Report from
WFP P4P Monitoring and Evaluation Technical Meeting
April 18-19, 2011
Washington, D.C.

The World Food Programme (WFP) is mid-way through its five-year Purchase for Progress (P4P) pilot initiative which is testing new ways to implement local and regional procurement (LRP) activities and also has ambitious learning objectives, especially around understanding the impacts of LRP on market development and household income.

In April, 2011, WFP convened a two day conference in Washington, D.C. to discuss various aspects of LRP of food. The 40 conference participants represented a range of stakeholders with a common interest in this subject and included donors either funding P4P and/or providing funding to WFP and other international Private Volunteer Organisations (PVOs) for local food purchases, PVOs that are implementing LRP projects, as well as academics and others engaged in research on LRP-related issues. Most of the PVOs in attendance were participating in a United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)-funded pilot LRP project with specific requirements for reporting impacts (view the complete list of participants in Annex B). The PVOs and WFP are each applying different approaches to the collection of the required data. A number of the PVOs have also formed a Learning Alliance[1] with the aim of developing and implementing a standardized strategy for the implementation of the market impact monitoring component of their respective USDA funded LRP projects.

This conference therefore provided an ideal opportunity for participants to:

1. Share learning and challenges with respect to LRP experience to date
2. Discuss the varied approaches adopted so far to estimating the impacts of LRP activities, and
3. Explore opportunities for collaborating on monitoring and evaluation.

From WFP's perspective, the conference also represented an opportunity to:

1. Inform other agricultural development stakeholders of the P4P pilot initiative and the monitoring and evaluation activities associated with the pilot
2. Engage a broad range of stakeholders in a peer review process of P4P monitoring and evaluation procedures.
3. Share and validate lessons from P4P

It was expected that by the end of the conference, participants would have:

1. Developed a shared understanding of:
   - WFP's Local and Regional Procurement activities
   - WFP's approach to the monitoring and evaluation of LRP activities

[1] Learning Alliance members include the three original members, namely Cornell University, Catholic Relief Services and Mercy Corps. Membership was expanded to include World Vision, Land O' Lakes and ACDI-VOCA.

2. Exchanged ideas and learning on:
    - Approaches adopted to meet reporting requirements for USG-funded LRP projects
    - WFP's approach to market analysis in general
3. Identified opportunities for engaging a wide range of stakeholders in collaborative learning

This report provides the record of the meeting proceedings and outcomes. Each of the sessions (see agenda in Annex A) is summarized by a brief description of the presentations made as well the key questions raised and responses provided during both group and plenary discussions.

Proceedings

The conference contained five main sessions[2]. Each session included one or more presentations around a particular theme. Some sessions also included breakout group discussions with opportunities for the groups to report back in plenary.

Session 1: WFP's Local and Regional Procurement (LRP)

WFP has been buying food in local and regional markets for over 20 years. It buys most of this food from large established traders capable of reliably supplying the quantities and qualities required by WFP. This is the standard Local and Regional Procurement (LRP) approach. With the five-year P4P initiative which began in 2008, however, WFP is piloting new approaches to LRP in an attempt to learn if and how it can optimize its overall LRP activity to enhance development impacts – particularly for smallholder farmers. In order to understand how to alter its LRP activities to incorporate lessons from P4P, WFP needs to know the development impact of its standard approach to LRP. In the first of the two presentations in this session, WFP personnel reviewed and compared WFP's two approaches to LRP (standard LRP and P4P). In the second session, faculty members from Michigan State University's Department of Agricultural Economics presented a proposal for estimating the development impacts of the standard LRP approach. This section summarizes each presentation in turn.

How WFP Buys: LRP and the P4P Pilot

Jack Keulemans, Head of WFP's Field Food Procurement Support Unit and Clare Mbizule, Programme Advisor (Learning and Sharing) for P4P, described how WFP buys in local and regional markets. The presentation highlighted the differences between the "standard LRP" approach and that of the P4P pilot – both of which are approaches to LRP.

