature review, draft paper, minutes, Better understanding and of research problems and methodology	1) Number of policy research and best practice papers generated 2) Number of stakeholder learning forums held where findings/best practices are presented
2.4.2 Research team analysis	MSU	Virtual, Abuja, East Lansing, Ibadan, Ota, Nsukka		6		
2.4.3 Research team results presentations	MSU	East Lansing, Ibadan, Ota, Nsukka, etc.	4 <sup>th</sup> quarter	1		

#### 2.5 Potential for the generation and diffusion of modern and improved seed varieties

2.5.1	Research Team Meetings	IFPRI	Virtual, Abuja, Zaria, NCRI, DC	Every 2 months	6	Meeting minutes, better understanding and of research problems, better identification of research questions and research methodology	1) Number of policy research and best practice papers generated 2) Number of stakeholder learning forums held where findings/best practices are presented
2.5.2	Research team field work: Field Work	IFPRI	Yaba/Abaji (FCT), Badeggi (Niger)	April-June 2017	1	DATA, field notes, better understanding of relevant field conditions	
2.5.3	Research team analysis	IFPRI	Virtual, Abuja, DC	Every 2 months	6 Meetings	Research summary, literature review, conceptual framework, draft paper	
2.5.4	Research team results presentations	IFPRI	Abuja	Fourth quarter	1		
<b>2.6 Potential for expanding and improving irrigation systems</b>							
2.6.1	Research Team Meetings	IFPRI	Virtual, Abuja, Gwagwada (FCT), Zaria, DC	Every 2 months	6	Meeting minutes, better understanding and of research problems, better identification of research questions and research methodology	1) Number of policy research and best practice papers generated 2) Number of stakeholder learning forums held where findings/best practices are presented
2.6.2	Research team field work: Field Work	IFPRI	FCT	October-December 2016 & April-June 2017	2	DATA, field notes, better understanding of relevant field conditions	
2.6.3	Research team analysis	IFPRI	Virtual, Abuja, Gwagwada (FCT) Zaria, DC	Every 2 months	6 Meetings	Research summary, literature review, conceptual framework, draft paper	
2.6.4	Research team results presentations	IFPRI	Abuja	July-September 2017 Fourth quarter	1		
<b>2.7 Drivers of malnutrition in Northern Nigeria <sup>3</sup></b>							

<sup>3</sup> This is a new research topic proposed by USAID for year 2. The information currently provided in the relevant part of the table is only tentative at this stage in view of the need to discuss further details about the structure of this research topic with USAID and staff availability at IFPRI to lead this research. The earliest this activity can start is the second quarter of year 2.

2.7.1 Identification of student and professor pair	IFPRI	TBD	January-March 2017	1	Collaborative team	3) Number of collaborative research teams involving local partners formed and undertaking policy re-search and analysis
2.7.2 Research team meetings	IFPRI	Abuja, TBD	January-March 2017	5(TBC)	Conceptual framework literature review, better understanding of research questions, hypotheses, and methodology	1) Number of policy research and best practice papers generated 2) Number of stakeholder learning forums held where findings/best practices are presented
2.7.3 Research team fieldwork	IFPRI	TBD	April-June 2017	1	TBD	
2.7.4 Research team analysis	IFPRI	Abuja, TBD	April –June 2017 and July September 2017 (Also to continue in year 3)	10 (TBC)	Research summary, literature review, draft papers	
2.7.5 Research team results presentations	IFPRI	Abuja (TBD)	July-September 2017 (also in early part of year 3)	1		
<b>2.8 Land governance and investment - implications for sustainable and more effective land tenure administration systems</b>						
<b>Sub-Activity 2.8.1. Mid-term impact evaluation of the pilot systematic land tenure regularization (SLTR) program:</b>						
2.8.1.1 Data Collection and training of government employees	IFPRI	Ondo State	Nov-Dec 2016	1	Data collection and government employees get training	1 ) Number of policy research and best practice papers generated 4) Number of technical training courses offered to build technical skills and capacity for policy analysis 5) Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term technical training in agricultural sector productivity or food security policy analysis
2.8.1.2 Analysis	IFPRI	Washington and Abuja	Jan-Apr 2017	1	Report of preliminary findings	
2.8.1.3 Presentation	IFPRI	Abuja	April-June 2017	1	Literature review, draft paper, PowerPoint	
2.8.1.4 Presentation	IFPRI	Washington	April-June 2017 Third quarter	1		
<b>Sub-Activity 2.8.2. Assessment of the land administration service delivery in Nigeria</b>						

2.8.2.1 Data Collection	IFPRI	Nigeria	Mar-Apr 2017	1	Data collection	1) Number of policy research and best practice papers generated 2) Number of stake-holder learning forums held where findings/best practices are presented 6) Number of Nigerian graduate students who have received support for skill enhancement training in the US through project pro-grams
2.8.2.2 Analysis	IFPRI	Washington and Abuja	May-Jul 2017	1	Report of preliminary findings	
2.8.2.3 Presentation	IFPRI	Abuja	Sep-2017 Fourth quarter	1	Literature review, draft paper, PowerPoint	
<b>2.9 Macroeconomic factor influence on agricultural policy implementation and outcomes<sup>4</sup></b>						
2.9.1 Identification of professor and student pair	IFPRI	Abuja and ABU	October-November 2016	1	Collaborative team	3) Number of collaborative research teams involving local partners formed and undertaking policy re-search and analysis
2.9.2 Research Team Meetings	IFPRI	Abuja and ABU	November-December 2016	11	Research update/summary, literature review, better understanding of research questions, hypotheses, and methodology	1) Number of policy research and best practice papers generated 2) Number of stake-holder learning forums held where findings/best practices are presented
2.9.3 Research team field work: Field Work	IFPRI	Kaduna	February-March 2017	1	Qualitative data	
2.9.4 Research team analysis	IFPRI	Abuja and ABU	April-June 2017	11	Research summary, literature review, draft papers	
2.9.5 Research team results presentations	IFPRI	Abuja and ABU	July-September 2017 Fourth quarter	1		
<b>2.10 Political Economy of Policymaking in Nigeria: Applying the Kaleidoscope Model</b>						
2.10.1 Research Team Meetings	IFPRI	Virtual, Washington, DC and	Monthly	12	Minutes of meetings	1) Number of policy research and best practice papers generated 2) Number of stake-holder learning forums held

<sup>4</sup> This is a new research topic proposed for Year 2 replacing the topic on the drivers of agricultural public expenditures, which will be successfully completed as planned at the end of Year 1.

