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PAA Africa – an innovative development programme combining agricultural support and social protection
1.) PAA Africa – an overview

- Basic idea: Link school feeding programmes to local agricultural production
- Inspired by the Brazilian school feeding programme PNAE and the institutional demand programme PAA (Programa de Aquisição de Alimentos)
  - Brazil: By law 30% of publicly procured food needs to be sourced from family farms
- 1st and 2nd phase of the programme (2012-2013 and 2014-2016) – co-funded by the governments of Brazil and the UK
  - Implementation: Brazil (CGFome)
  - Research / Knowledge sharing: UK (DFID)
IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

1.) PAA Africa – implementation arrangements

- Agricultural support (inputs, productive assets, extension)
- Local purchases from smallholder farmers
- School feeding

Productive inclusion

Social protection
1.) PAA Africa – implementation arrangements

Agricultural support (inputs, productive assets, extension) → Local purchases from smallholder farmer organizations → School feeding

Involvement of national governments across all three pillars
1.) PAA Africa – an overview
So far implemented in 5 African countries (pilot scale):
• Malawi
• Mozambique
• Ethiopia
• Niger
• Senegal

Models of implementation adapted to the specific country context
FIGURE 1: Direct purchases from primary-level FOs

Malawi

Farmer → Farmer organisation → WFP/GOV → Schools
FAO/NGO

Mozambique

Farmer → Farmer organisation → WFP/GOV → Schools
FAO/GOV

Food sales
Institutional purchases
Procurement support
Food distribution
Production support
FIGURE 2: Direct purchases from farmer cooperative unions and federations

- **Ethiopia**: Farmer → Primary co-operative → Co-operative union → GOV → Schools
  - FAO/GOV
  - WFP

- **Niger**: Farmer → Farmer organisation → Farmer federation → WFP → Schools
  - FAO/GOV
  - GOV

- **Senegal**: Farmer → GIEs → Farmer union → WFP/GOV → Schools
  - FAO/GOV/NGO
Monitoring and Evaluation of PAA Africa
MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF PAA AFRICA

PAA Africa phase II (2014-2016):
• Monitoring in all five countries of implementation
• Process and outcome evaluation in Senegal and Malawi

PAA Africa phase III (2017-2020)
• Impact evaluation of PAA Africa’s scale-up phase
Research questions:

• To what extent have the planned activities been implemented and outputs been achieved?

• To what extent can the Brazilian Home Grown School Feeding model be adapted to the context of 5 African countries?

• What are the main achievements and good practices of the programme?

• Where are difficulties/bottlenecks and how can they be addressed?
Methodology:

- Analysis of qualitative information
  - Key informant interviews
  - In some countries: focus group discussions

- Analysis of quantitative indicators...
  - Regularly collected information by FAO and WFP country offices and sub-offices
  - Primary data collection in the field by FAO and IPC consultants
  - Interpretation of data and comparison of programme targets with actual performance
PAA Africa – Monitoring Results
OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Substantial progress towards the achievement of programme objectives has been made in all five countries:

• By the time of the data collection the majority of planned programme activities have been implemented successfully

• Major delays and bottlenecks were mostly due to external factors (e.g. climate shocks, budget cuts)

• Efforts to implement the pending activities were under way in all five implementation countries

PAA Africa’s project design is generally suitable to the context of the five African pilot countries
AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY

• PAA’s mix of agricultural support (inputs, trainings) and institutional purchases is effective in fostering productivity

• Productivity of PAA-supported farmers compared to traditional techniques (FAO estimates):
  • Ethiopia: +20% - 75% *
  • Niger: +153% - 257% *
  • Senegal: +130% - 275% *

• Qualitative evidence shows that participating farmers are highly satisfied with the programme’s agricultural support (e.g. Senegal, Ethiopia)

Preliminary evidence: PAA contributes to increases in production and productivity of smallholder farmers

* Range of productivity increases depending on crop and intervention district. Data on productivity increases in PAA’s phase II was not available for Mozambique and Malawi.
NUTRITIONAL DIVERSITY

• PAA Africa has made important contributions to the nutritional diversity of school meals
  • Malawi: cereals, legumes, fruits, vegetables and meat
  • Ethiopia: haricot beans, fava beans, maize, wheat
  • Mozambique: horticultural products

• Decentralized procurement procedures have proven a viable option to assure the supply of perishable food to schools (Malawi, Mozambique)

• Vast majority of purchases are still dedicated to cereals → Potential to make even stronger contributions to nutritional diversity in the future

Local food purchases can be an effective strategy for the diversification of school meals
Important steps towards the programme’s sustainability have been made:

- Successful implication of national partners in the implementation of the programme (all five countries)
  - Active role of decentralized government institutions from the beginning (Ethiopia, Senegal)
  - Partnership with civil society organisations have proven effective (Malawi, Senegal)
  - Strengthening of farmer organizations (Senegal, Mozambique, Ethiopia, Malawi, Niger)

- Establishment of “technical groups” chaired by the government to coordinate the programme can increase national ownership (Senegal, Mozambique)
POTENTIAL TO IMPROVE COORDINATION OF PAA COMPONENTS

Two key components (smallholder farmer perspective)

- Productive support (FAO-led)
- Institutional demand (WFP-led)

→ How well are they coordinated?

Multi-stakeholder coordination is crucial to assure an integrated programme.
NEED TO ADAPT PURCHASE PROCEDURES TO SMALLHOLDERS

- Bottlenecks in institutional purchases have been observed in all PAA countries
  - Difficulties to purchase announced quantities (Mozambique, Niger)
  - Long delays between food delivery and payment (Senegal, Ethiopia)
  - Suspension of school feeding due to delays in the transfer of funds (Malawi)
- Main reasons for the bottlenecks according to key informants
  - Intricate and time consuming purchasing procedures
  - Difficulties for smallholder farmers to meet WFP’s quality standards

Adapting purchase procedures to the needs of smallholder farmers should be a priority during PAA’s scale-up
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