WFP buys food largely from two sources – from markets within the countries and regions in which beneficiaries are located and on international markets. The organization's mission is to "provide acceptable food to the beneficiaries in a timely and cost-efficient manner." The Financial Rules encourage WFP "to the extent possible to procure from the developing countries" thus reflecting a strong preference for using LRP to pursue its mission. In 2010, WFP

[2] 1. WFP's Local and Regional Procurement; 2. Monitoring and Evaluation for P4P; 3. Putting P4P back into an overall context; 4. USDA LRP Reporting Requirement; and 5. Potential for Collaboration

purchased 3.2 million mt of food valued at USD 1.25 billion from 76 developing and 20 developed countries.

Standard LRP

The primary factors that affect decisions about how and where WFP buys food include donor country conditions and restrictions, recipient country requirements, and considerations for the impact of procurement on local markets/economies. For instance, donor countries may specify the origin, destination, quality, packaging, marking, and other characteristics of the food purchased with donated funds. A common condition is that funds be used for LRP. Like tied food aid, this restriction limits WFP's options and sometimes leads to a type of procurement that is not best suited to needs. Recipient countries may also impose requirements on food they receive. Common requirements include the type of food and its origin and packaging. Recipient country import restrictions may also constrain WFP's procurement. WFP conducts market research when it buys locally to prevent adverse impacts on local markets or economies. For example, it may choose not to buy locally in thin markets to avoid exerting upward pressure on local prices.

Purchase for Progress

The standard LRP approach buys primarily from large traders, processors, millers, and wholesalers with the capacity to reliably supply the quantity and quality required by WFP. Through P4P, WFP buys largely from farmers' organizations (FOs), small and medium traders, small-scale processors, and commodity exchanges. Because these suppliers often can't meet WFP's usual requirements (e.g., quantities, quality, performance bonds, bagging, marking, delivery) P4P employs innovative procurement modalities designed to address these market access constraints. Table 1 summarizes the salient differences between the standard LPR and P4P pilot approaches to LRP from a procurement perspective.

TABLE 1. COMPARISON OF STANDARD LRP AND P4P PROCUREMENT REQUIREMENTS

	Standard LRP	P4P
Suppliers	Pre-qualified suppliers (mostly larger traders) with legal standing, financial capacity, delivery capacity, and good performance record.	Pre-qualified smallholder farmers' organisations and small and medium traders
Contracting mechanisms	Competitive tenders	• Competitive tenders • Modified competitive tenders (see contract terms below) • Direct contracts • Forward contracts • Commodity exchanges[3]
Procurement requirements		

[3] See page 19 for a detailed description of the P4P procurement modalities.

Price	Determined by authorized contracting mechanisms but not to exceed import parity	Determined by authorized contracting mechanisms but not to exceed import parity
Quantities	Preference for relatively large quantities	Will consider much smaller quantities to accommodate FO capacities
Performance bond	5 – 10%	None
Quality	WFP standards (or relevant recipient country standards)	WFP standards (or relevant recipient country standards)
Bagging	Bagged in 50 kg bags and marked with WFP logo	Flexible (may subsidize bagging and/or waive marking as needed to accommodate capacity of supplier)
Delivery terms	DDU to specified destination (usually WFP warehouse) on specified date	Flexible (WFP may collect the commodity, modify delivery locations, allow extended delivery times, etc.)

As a pilot, P4P emphasizes learning – learning if and how WFP can use its procurement to enhance smallholder farmers' capacities to produce and profitably market their staple commodities. Through P4P, WFP seeks to answer two broad questions:

1. What procurement modalities/platforms best support capacity building and create an enabling environment for procurement from smallholder farmers?
2. What is the best way for WFP to balance the risks and costs associated with pro-smallholder procurement in order to optimize and transform its local procurement practices?

Criteria used to assess progress on these fronts include group marketing capacity, production capacity, and livelihood improvement.

By committing to buy from smallholder farmers, P4P expects to catalyze support from other development partners to build smallholder farmers' capacities to produce and to access markets. WFP's contribution to P4P is to provide smallholder farmers and assured market for the duration of the pilot. This market will give smallholder farmers a level of comfort necessary to begin to invest, with the support of capacity building partners, in increasing production, value addition, and market access. Ultimately, WFP will incorporate market development best practices identified through P4P into its procurement practices and share best practices with other agricultural development stakeholders. This statement emphasizes the three pillars of P4P:

1. **WFP's demand** – Test innovative procurement modalities (soft tendering, direct contracts, forward contracts, linking smallholder farmers to processors) to foster WFP's

ability to work with smallholder farmers. Share knowledge on post-harvest handling, transport, and storage.