			Abuja				where findings/best practices are presented
2.10.2 Research team field work: Field Work	IFPRI	Cross Rivers, Ondo, Katsina	October-December 2016	2	Data collection from key stakeholders involved in target research areas (e.g. land reform, youth employment, and institutional reform); Better understanding of the barriers and opportunities for improved policy outcomes, including policy adoption and implementation		
2.10.3 Research team analysis	IFPRI	Virtual, Washington, DC and Abuja	Monthly	12	Minutes of meetings and draft papers		
2.10.4 Research team results presentations	IFPRI	Washington, DC and Abuja	January-March and July-September 2017 Second quarter and fourth quarter	2	Dissemination of results from data collection and analysis that applies the Kaleidoscope Model to improve policy outcomes		
<b>2.11 Bio-Technology</b> <sup>5</sup>							
2.11.1 Identification of collaborators in Nigeria based organizations with interest and knowledge in the area of biotechnology / biosafety and forming a research team in line with the operational structure of NAPP	MSU		Nov-Dec 2016				
2.11.2 Desk review: Review of general literature and Nigeria specific	MSU		Dec 2016-Feb 2017				

<sup>5</sup> Conditional on available funds. See Appendix F.

assessments, research studies to understand the potential researchable issues related to "biotechnology / biosafety perception, concern, and acceptability in Nigeria"						
2.11.3 Visit by Maredia and Timpo to Nigeria to meet with partners and stake-holders, identify priorities, discuss study design	MSU		Feb-Mar 2017			
2.11.4 Develop a study design document based on the desk review and field reconnaissance visit; develop data collection instruments	MSU		Apr-17			
2.11.5 Data collection:	MSU					
2.11.5.1 Country wide citizen survey and interventions to test approaches to address perception, concern and acceptability issues, and to come up with strategies for communication approaches to biotechnology and biosafety	MSU		May-Aug 2017			
2.11.5.2 Key informant interviews of key stakeholders in Nigeria	MSU		July - Sept 2017			
2.11.5.3 Researcher's time for data collection, data analysis, report writing	MSU		May-Dec 2017			
2.11.6 Outreach and dissemination of results( where possible this will be aligned with a planned NAPP dissemination activity)	MSU		Jan-Mar 2018			

### **3. Strengthening evidence-based policy process and promoting impact**

#### **Introduction**

This component addresses policy impact through targeted communication and increased and targeted capacity building at universities and FMARD. Strategies will include directly contributing to the donor-government policy dialogue on agricultural policy; launching a policy brief series for the project (to serve as an outlet for early results of ongoing research, policy analysis, and outcomes from roundtable discussions and/or policy dialogues sponsored by the project). It will also work to promote a “think tank” culture within the agricultural policy process through organizing various seminars and events targeted at all the actors in the process, including policy makers, local research community, FMARD, development partners, and the general media among others. The overall aim is to strengthen the visibility and credibility of Nigerian research networks. Capacity building is expressed in training courses provided by the NAPP team for FMARD and scholars (with particular emphasis on young Nigerian researchers and junior faculty members) across Nigeria as well as provisions for selected Nigerian graduate students to take advanced courses at Michigan State University. The training courses organized by the project are demand-driven by our partners. They include courses related to Stata for policy relevant rigorous empirical work by young researchers and more recently courses on Monitoring and Evaluation methodologies and policy communication methods and on how to prepare non-technical policy briefs. These topic requests come from project beneficiaries and the NAPP project management team responds accordingly. In year 2, the management team intends to continue to respond in a very positive way to the demand for these types of courses. The project team is also open to new demands in Year 2 on training courses from our partners (incl. of course FMARD, which has already been contacted on this in view of the delay from the Ministry in responding positively to the project team’s efforts on training courses during Year 1, due in particular to various changes in the FMARD leadership during the year) and prepared to meet successfully this demand with properly organized training courses, building also on the important lessons learned from Year 1. A total of 14 technical training courses have been earmarked for the second year for various stakeholders in the agricultural sector (government, academia, NGOs, private sector). The training courses will be targeted for at least 10-25 participants per training session for a duration of 2-3 days per training. The trainings will be spread out during the year and offered on a quarterly basis. The training courses can help improve the implementation of research team activities relevant to the production of high quality research for policy and integral to the capacity-building component of the project. The training courses also provide a base to build a sustainable development process in this area by eventually having the current trainees becoming the trainers in the long term. Finally, the establishment of a Policy Communications Unit at the IFPRI Abuja Office as part of the project activities in Year 1 will help the project, in Year 2 (and following the recent lifting of the publicity embargo) to implement a series of communication activities to strengthen engagement with project beneficiaries and for the promotion

of the project findings to the wider public. This section focuses on the activities geared towards strengthening evidence-based policy process and promoting impact.

Component 3: Summary of Year 1 Accomplishments: Strengthening evidence-based policy process and promoting impact<sup>6</sup>

Milestones/Bench- marks	Year 1 targets	Achieved Numbers	Deviation +- %	Notes/ Comments	Lessons Learned
<b>3.1 capacity building</b>					
3.1.1 Technical Training: Identify Needs within Universities	NA				
3.1.2 Technical Training: Universities	4	13	+225%	Training courses to universities have to date included: 3 trainings at Ahmadu Bello University (1 Stata, 1 M&E, and 1 Policy Communication), 6 trainings at University of Ibadan (3 Stata, 1 on Value Chains, and 1 on Systems Dynamics Modelling, 1 training about US graduate school requirements), 2 trainings at Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta (2 Stata trainings), 1 (9 sessions) panel data analysis with STATA training with the graduate students on the climate change team, 1 M&E training for NAPP researchers,	
3.1.3 Technical Training: Universities. Evaluation	4	7	+75%	An evaluation was undertaken after certain trainings to give a sense of participants perception of the training course and areas of improvement	

<sup>6</sup> Please note that the table of accomplishment does not include accomplishments related to activities in quarter 4 of year 1. Relevant information is currently being processed towards the preparation of quarter 4 of year 1 report/year1 annual report.

3.1.4 Technical Training: Identify Needs within FMARD	1	1	0%	Although training needs were identified in Q1 of Year 1 of the project following a particular effort by the NAPP team, FMARD did not respond after that in view of their own internal constraints for most of the year (see changes in FMARD leadership, appointment of new advisors only recently etc.).	
3.1.5 Technical Training: FMARD	12 (TBC)	0	-100%	See comment above under 3.1.4	
3.1.6 Technical Training: FMARD. Evaluation	12 (TBC)	0	-100%	See comment above under 3.1.4	
<b>3.2 Capacity Building of Nigerian Students</b>					
3.2.1 Securing visa for graduate students from Nigeria	2	2	0%		<p>Though achieved in year 1, it was realized that the process for selection and logistics takes a long time and thus the selection process for students going forward will commence earlier given the target date/semester of their arrival at MSU.</p> <p>In year 2, we plan to identify the students by January 2017 so that preparations can begin earlier</p>

	3.2.2 Graduate students come for training at MSU	2	2	0%		<p>It was determined that the students be classified as “Life Long Learners” as this allows them to take graduate courses without being enrolled in an MSU degree program. They can also earn credit for the course(s) that they take.</p> <p>Housing is arranged in the graduate dorm. Meals can be taken in that dorm as well as other locations on campus.</p>
	3.2.3 Nigerian Graduate students make presentations at MSU/IFPRI	2	0	-100%	The final work plan for year 1 was approved on 2 <sup>nd</sup> November 2015 making it infeasible for selected Nigerian students to secure visa and make other arrangements to start at MSU in January, 2016. The students have started at MSU this Fall in August 2016	
	3.2.4 Securing visa for Nigerian professors to visit MSU and IFPRI Headquarters	3	0	-100%	The professors did not visit due to the graduate students’ delay in enrolling at MSU.	
	3.2.5 Nigerian professors visit MSU	3	0	-100%		
	3.2.6 Nigerian professors presentations at MSU	3	0	-100%		

3.2.7 Nigerian professors meetings with various faculties at MSU	3	0	-100%		
3.2.8 Blog set up by IFPRI in preparation for management by the project team of grad students	1	0	-100%	Selected students have started at MSU this fall in August. A blog was not created in Year 1 due to the publicity embargo by USAID. It will be created in Year 2.	
3.2.9 Students identify other avenues for outreach (e.g. TV, radio etc.)	1	0	-100%	Not done in Year 1 due the publicity embargo	
3.2.10 Selection of 25 papers for special session	1 (during year)	1	0%	21 papers and 6 posters have been selected for presentation in parallel and poster sessions in the NAPP conference	
3.2.11 Production of proposed bi-annual publication and special issue of the Nigerian Ag. Econ. Journal or NSSP Working Paper series /MSU FSG publication	2	1	-50%	Due to publicity embargo for most of Year 1 the project will be able to deliver 1 special issue (from papers to be presented in the NAPP Sept. conference) instead of 2.	