2. **Partnerships** – Through capacity-building partnerships, ensure quality and reliability of local supply by building smallholders' production and marketing capacities.
3. **Learning and Sharing** – Learning from experience and identifying best practices. Learning tools include the monitoring and evaluation system; a Technical Review Panel; Annual Reviews at the national, regional, and global levels; and contributing to policy dialogues.

Through this development process, WFP expects to build smallholder farmers' capacities for sustainable and profitable engagement in formal markets thus increasing their incomes and welfare. To accomplish this, P4P must increase smallholders' productivity and profitable access to markets (i.e., strengthen aggregation capacity, develop markets, and promote a pro-smallholder enabling environment). If successful, WFP expects that "by 2015 that agricultural markets will have developed in such a way that many more smallholder or low-income farmers, the majority of whom are women, will produce food surpluses, sell them at a fair price, and increase their incomes."

Country approaches to P4P are tailored to suit the opportunities and constraints within each country. Generally, however, each programme has applied one or more of the general approaches summarized in Table 2.

TABLE 2. P4P APPROACHES

Approach	Characteristics/examples of the approach
Approach #1: Farmers' organisations and capacity building partnerships	• WFP buys from FOs of varying capacities • Procurement modality selected to match FO capacity/needs with progression strategy ending in capacity for competitive tendering • FOs receive support on production and marketing

Approach #2: Support to emerging structured trading systems	• WFP supports establishing warehouse receipts systems (WRS) in two ways:
	  • direct support for establishing WRS
	  • purchasing through WRS
	• Purchasing through cereal fairs or commodity exchanges to create a "pull-in/follow-in effect"
	• Working with FOs to build capacities for structured trade

Approach #3: Small and medium traders	• Enhance competition among buyers • Provide an alternative market for farmers' surpluses • Buys from traders through modified tendering • Train traders on WFP procurement and contract requirements • Invest in marketing equipment – stitching machines, weighing scales
Approach #4: Developing local food processing capacity	• Connect farmers' organisations to established food processors • Develop local processing capacity – biscuits, supplementary feeding products

Questions and Answers

1. *How do donor preferences for buying from developing countries affect procurement (pricing) rules?* Jack responded that some donors are willing or accept to pay a premium (up to 10%) and some new donors are creating new conditions. Therefore, WFP at times pays more to support development objectives, but Jack warned that paying too high a premium is counterproductive to development efforts by creating a false market and not building capacity to engage sustainably and profitably in markets.
2. *Does WFP willingness to cave in to recipients' desire for non-GMO foods support these practices?* Jack responded that the constraint is causing problems – particularly in maize because only a few countries can guarantee GMO free maize making it difficult for WFP to find sufficient quantities of non-GMO maize to meet needs.
3. *When P4P sources from a commodity exchange, how does it know that the commodity is coming from a smallholder farmer?* Tobias Flaemig, P4P Coordinator in Malawi responded that it is impossible to identify specific FOs and smallholder farmers who sell to WFP through a commodity exchange. However, he is confident that most of what WFP buys across the exchange in Malawi comes from smallholders. Warehouse receipt systems (WRS) linked to exchanges will make it easier to trace commodity origins. Other P4P pilot countries are also trying to establish systems for tracing commodity origins.

Assessing the Impact of Standard LRP

The standard LRP approach is an integral part of WFP's LRP activity and has performed well in meeting WFP's core objectives of timely and cost-efficient delivery of acceptable food. However, little evidence exists about the development impacts of the approach. Such evidence is crucial to integrating lessons from the P4P pilot into WFP's LRP practices. In this presentation, Drs. David Tschirley and Bob Myers of Michigan State University presented a proposal for estimating the development impacts associated with the WFP's standard LRP approach[4]. They identified two key questions that need to be answered:

- To what extent are markets transmitting prices from traders to farmers?
- To what extent do higher prices prompt a supply response both in terms of farmers increasing production and the larger food system (e.g., traders, processors, transporters) increasing investments. Since farmers may increase production of one commodity at the expense of another, the question at the farmer level is really whether there is an aggregate supply response. An aggregate supply response will increase household incomes.