Component 3: Proposed Year 2 Activities: Strengthening evidence-based policy process and promoting impact

Milestones/Benchmarks	Lead (MSU/IFPRI)	Sites/ location	Dates	Annual performance targets	Outputs/ outcomes	Matching indicators
<b>Activity 3.1 Capacity Building</b>						
3.1.1 Technical Training: Identify Needs within Universities	IFPRI	ABU (2), UI (1), Abakaliki (1) Nsukka (1) Port Harcourt (1) Abeokuta (2)	October-November 2016	8	Topics Identified	4) Number of technical training courses offered to build technical skills and capacity for policy analysis 5) Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term technical training in agricultural sector productivity or food security policy analysis
3.1.2 Technical Training: Universities	IFPRI	ABU (2), UI (2), Abakaliki (1) Nsukka (1) Port Harcourt (1) Abeokuta (2)	Quarterly	8	Training Materials, Trained faculty and students (2-3 days per training. Up to 25 participants maximum per training). Training materials are made available to lectures and participants immediately after the training	
3.1.3 Technical Training: Universities. Evaluation	IFPRI	ABU (2), UI (2), Abeokuta (2)(TBD)	After each Training	4	Feedback on trainings held and suggestions for future training courses	
3.1.4 Technical Training: Identify Needs within FMARD	IFPRI	FMARD	October	1	Topics Identified	

	3.1.5 Capacity building activities for FMARD..	IFPRI	FMARD	First, second, third and fourth quarter	6	Training Materials, Trained FMARD officials faculty and students (2 days per training)	
	3.1.6 Technical Training: FMARD. Evaluation	IFPRI	FMARD	After each Training	6	Feedback on training courses held and suggestions for future training	
<b>3.2 Capacity Building of Nigerian Students</b>							
	3.2.1 Securing visa for graduate students from Nigeria	MSU	Nigeria	December/August	5	APPROPRIATE VISA/ research summary, Literature review, draft paper, minutes, Better understanding and of research problems and methodology	NA
	3.2.2 Graduate student come for training at MSU	MSU	MSU	January/September	5	Graduate students trained, research analysis, research papers produced,	6) Number of Nigerian graduate students who have received support for skill enhancement training in the US through the project
	3.2.3 Nigerian Graduate student presentations at MSU/IFPRI	MSU/IFPRI	MSU	November /April	5	PRESENTATION (POWER-POINT) Training of grad students, research output	1) Number of policy research and best practice papers generated 2) Number of stakeholder learning forums held where findings/best practices are presented
	3.2.4 Securing visa for Nigerian professors to visit MSU and IFPRI Headquarters	MSU	USA	October/March	5	APPROPRIATE VISA/research analysis, research papers produced, capacity building	
	3.2.5 Nigerian professors visit MSU	MSU	MSU	November/March	5	PRESENTATION (POWER POINT)/research analysis, research papers produced,	
	3.2.6 Nigerian professors presentations at MSU	MSU	MSU	November/March	5	capacity building	

3.2.7 Nigerian professors meetings with various faculties at MSU	MSU	MSU	November/March	5		
3.2.8 Blog set up by IFPRI in preparation for management by the project team of grad students	IFPRI	Virtual	Second, third and fourth quarter	1	Dissemination of results from data collection and analysis to improve policy outcomes	2) Number of stakeholder learning forums held where findings/best practices are presented
3.2.9 Students identify other avenues for outreach (e.g. TV, radio etc.)	IFPRI	Virtual	Third and Fourth quarters	1	Dissemination of results from data collection and analysis to improve policy outcomes	
3.2.10 Selection of papers for special NAPP publication	MSU/IFPRI	Virtual	Third quarter	10	NAPP publication.	1) Number of policy research and best practice papers generated 2) Number of stakeholder learning forums held where findings/best practices are presented
3.2.11 Production of proposed annual NAPP publication as special issue of the Nigerian Ag. Econ. Journal or NSSP Working Paper series/MSU FSG publication/FSP Research Paper series	IFPRI	Nigeria various	Fourth quarter	1	NAPP publication	1) Number of policy research and best practice papers generated 2) Number of stakeholder learning forums held where findings/best practices are presented

## 4. Program Management

### Introduction

Given the presence of two institutions implementing the NAPP under the FSP consortium, a management structure rests upon two key individuals: the IFPRI Chief of Party and the MSU Faculty Principal Investigator.

The IFPRI Chief of Party based in Abuja Nigeria (George Mavrotas), is responsible for:

1. Overall oversight, day-to-day management and leadership of the Feed the Future Nigeria Agricultural Policy Project (NAPP).
2. Coordinating and interacting often across both institutions (IFPRI and MSU).
3. Substantive lead on the IFPRI allocated Work Plan activities.
4. Working closely with the MSU Faculty Principal Investigator in the financial and programmatic reporting.

The MSU Faculty Principal Investigator (Saweda Liverpool-Tasie) based at MSU in East Lansing MI, USA and is responsible for:

1. Project communication with USAID/Nigeria
  - a. Financial and programmatic reports. (These reports will require close collaboration with and contributions from IFPRI.)
  - b. Associate Award contracting issues
2. Sub-contracting arrangements between MSU and IFPRI.
3. Substantive lead on the MSU allocated Work Plan activities.

Both institutions interact with the National Advisory Committee, and also contribute to all aspects of the project based on annual agreements on the work plan, resource allocations, and outreach activities of the NAPP. NAPP is a single integrated effort of both institutions. Individual activities are assigned based on institution agreement.

Program Management. Summary of Year 1 Accomplishments<sup>7</sup>.

	Milestones/Benchmarks	Year 1 targets	Achieved Numbers	Deviation +- %	Notes/ Comments	Lessons Learned
<b>4.1 Project Administration</b>						
	4.1.1 Annual Workplan Development	1	1	0%	The annual work plan is in the process of being developed	
	4.1.2 Sub-contracting completed based on Workplan	1	1	0%		
	4.1.3 Open Data Plan	1		0%	NAPP is moving forward with compliance as more data sets become available.	
<b>4.2 Project Coordination</b>						
	4.2.1 Quarterly meetings with various stakeholders to ensure consistency and to avoid duplication of action	4	25	+525	A number of key meetings involving government, academia, private sector, and NGO's have been undertaken as a means of promoting stakeholder consultation in the project and improving likelihood of program buy in and success. More interactions are expected to occur over the second year in view of the upcoming project launch on September 27, 2016	
	4.2.2 Quarterly meetings with other USAID implementing partners in the area of agricultural policy reform to coordinate activities and communications outreach. Annual joint work planning for outreach events.	4	2	-50%	We had 2 meetings with IFDC Abuja Office during Year 1 for possible collaboration. Consultation process still ongoing.	

<sup>7</sup> Please note that the table of accomplishment does not include accomplishments related to activities in quarter 4 of year 1. Relevant information is currently being processed towards the preparation of quarter 4 of year 1 report/year1 annual report.

<b>4.3 Operationalize Monitoring Evaluation Plan</b>					
4.3.1 Develop MEP	1	1	0%		
4.3.2 Baseline Survey of the stakeholder assessment survey of agriculture and food security policy processes	1	0	-100%	See next line	
<p>The plan was to implement the baseline survey in January but changes in leadership at FMARD and delays in the IRB approval process meant that the launch of the baseline survey was postponed from January to late February. Following IRB approvals, a pretest questionnaire was sent out to a few respondents to allow for the NAPP team to ensure that all kinds of errors associated with survey research were minimized. The main baseline survey was launched on March 11 and questionnaires were submitted to 160 (in line with the survey instrument narrative shared with USAID/Nigeria some time ago) stakeholders including government, development partners, civil society, private sector, and research and academia. While tremendous effort has been placed on follow up of respondents, the response rate has remained rather low. The survey was initially designed to be delivered online and through email. Realizing the poor response rate, the survey team decided to additionally conduct interviews in person and using the phone. This approach has worked to some extent but scheduling for appointments has been problematic in other instances as the targeted respondents have either been away or unavailable for interviews. To date 90 out of the 160 participants have completed the questionnaires. We plan to make a final attempt to follow up with non-respondents and increase the response rate to at least more than 100 by the end of this month. Data analysis and summary report will be completed in October.</p>					
4.3.3 Collect indicator information for reporting purposes	2	3	+50%	Indicators for reporting purposes are collected and updated on a quarterly basis	
4.3.4 Follow up of Major conference	1	0	-100%	On track. The first NAPP conference is scheduled to take place on 27-28 September at the Rockview Hotel Royale in Abuja.	
<b>4.4 Reporting to USAID/Nigeria</b>					
4.4.1 Financial reports:	4	3	-25%	On track. The final financial report to be submitted at the end of Q4	
4.4.2 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarterly reports	2	2	0%		

4.4.3 Annual report (including indicators)	1	1	0%	On track. Annual report will be submitted at the end of Q4	
--	---	---	----	--	--

## Program Management. Proposed Year 2 Activities

	Milestones/Benchmarks	Lead (MSU/ IFPRI)	Sites/ location	Dates	Annual performance targets	Outputs/ outcomes	Matching indicators
<b>4.1 Project Administration</b>							
	4.1.1 Annual Workplan Development	MSU/ IFPRI	Various	July-August	1	Annual workplan	NA
	4.1.2 Sub-contracting completed based on Workplan	MSU/ IFPRI		September	1	Fully executed sub-contracts	
	4.1.3 Open Data Plan	MSU/ IFPRI		4th quarter	1	Submission of a plan	
<b>4.2 Project Coordination</b>							
	4.2.1 Quarterly meetings with various stakeholders to ensure consistency and to avoid duplication of action	IFPRI/ MSU	Nigeria	Quarterly	4	Promoting stakeholder consultation in the project and improving likelihood of program buy in and success	NA
	4.2.2 Quarterly meetings with other USAID implementing partners in the area of agricultural policy reform to coordinate activities and communications outreach. Annual joint work planning for outreach events.	IFPRI/ MSU			4	Promoting stakeholder consultation in the project and improving likelihood of program buy in and success	
<b>4.3 Operationalize Monitoring Evaluation Plan</b>							
	4.3.1. Collect indicator information for reporting purposes	IFPRI	Nigeria	Quarterly	4	Adherence to award requirements	
	4.3.2. Follow up of Major conference	IFPRI		November	1	Promoting stakeholder consultation in the project and improving likelihood of program buy in and success	
<b>4.4 Reporting to USAID/Nigeria</b>							

	4.4.1 Financial reports:	MSU/ IFPRI	Nigeria	January 31, April 30, July 31 and October 31 annually	4	Adherence to award requirements	NA
	4.4.2 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarterly reports	MSU/ IFPRI		January 31, April 31, July 31 annually	2		
	4.4.3 Annual report (including indicators)	MSU/ IFPRI		October 31 annually	1		

**Table 1: Summary Year 2 Work Calendar**

Component/Activity Description	Y2 2016/2017											
	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September
<b>Component 1: A Strategy for Enhancing National Agriculture and Food Security Policy Capacity</b>												
<b>Activity 1.1: Operation of Advisory Committee</b>												
1.1.1 Advisory committee meeting to discuss the project												
<b>Activity 1.2: Stakeholder consultation meetings</b>												
1.2.1 Meeting with various stakeholders in the policy process- (APRNet)												
1.2.2 Engage with associations that would enable project to reach more broadly the Ag. Econ community in Nigeria e.g. Nigerian Ag Economics Association												
1.2.3 Meeting with various stakeholders in the policy process- Agriculture Research Council of Nigeria (ARCN)												
1.2.4 Meeting with various stakeholders in the policy process identified during the course of the project (ADWG)												
1.2.5 Attend stake holders' meetings (these include ABU, UI, FMARD, APR-Net, ARCN, ADWG among others)												
1.2.6 Stakeholder consultations												

<b>Activity 1.3: Dissemination/ Outreach</b>											
1.3.1 smaller project dissemination activities											
1.3.2 Interaction with the press											
<b>Component 2: Policy driven collaborative research and analysis.</b>											
<b>Activity 2.1 Enhancing Institutional Collaboration and Partnerships</b>											
<b>Activity 2.1.1 – Enhancing Engagement with Government (Federal and State) towards</b>											
2.1.1.1 Engagement events with Ebonyi State Government and the State Ministry of Agriculture											
2.1.1.2 Engagement events with Kaduna State Government and the State Ministry of Agriculture											
2.1.1.3 Engagement events with Oyo State Government and the State Ministry of Agriculture											
2.1.1.4 Engagement events with Rivers State Government and the State Ministry of Agriculture											
<b>Activity 2.1.2- Enhancing Engagement and collaboration with Nigerian Universities (Public and Private)</b>											
2.1.2.1 Signing MOU with Ahmadu Bello University											
2.1.2.2 Enhance engagement with Nigerian Universities and Select Tertiary Institutions and Collaborate with Faculty of these Institutions towards the delivery on capacity strengthening of Nigerian analysts to undertake and make widely available relevant evidence-based policy analysis											
<b>Activity 2.2 Climate change and agricultural resilience in Nigeria.</b>											
2.2.1 Research Team Meetings											