The presenters proposed a *package* of analyses consisting of three parallel and complementary approaches:

[4] Powerpoint presentation outlining the proposal can be found at: http://www.aec.msu.edu/fs2/emergency/LRPProposalPresentation-TschirleyMyers.pdf

- **Market modeling** – Modeling the impact of LRP activity at both the market and household levels. At the market (macro) level, the presenters propose to use a Vector Autoregression (VAR) model to estimate the impact of LRP (i.e., LRP purchases, food aid distributions) on commodity price levels, price stability, production levels, and aggregate production.
- **Household modeling -** At the household (micro) level, they propose to estimate the impact of LRP activity (i.e., price effects of LRP estimated from the macro analysis, food aid distributions) on household level production, household welfare, and (possibly) household consumption.
- **Case studies** to examine the effect of increased price expectations/prices on investments in food system infrastructure and development of market institutions (e.g., commodity exchanges and warehouse receipt systems). The case studies would also examine the performance of LRP relative to causing adverse market impacts (increasing prices or price volatility), reliability (defaults), and suitability (food quality).

These analyses are data intensive and their feasibility will depend on access to necessary data. Data availability will determine the countries where the approach can be applied. In particular, the macro analysis will require data on procurement, prices, and production. The household (micro) analysis will require cross sectional/panel data based on household surveys on aggregate production and, perhaps, consumption.

Based on the presenters' knowledge of data availability, they propose implementing the approach(es) in Zambia, Mozambique, and Kenya. The available data will probably limit the macro (VAR) model to a single cross-country study that combines data from all three countries into a single analysis.

Following the presentation, conference participants separated into two breakout groups to discuss and report back on the following questions:

1. *What impacts do you expect (or have you observed) from your LRP activities?*
2. *How, if at all, can WFP's work contribute to understanding the impacts of your own work?*
3. *What specific suggestions do you have for MSU to improve the proposed analysis or its relevance to your work?*

Breakout Group Report Back

Both groups endorsed the proposed approach, believing it to be relevant and appropriate and saw great value in sharing results among LRP stakeholders (USDA, Cornell, MSU, Learning Alliance, etc.). USDA was particularly interested in exploring issues of cost-efficiency of LRP. The following comments and responses summarize the report back of the two breakout groups.

- Some participants questioned the ability of LRP to have any impact on prices and aggregate production because the size was very small relative to national production and that it might be necessary to examine impacts in secondary markets and/or weekly price data. The analysis should examine spatial price transmission in light of the relevant local market.
- In light of recent increases in food and transportation costs, it is worth re-examining the cost-efficiency of LRP relative to in-kind food aid. The presenters agreed that there might be value and offered to add this analysis to the proposal.
- Consider including West Africa, Uganda, and Latin America (El Salvador) in the analysis if data are available. The presenters are open to considering a wider range of countries – or at least exploring where data are available. Bob suggested that it might be more appropriate to prioritize countries where we would most expect an impact rather than countries where data are available. There is potential for implementing selected parts of the *package* in a particular country depending on what data are available.
- The analysis should account for government interference in commodity markets and government purchases.
- The analysis should examine impacts on the transport sector and impact on development of market institutions.
- The analysis should include internal consumption if data exist.
- The analysis should examine impacts on different types/sizes of farmers. Price impact will be different for net buyers and net sellers
- The analysis should also examine the impact of LRP on the prices of food other than that purchased through LRP.
- Consider remote sensing approach to production data.
- There is value in collaboration and USDA and USAID may be able to make some data available to the study.

Session 2: Monitoring and Evaluation for P4P

In this session, Clare Mbizule, Programme Advisor (Learning and Sharing) for P4P and Emmanuela Mashayo, P4P Country Coordinator in Rwanda reviewed the P4P monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system – from the headquarters and country perspective.

The P4P Coordination Unit designed the M&E system primarily to support programme-level learning and left monitoring of country-level implementation largely to the country offices. The M&E system specifies data collection and analysis methods designed to track a number of indicators of programme performance. Illustrative indicators include:

- Indicators of farmers' organization capacity
    - Sales volume, aggregation capacity, number of buyers, membership, services offered, value addition activities.
- Farmers' production and welfare

    - Surpluses, sales and percentage of sales through the farmers' organization, prices received, post-harvest practices/losses, household income, food consumption score, asset score, expenditure, household income, net buyer/seller status.
- Procurement
    - WFP purchases from smallholder farmers, transformation of WFP procurement practices.