<b>2.7 The drivers of malnutrition in Northern Nigeria</b>											
2.7.1 Identification of student and professor pair											
2.7.2 Research team meetings											
2.7.3 Research team fieldwork											
2.7.4 Research team analysis											
2.7.5 Research team results presentations											
<b>2.8 Land governance and investment - implications for sustainable and more effective land tenure administration systems</b>											
<b>Sub-Activity 2.8.1. Mid-term impact evaluation of the pilot systematic land tenure regularization (SLTR) program:</b>											
2.8.1.1 Data Collection and training of government employees											
2.8.1.2 Analysis											
2.8.1.3 Presentation											
2.8.1.4 Presentation											
<b>Sub-Activity 2.8.2. Assessment of the land administration service delivery in Nigeria</b>											
2.8.2.1 Data Collection											
2.8.2.2 Analysis											
2.8.2.3 Presentation											
<b>2.9 Macroeconomic factor influence on agricultural policy implementation and outcomes</b>											
2.9.1 Identification of professor and student pair											
2.9.2 Research Team Meetings											
2.9.3 Research team field work: Field Work											
2.9.4 Research team analysis											
2.9.5 Research team results presentations											
<b>2.10 Political Economy of Policymaking in Nigeria: Applying the Kaleidoscope Model</b>											
2.10.1 Research Team Meetings											





<b>4.1 Project Administration</b>												
4.1.1 Annual Workplan Development												
4.1.2 Sub-contracting completed based on Workplan												
4.1.3 Open Data Requirement Met												
<b>4.2 Project Coordination</b>												
4.2.1 Quarterly meetings with various stakeholders to ensure consistency and to avoid duplication of action												
4.2.2 Quarterly meetings with other USAID implementing partners in the area of agricultural policy reform to coordinate activities and communications outreach. Annual joint work planning for outreach events.												
<b>4.3 Operationalize Monitoring Evaluation Plan</b>												
4.3.1 Collect indicator information for reporting purposes												
4.3.2 Follow up of Major conference												
<b>4.4 Reporting to USAID/Nigeria</b>												
4.4.1 Financial reports:												
4.4.2 1st, 2nd and 3rd quarterly reports												
4.4.4 Annual report (including indicators)												

Appendix A: Accomplishments in terms of targets in Year 1

[Strategic Objective]											
Indicator	Data Source	Baseline data		FY 2016		Quarterly Status – FY 2015				Annual Performance Achieved to Date (in %)	Comment(s)
		Year	Value	Annual Cumulative Planned target	Annual Cumulative Actual	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		
<b>Intermediate Result (IR):</b>											
1.1. Increased agricultural competitiveness											
1.2 Improved business environment											
3.2 Improved responsiveness of targeted government institutions											
3.3 Increased capacity for civic advocacy, monitoring, and engagement											
<b>Sub-IR: 1.3 Improved agricultural policy environment</b>											
1. Number of policy research and best practice papers generated	Project records	NA	NA	7	3	0	1	2		43%	
2. Number of stakeholder learning forums (national or global) held where findings/best practices are presented	Project records	NA	NA	10	12	2	6	4		120%	
3. Number of participants attending project organized events	Project records	NA	NA	200	551	83	283	185		276%	
4. Number of formal , informal or ad hoc meetings held with key government or private sector partners, where project outputs and findings are discussed	Project records	NA	NA	60	71	12	42	17		118%	

5. Number of agricultural and nutritional enabling environment policies completing the following processes/steps of development as a result of USG assistance in each case: 4.5.1(24): 1. Analysis 2. Stakeholder consultation/public debate 3. Drafting or revision 4. Approval (legislative 5. Full and effective implementation	Project records	NA	NA	7	1	0	0	1		14%	
6. Number of collaborative research teams involving local partners formed and undertaking policy research and analysis	Project records	NA	NA	10	10	4	5	1		100%	
7. Number of technical training courses offered to build technical skills and capacity for policy analysis.	Project records	NA	NA	16	11	1	3	7		69%	
8. Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term technical training in agricultural sector productivity or food security policy analysis training. FTF 4.5.2(7)	Project records	NA	NA	100	309	42	23	244		309%	
9. Number of individuals who have received USG supported long-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training. FTF 4.5.2(6)	Project records	NA	NA	1	1	0	1	0		100%	

10. Number of Nigerian graduate students who have received support for skill enhancement training in the US through the project	Project records	NA	NA	3	2	0	2	0		66%	Due to a delay in selecting the graduate student from ABU, the 3 <sup>rd</sup> MSc student is scheduled to arrive at MSU for the Spring 2017 semester
11. Number of organizations/entities assisted to participate in various roundtable and stakeholder meetings, seminars and conferences focused on agricultural policy issues	Project records	NA	NA	10	13	0	1	12		130%	
12. Index (or scorecard) of quality of agriculture and food security policy processes in Nigeria, as measured by stakeholder evaluation to capture level of satisfaction and confidence	Base-line, mid-term and end-line	NA	NA	NA							
13. Index (or scorecard) of quality of the institutional architecture for agriculture and food security policy processes in Nigeria, as measured by stakeholder evaluation survey to capture level of satisfaction and confidence	Base-line, mid-term and end-line	NA	NA	NA							

## Appendix B: Year 2 Indicators and Estimated Targets<sup>8</sup>

Indicator	Data Source	Baseline data		Annual Cumulative Planned target
		Year	Value	
1. Number of policy research and best practice papers generated	Project records	NA	NA	8
2. Number of stakeholder learning forums (national or global) held where findings/best practices are presented	Project records	NA	NA	10
3. Number of participants attending project organized events	Project records	NA	NA	300
4. Number of formal , informal or ad hoc meetings held with key government or private sector partners, where project outputs and findings are discussed	Project records	NA	NA	60
5. Number of agricultural and nutritional enabling environment policies completing the following processes/steps of development as a result of USG assistance in each case: 4.5.1(24): 1. Analysis 2.Stakeholder consultation/public debate 3. Drafting or revision 4. Approval (legislative 5. Full and effective implementation	Project records	NA	NA	7
6. Number of collaborative research teams involving local partners formed and undertaking policy research and analysis	Project records	NA	NA	10
7. Number of technical training courses offered to build technical skills and capacity for policy analysis.	Project records	NA	NA	14
8. Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term technical training in agricultural sector productivity or food security policy analysis training. FTF 4.5.2(7)	Project records	NA	NA	200
9. Number of individuals who have received USG supported long-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training. FTF 4.5.2(6)	Project records	NA	NA	1
10. Number of Nigerian graduate students who have received support for skill enhancement training in the US through the project	Project records	NA	NA	5

<sup>8</sup> Please also note that the new targets are not determined ad hoc but rather in view of the targets (for the relevant activities) in Year 2 and on the basis of the project performance in terms of targets achieved in Year 1 (see Appendix A for details).

11. Number of organizations/entities assisted to participate in various roundtable and stakeholder meetings, seminars and conferences focused on agricultural policy issues	Project records	NA	NA	10
12. Index (or scorecard) of quality of agriculture and food security policy processes in Nigeria, as measured by stakeholder evaluation to capture level of satisfaction and confidence	Baseline, mid-term and end-line	NA	NA	NA
13. Index (or scorecard) of quality of the institutional architecture for agriculture and food security policy processes in Nigeria, as measured by stakeholder evaluation survey to capture level of satisfaction and confidence	Baseline, mid-term and end-line	NA	NA	NA

## Appendix C: Description of Year 2 policy driven collaborative research and analysis activities

### **Activity 2.1: Enhancing Institutional Collaboration and Partnerships**

The signing of the MOU between IFPRI and Ahmadu Bello University, which was postponed last year due to publicity embargo on the NAPP and advice by USAID not to proceed with this MOU until the embargo is lifted, will now take place in Year 2 of the project. In addition, the project team will make an effort to formalize institutional partnerships with other universities (if they express interest) during Year 2.