The M&E system collects data from a number of sources including:

- Large scale panel surveys of farmers' organizations and smallholder farmers. To accommodate capacity constraints at both the country office and headquarters levels, these surveys are conducted every other year. To facilitate rigorous impact assessment, selected countries collect survey data from both treatment and comparison groups.
- Surveys of traders conducted every other year.
- Bi-annual case studies with selected smallholder farmers, farmers' organizations, and traders to collect in-depth information about how and why P4P is working.
- Detailed information on farmers' organizations aggregation and sales activities gleaned from farmers' organization records.
- Market price data collected largely from secondary sources.
- Procurement data obtained from WFP and P4P procurement records.
- Secondary data from agricultural statistics services, partners, etc.

The M&E system also incorporates peer review to identify and validate best practices. At the country level, these include stakeholder meetings, workshops, and annual reviews. At the regional level, WFP is using writeshops and regional workshops to consolidate and validate learning. At the global/programme level, a Technical Review Panel meets annually to review and help interpret results and to guide implementation. Peer review meetings, annual reviews, internal (to WFP) stakeholder groups, and external evaluations also serve to validate results.

Managing the learning process for a programme with the scope and scale of P4P has been challenging and the design and evolution of the M&E system reflect these challenges. In particular:

- The donor's insistence on assessing P4P's impact on household income dictated a rigorous quasi-experimental design approach that has taxed the data collection and management capacities of both the P4P Coordination Unit and country offices. Recognizing the challenges of obtaining a reliable measure of household income, the Coordination Unit also specified collecting data on alternative welfare measures (i.e., expenditure, food consumption score, asset score). Also, to limit the data collection burden, the Coordination Unit accepted the recommendation of the Technical Review Panel and limited the number of countries for rigorous impact assessment and scaled back the household survey to every other year. WFP has now engaged the African

Economic Research Consortium (AERC) to manage collection and analysis of the quantitative data.

- It has proven difficult to maintain the comparison groups necessary for impact assessment. In some cases, country offices began to incorporate comparison group members into P4P. In others – i.e., Rwanda – the government decided to replicate the P4P intervention nationwide. In others, where there was little geographic separation between treatment and comparison farmers' organizations, members began to migrate from comparison groups to treatment groups.
- Using FOs as the point of contact for capacity building may also raises a risk that capacity building will not be transmitted effectively to smallholder members. In response, country offices are developing strategies to limit the potential for elite capture.
- Bringing together the learning across the 21 P4P countries also presents a challenge. NB. The Coordination Unit has initiated a series of writeshops beginning to coalesce and document learning.

Breakout Group Report Back

The breakout groups addressed the following three questions.

1. *What types of data and methods (e.g., livelihoods measures, level of rigor, impact assessment methods, etc.) do we need to understand the impact of our work (both for management and for reporting/communication)?*
2. *What are the challenges to generating this type of data or implementing the methods?*
3. *What specific opportunities do you see for collaborating to improve learning among members of the development community and what challenges to you anticipate in enhancing collaboration?*

Responses of the breakout groups to these questions included.

- Measuring income is a major data collection challenge and we do not yet have an agreed best approach.
- The scope of the P4P M&E system is appropriate to being able to learn and report the nuanced story.
- It will be particularly challenging to identify the impacts/effects of different procurement modalities.
- It will also be challenging to deliver results by gender and ethnic groups and a strong M&E system can facilitate a more transparent approach in these situations.
- The P4P M&E system offers great potential for sharing experience and knowledge. It will be valuable to have government and other partners involved in data collection in order to build sustainable capacity for data collection and analysis.