### **Activity 2.2: Climate change and agricultural resilience in Nigeria.**

Climate change and the negative consequences it has on agriculture is already evident in Nigeria and other Sub-Saharan African countries. Mean annual rainfall in the Sahel region is declining and becoming more erratic while the growing season gets shorter and shorter. With this in mind, the Nigerian Agricultural Resilience Framework (NARF) was launched by the Ministry of Agriculture in April 2014 to find ways and means to prevent, adapt to, and mitigate the negative effects climate change may have on agriculture in Nigeria. This activity is designed to provide information to inform such efforts. However, there is a danger of over-attributing all stressors in the agricultural sector to climate change, which could lead to inattention to other environmental or economic drivers that are negatively affecting agricultural productivity. This activity strives to provide a better understanding of what is known and not known about this topic in Nigeria. The climate change workshop conducted in year 1 with stakeholders was the first step towards doing this. Through the collaborative effort with Nigerian professors and graduate students, this activity will build on activities in year 1. The research team will quantify and simulate a system dynamics model around challenges and opportunities for agricultural production in Nigeria; bring the model back to stakeholders for validation and scenario exploration. This model will simulate production of Nigeria's major staple food crops (cassava, rice, maize, sorghum and yams) to the year 2060, incorporating potential impacts of climate change, economic development, environmental degradation, etc.

### **Activity 2.3: Exploring how the implications of climate change on cropping systems interact with the broader food system in Nigeria (particularly poultry and maize)**

With the effects of climate change likely to require the adoption of new varieties of traditional crops and the development and adoption of completely new crops and cropping systems, it is important to understand how these changes will affect and be affected by the Nigerian food system more broadly; particularly animal (livestock, poultry and fish) production systems. This activity will use a value chain approach to explore the links between changing consumption patterns and farmers' adaptation to climate change and animal production systems.

Activities in year 2 will build on lessons learned about the poultry subsector in year 1. A doctoral student from University of Ibadan working on the team is spending a year at MSU working intensively on the design of various surveys to be administered to various stakeholders in quarter 2 of year 2. These surveys are planned to be administered to poultry producers, feed mill operators and maize producers in South West Nigeria.

**Activity 2.4: Understanding the landscape for land access in Nigeria and its relation to food security within the realm of various global factors)**

The newly formed research team on activity 2.4 will take a two-fold approach. The first approach uses a nationally representative dataset collected by the World Bank and the Nigerian Bureau of Statistics (NBS) to provide some descriptive analysis of the Nigerian landscape with particular attention to land availability and its correlations with rural household activities. This approach will specifically explore an extraction of data on farm sizes across states of the federation to inform relevant policy at the Federal and State Level.

The second dimension of the work of the research team will focus on current issues around land in Nigeria including conflicts around land. Of particular interest is the Federal Government policy to establish grazing reserves in States of the Federation as a means to improve yield from livestock farming as well as curb clashes between cattle farmers on one hand and crop farmers and their community on the other. There are divergent opinions, especially amongst Governments (with significant support of the population) of the States of the Federation on the viability of this policy. As a topical issue, not limited to Nigeria, the research team will provide an analysis on the subject.

The research activity under this component will continue to be undertaken by a Faculty at Michigan State University with Faculty at University of Nigeria Nsukka and Covenant University and their graduate students.

**Activity 2.5: Potential for the generation and diffusion of modern and improved seed varieties**

Seed is critical because it is the source of varietal technology, which largely affects agricultural productivity. The local private sector's ability/incentives to innovate other technologies, induce institutional innovations, and invest in changing some of their socio-economic characteristics, can also be affected by the availability of these externally supplied varietal technology levels. In such cases, agricultural incomes (and overall household incomes if they largely depend on agricultural incomes) are likely to be largely affected by the varietal technology levels available for particular locations. Varietal technology levels of certain crops (for example rice) in Nigeria may vary considerably across locations (Diagne et al. (2015); Takeshima H. (2016); Takeshima H & A Maji (2016)). This is because the overall domestic support for varietal developments through agricultural R&D in Nigeria has been lower than in developing countries in other regions, and more importantly, many improved varieties are developed/tested in relatively few research stations in the country, despite the fact that Nigerian production environments are highly diverse. These conditions suggest that agricultural productivity, incomes in Nigeria may vary considerably across locations, depending on the

similarity of agro-ecological conditions of each location with those conditions in areas where most varietal developments activities take place. In FY 2017, we will start an empirical analysis to test such hypothesis. Specifically, we use the information of the locations of agricultural research stations in Nigeria, various indicators of agro-ecological conditions, and agricultural production and income data of Living Standard Measurement Survey (LSMS) data. The analysis will ultimately focus on assessing how agricultural production, and incomes of households are associated with their similarity with agricultural research stations in terms of agro-ecological environments. By the end of FY 2017, we will have a report discussing the background issues and empirical results.

### **Activity 2.6: Potential for expanding and improving irrigation systems**

Irrigated areas in Nigeria account for only about 1% of cultivated area, much lower than the world average of 21% (FAO 2015). This can be attributed to the challenges in both public and private irrigation systems. In FY 2017, we will focus on two aspects: First, we will initiate a study to better understand the production costs associated with private/public irrigation systems. The information of production costs involved with irrigated farm production systems in countries like Nigeria is scarce. In particular, little is documented regarding the level of labor inputs required (for constructing/maintaining irrigation systems, assisting water flow on the plots, and so on. In FY 2017, we plan to conduct brief field work followed by small surveys in a few selected areas around Federal Capital Territory (FCT) to obtain detailed information on labor use in irrigated production systems. In doing so, we also intend to use various different survey instruments, to assess how irrigated farm labor use data may be susceptible to the variations in survey instruments used. Second, we plan to extend the study of the impacts of large irrigation dams based on Living Standard Measurement Study (LSMS) data (Takeshima et al. 2016), which looked at the impacts on household income and food consumption across hydrological basins, to other key outcome indicators. Depending on the availability, the third round of LSMS data may also be incorporated. By the end of FY 2017, we expect to have at least one report based on the findings from one of the studies above.

### **Activity 2.7 The drivers of malnutrition in Northern Nigeria**

The Feed the Future Nigeria Agricultural Policy Project management team very recently received a request from the USAID Nigeria Mission to consider working on the drivers of malnutrition in Northern Nigeria. As this request came less than a week before the consortium (MSU & IFPRI) had to submit the project Work Plan (WP) for Year 2 the team was not able to incorporate this fully into the WP. However, since the submission of the WP, IFPRI is currently actively exploring the human resources available at the IFPRI Abuja Office and IFPRI HQs in Washington DC to properly address this request during the course of Year 2. Since it is not feasible due to staff constraints and lack of in-house expertise to start working on this particular topic from the beginning of Year 2, a particular effort will be made to start this research topic (led by IFPRI) during the second quarter of Year 2. At this stage we have provided some tentative information on this in the relevant Table of proposed research activi-

ties in Year 2 (see research topic 2.7 in the Table) and we are very confident that this research will be part of Year 2 of the WP. The IFPRI team also needs to have a brainstorming meeting with USAID/Nigeria in the early part of Quarter 1 of Year 2 to discuss further details about the particular focus of this research, including sites/location, research structure and key research questions to be addressed, so that on the basis of this information, the research team is formed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter to conduct the work.

### **Activity 2.8: Land governance and investment - implications for sustainable and more effective land tenure administration systems**

Lack of farm-level investment, poor technology adoption and the resultant low level of agricultural productivity have been documented as persistent features of smallholder agriculture in Nigeria. Weak land governance and failure to recognize/protect customary land rights and lack of inclusive private sector development have been key issues associated with such poor performance of the agricultural sector in the country. To address this issue, a new wave of land reforms has hit the country in the last two decades. Most specifically, the pilot systematic land tenure regularization (SLTR) program first piloted in Ondo state in 2014/15 was the most notable one. With a view toward identifying opportunities and challenges of the existing legal and institutional framework concerning land governance in Nigeria and document the intermediary impacts of the SLTR program, in the NAAP year-2 period (Oct. 1 2016 – Sep. 30, 2017), the team will focus on the following core activities: (i) Continue phase-2 data collection of the mid-line survey for SLTR impact evaluation in Ondo that will focus investigating impacts of the program on intra-household bargaining power and land/other asset transfer or decision makings; (ii) Data management and analysis work using both phase-1 and phase-2 mid-line survey data with focus on three major impact pathways (impact evaluation papers), namely: program impact on gender-disaggregated land tenure security; intra-household bargaining power and decision making; and impact on household income generating capacity and youth livelihood diversification strategy; (iii) finalizing paper on “perceived land tenure security and agricultural transformation in Nigeria” for journal submission (continuation of NAAP year-1); and (iv) Continue mentoring a Nigerian PhD student and work on finalizing draft Nssp WP on “Challenges of land service delivery in Nigeria: case study from 8 states”.

### **Activity 2.9: Macroeconomic Factor Influence on Agricultural Policy Implementation and Outcomes<sup>9</sup>**

One of the most persistent themes in the Agricultural Production Survey reports of the National Agricultural Extension and Research Liaison Service (NAERLS) of the Nigerian Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (FMARD) and Ahmadu Bello University

---

<sup>9</sup> This is a new research topic proposed for Year 2 replacing the topic on the drivers of agricultural public expenditures, which will be successfully completed as planned at the end of Year 1. It will be led by Dr. G. Mavrotas (Head of IFPRI Abuja Office & IFPRI Senior Research Fellow) and Dr. P. Hatzenbuehler (Associate Research Fellow, IFPRI Abuja Office).

(ABU) is the persistent lack of funding for agricultural extension activities of agricultural development projects (ADPs), the principal agricultural extension entity in each state, for most states in Nigeria (see, for example, NAERLS and FDAE 2013). A lack of funds for implementation of agricultural programs is not unique to state governments, but also applies to the FMARD<sup>10</sup>. In this poor funding environment, the FMARD has to choose amongst activities. These funding constraints have meant that worthwhile initiatives have been abandoned. A key example is the non-implementation of an agricultural census in 2007 because Nigerian government funds were not provided as counterpart funding to those provided by international donors (Onyeri 2011). The Nigerian government budget, in which most federal government funding is obtained from fees and rents from the oil industry, is tightly aligned with movements in the global oil price (Olomola et al. 2014). Since the global oil price is exogenous and subject to intertemporal fluctuations, the federal budget tends to vary and cannot feasibly be stabilized under the current funding structure. Due to the organizational arrangement of the Nigerian government, in which the majority share of state government budgets come from federal allocations and states have relatively small tax bases, the intertemporal variation in the federal budget has large implications for sustainability and effective implementation of state level government programs.

The proposed study will include a theoretical macroeconomic model that investigates the following research question: which macroeconomic factors are key for explaining the implementation and sustainability of publicly funded agricultural programs in the context of oil price shocks, a small tax base, and financial market distortions? The developed theoretical model will be calibrated to reflect an agriculturally productive state in Northern Nigeria, such as Kaduna State, as well as another state that has different agricultural production, socioeconomic, and economic sectoral characteristics in order to allow for a future comparative analysis (to be determined). Data will be gathered from these states to implement the calibration of empirical models. The key issues of analysis are the relative importance of financial frictions, resource allocation, and size of the tax base in determination of agricultural program implementation and sustainability. This study will contribute to an ongoing policy dialogue on the implications of relatively small tax bases in developing countries, and the effects of expanding tax bases, as recently promoted by The Group of Twenty (G-20 2016), on developing country macroeconomic performance. It also contributes to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) research focus on oil price fluctuation effects on market conditions in oil exporting countries, such as the recent study on the influence of oil price variation on banking system performance in Gulf Cooperation Council countries (Khandelwal, Miyajima, and Santos 2016).

Implementation of the analysis will be supported by a research team that will include a faculty member and graduate student in the Department of Agricultural Economics at ABU, in Kaduna state. The timeline and associated deliverables for this study are:

- Quarter 1, Year 2: Organization of the work team that includes a faculty member and graduate student at ABU; theoretical model development and literature review;
- Quarter 2 & 3: Data gathering and empirical model calibration.

---

<sup>10</sup> See, for example, Olomola et al. (2014), for a discussion on the low relative public spending on agricultural programs in Nigeria compared to other countries in Sub-Saharan Africa.

- Quarter 4, Year 2: 2 IFPRI discussion papers, and subsequent journal articles (one focused on Kaduna State and the other on the selected comparative state).

### **Activity 2.10: Political Economy of Policymaking in Nigeria: Applying the Kaleidoscope Model**

As in much of Africa, land tenure remains a highly contentious issue in Nigeria at both the federal and state levels. At the same time, resolving land ownership issues is critical for boosting agricultural productivity, encouraging investment in agro-processing, improving fiscal revenues, and resolving localized conflicts. During FY15/16, work was commenced by Dr. Danielle Resnick (IFPRI) to examine the drivers of land tenure reform at the federal level, with particular attention to proponents and opponents of the Land Use Act, the creation and reception of the President’s Technical Committee on Land Reform, and the pursuit of various land governance modalities, including the systematic land titling and registration (SLTR) approach. The work was largely guided by the Kaleidoscope Model of Food Security Policy Change developed by IFPRI, MSU, and the University of Pretoria. By the end of FY2016, a draft discussion paper was produced on the topic in collaboration with Austen Okumo, a Nigerian land expert and PhD student at the University of Hohenheim (based in Abuja). This paper will be finalized and transformed into a journal article by the end of 2016. In FY16/17, research under this topic will be further expanded by focusing more on variations in state-level progress with land reform. In particular, the research will focus on addressing the following question: What accounts for differential levels of progress with, and approaches toward, improving land registration and titling across states? A controlled comparison approach will be used that focuses on a typology of reforms. This typology includes “supply-driven” SLTR states that were chosen by the federal PTCLR for reform, “demand-driven” SLTR states that approached the PTCLR for assistance in implementing the SLTR modality, and “trailblazer states” that had made substantial progress towards reform that preceded interventions from the PTCLR or the donor community. By taking into account these different motivations for reform, the political economy team will assess to what degree they impact the level of political will and commitment to reform implementation. Fieldwork interviews will be conducted with a range of stakeholders in three states that map onto this typology, which are Ondo, Katsina, and Cross Rivers states, respectively. The interviews will be supplemented by policy chronologies and stakeholder mapping for the three states. Dr. Resnick and Mr. Okumo plan to complete a discussion paper and journal article on the state-level dynamics by the end of FY2017. The team anticipates that by identifying the entry points and barriers to reform, land policy reform in Nigeria can be better targeted for greater impact.

### **Activity 2.11 Bio-Technology**

The NAPP team received a request to do a country-wide study on biotechnology/biosafety perception, concern, and acceptability in Nigeria. In response to the request the NAPP management team has been in protracted discussions with personnel in our two institutions. While the biotechnology/biosafety topic can be an option to replace one of the two topics discontinued from year 1, IFPRI does not currently have the personnel to take it on. Thus

MSU (in consultation with IFPRI) has agreed to take the lead on this. MSU has identified researchers willing to work on the biotechnology/biosafety research activity and a proposed timeline of activities and budget is included as appendix F. However, given that MSU's focus (in addition to management) is capacity building, there are no funds available in the current NAPP budget for MSU direct activities for year 2 to accommodate the inclusion of this topic without additional resources. Conditional on the availability of additional funds, and or realignment of available funds for the research component under the Award, this topic can be included in year 2, as an additional MSU direct task.

### References for Appendix C

- Diagne A, FM Kinkingninhoun-Medagbe, E Amovin-Assagba, T Nakelse, K Sanni1 & A Toure. (2015). *Evaluating the Key Aspects of the Performance of Genetic Improvement in Priority Food Crops and Countries in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Case of Rice*. In *Crop Improvement, Adoption, and Impact of Improved Varieties in Food Crops in Sub-Saharan Africa*, T Walker & J Alwang (eds). CABI.
- G-20. 2016. "Enhancing Effectiveness of External Support in Building Tax Capacity in Developing Countries." Report prepared for submission to G-20 Finance Ministers. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Paris, France.
- Khandelwal, P., K. Miyajima, and A. Santos. 2016. "The Impact of the Oil Price on the Banking System in the GCC." IMF Working Paper 16/161. International Monetary Fund. Washington, DC.
- NAERLS and FDAE. 2013. "Agricultural Performance Survey of 2013 Wet Season in Nigeria." National Agricultural Extension and Research Liaison Service, Zaria, Nigeria, and Federal Department of Agricultural Extension, Abuja, Nigeria.
- Olomola, A., T. Mogue, T. Olufinbiyi, C. Nwoku, E. Udoh, R. Alabi, J. Onu, and S. Woldeyohannes. 2014. "Analysis of Agricultural Public Expenditures in Nigeria: Examination at the Federal, State, and Local Levels." IFPRI Discussion Paper 01395. International Food Policy Research Institute. Washington, DC.
- Onyeri, N. 2011. "CountrySTAT Panorama Report II Nigeria." Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Abuja, Nigeria.
- Takeshima H. (2016). *Chapter 4: Policy Options for Inducing a Supply Response*, in *The Nigerian Rice Economy: Policy Options for Transforming Production, Marketing, and Trade*, K Gyimah-Brempong, M Johnson & H Takeshima (eds). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Takeshima H. & A. Maji. (2016). *Varietal technology development and the effectiveness of seed sector policies: Simple conceptual diagnostics and reviews of international perspectives - the case of rice in Nigeria*. Mimeo.
- Takeshima H., A. Adeoti & O. Adebola. (2016). *Irrigation dams, drought-mitigations, and downstream hydrological basins: Insights from northern Nigeria*. Mimeo.

## Appendix D: Budget, inclusive of sub-award to IFPRI, USD

Budget category	Year 2
Total direct labor	
<i>Salary and wages</i>	\$149,595
<i>Fringe benefits</i>	\$32,031
Consultants	\$0
Travel, transportation, and per diem	\$103,433
Materials and supplies	\$9,750
Sub-awards (IFPRI)	\$2,000,000
Sub-awards (other than that for IFPRI)	\$0
Data Collection	\$60,000
Participant training	\$79,089
Other direct cost	\$25,336
Indirect Cost	\$113,203
General & administrative costs	\$0
Material overhead	\$0
Total Estimated Cost	\$2,572,437

## Appendix E: IFPRI Budget, USD

<u>Budget category</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Total direct labor	
<i>Salary and wages</i>	\$358,284
<i>Fringe benefits</i>	\$209,596
Consultants	\$462,500
Travel, transportation, and per diem	\$95,000
Equipment and supplies	\$233,424
Sub-awards	\$0
Allowances	\$126,864
Participant training	\$60,000
Other direct cost	\$163,734
Indirect Cost	\$290,598
General & administrative costs	\$0
Material overhead	\$0
<hr/> Total Estimated Cost	<hr/> \$2,000,000

## APPENDIX F

### A country-wide study on biotechnology/biosafety perception, concern, and acceptability in Nigeria

Lead researchers: Mywish K. Maredia, AFRE, MSU, Samuel Timpo, NEPAD-ABNE, and Nigerian collaborators (to be determined)

#### Proposed timeline and budget (Preliminary estimate by MKM)

Activity 2.11 Bio-Technology	Time-line	Budget (Direct costs)	Notes
<b>2.11.1 Identification of collaborators in Nigeria based organizations with interest and knowledge in the area of biotechnology / biosafety and forming a research team in line with the operational structure of NAPP</b>	Nov-Dec 2016	\$ -	
<b>2.11.2 Desk review: Review of general literature and Nigeria specific assessments, research studies to understand the potential researchable issues related to "biotechnology / biosafety perception, concern, and acceptability in Nigeria"</b>	Dec 2016-Feb 2017	\$ 6,000	Research assistant support for 12 weeks, 20 hours/week at \$25/hour
<b>2.11.3 Visit by Maredia and Timpo to Nigeria to meet with partners and stakeholders, identify priorities, discuss study design</b>	Feb-Mar 2017	\$ 7,000	Travel cost only: \$4000 for Maredia (Michigan to Nigeria) and \$3000 for Timpo (Senegal to Nigeria)
<b>2.11.4 Develop a study design document based on the desk review and field reconnaissance visit; develop data collection instruments</b>	Apr-17	\$ 8,000	15 days of researcher time support (5 days each for MSU, Nigerian and ABNE collaborator) @ \$475 -725/day (average)
<b>2.11.5 Data collection:</b>			
<b>2.11.5.1 Country wide citizen survey and interventions to test approaches to address perception, concern and acceptability issues, and to come up with strategies for communication approaches to biotechnology and biosafety</b>	May-Aug 2017	\$ 25,200	mobile phone based survey of nationally representative sample (1200) and interventions @ \$7/survey * 3 times (baseline, intervention, follow up)

<b>2.11.5.2 Key informant interviews of key stakeholders in Nigeria</b>	July - Sept 2017	\$ 5,000	50 interviews @\$100/interview (logistics cost)
<b>2.11.5.3 Researcher's time for data collection, data analysis, report writing</b>	May- Dec 2017	\$ 21,500	41 days of total research time support (7 days for MSU, 17 days each for Nigerian and ABNE collaborators) @ \$475-725/day (average)
<b>2.11.6 Outreach and dissemination of results( where possible this will be aligned with a planned NAPP dissemination activity)</b>	Jan- Mar 2018	\$ 5,000	Lump sum for travel, communication, printing, etc.
<b>Total (Direct Costs)</b>		<b>\$ 77,700</b>	

Note: Given that the proposed timeline for this research activity continues into year 3, the total budgeted direct costs actually needed for year 2 is lower than \$77,700.