- The length of the interviews used in the P4P M&E system may have impacted the quality of data – particularly for households. This may be a particular problem for non-participating households and FOs who have little motivation to participate in the survey.
- WFP (and others who collect data) need to recognize that data collection is a burden for respondents.
- Targeted data collection is useful for P4P and may also enhance the quality of information in specific P4P regions.
- There are opportunities for collaboration with WFP but it may also be valuable to move towards a common framework for data collection and analysis.
- WFP could be a leader in bringing stakeholders together in collaborative learning.
- Impact assessment requires a high degree of rigor that will be challenging for most organizations. Will engaging AERC be sufficient to provide this level of rigor and address problems in baseline data collection?
- The potential for using rapid response data – perhaps for prices, smallholder participation in sales, etc. could be explored.
- There may be better indicators of FO capacity. Look at the Partner Institutional Viability Assessment (PIVA) tool as an option.
- Consider offering modest compensation to comparison groups (non-participating groups) to compensate them for data collection burden and to minimize attrition/migration.
- Consider using national level statistics to construct a proxy for comparison groups.
- Impact assessment requires a lot of resources. Don't sacrifice learning for impact assessment.
- Make sure to identify and collaborate with other data collection activities that can support learning – e.g., Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA).
- Collaborate with USDA on issues like food safety, etc.
- Consider looking beyond the market effects of LRP to examine development impacts.

Session 3: Putting P4P back into an overall context

The purpose of this session was to introduce the African Economic Research Consortium and their role in P4P and to give USG agencies (USDA, USAID) and opportunity to articulate their reporting needs and how this has influenced data collection and reporting requirements associated with USG-funded LRP projects.

African Economic Research Consortium introduction (WFP/AERC)

In this session, Innocent Matshe, Director of Training and Willis Kosura, Programme Director from the African Economic Research Consortium (AERC) described their organization, their collaboration with WFP/P4P, and their vision for a broader collaboration around building the capacity for research in Africa.

AERC is a consortium of funders supporting a network of individuals and institutions (researchers, students, universities, and policy research institutes) and policy makers, and

overseen by a secretariat in Nairobi. Its vision is to foster sustainable development through an informed society and sound economic management. AERC supports graduate training in agricultural economics and economics and builds the capacities of researchers through technical workshops and visiting scholarships. It draws on its network of researchers and institutions to conduct policy relevant research. AERC's network covers 35 countries and three linguistic groups – anglophone, francophone, and lusophone – and includes over 40 universities in collaborative masters and doctoral programmes.

WFP has established a data management hub within AERC to manage the vast quantities of data coming from P4P and to facilitate collaboration and learning around these data. The hub presents an opportunity for WFP to gain access to the capacity to enhance data analysis and learning and for AERC to engage its network of students and researchers thereby building their capacities for policy relevant research.

Questions and Answers

- *Will AERC also collect and manage data for the Latin America countries?* Yes, but AERC will seek partnerships with local partners with knowledge of the Latin American context and the ability to work in Spanish.
- *Will AERC collect and manage country-level M&E data?* AERC will support country offices in implementing surveys of farmers' organizations, farmers, and traders. To the extent that data from these surveys support country-level M&E, AERC will support the activity.

USG Perspectives on LRP Objectives and Reporting

In this presentation, representatives from three USG food security programmes described their agency's programme objectives and reporting requirements and identified areas of potential collaboration with WFP. Presenters included:

- Kristen Penn, Office of Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative, US Agency for International Development (USAID) speaking about Feed the Future;
- Adam Norikane, Policy Analyst - Food for Peace, US Agency for International Development (USAID); and
- Jamie Fisher, Chief, Local & Regional Procurement, US Department of Agriculture (USDA) speaking about the USDA LRP pilot.

A short question and answer session followed the presentations.

USAID – Feed the Future

USAID views reporting requirements around Feed the Future (FtF) broadly in the context of results-based management. This implies a focus not just on reporting but using data to manage USG investments in improving food security across agencies. To this end, reporting requirements for FtF help USAID monitor spending against FtF strategy and coordinate the

investments of other agencies around food security initiatives. The FtF approach embraces a commitment to building local capacity and recognizes that capacity to collect primary data on food security programming is a critical gap. USAID is also strongly committed to learning and knowledge sharing, not just within the USG agencies, but across the field of agricultural development stakeholders.

USAID sees a close alignment between FtF and P4P in the areas of definitions of food security, the basic approach (i.e., capacity building of farmers' organizations), and the focus on improved productivity and market development. There are also clear opportunities for collaboration to improve the work of both organizations – particularly in identifying indicators of farmers' organization capacity building and women's empowerment.

USAID – Food for Peace

Food for Peace (FFP) focuses primarily on reducing foods insecurity in vulnerable populations and less on development impacts such as benefits of LRP on local markets and producers. Because of its focus on food security, FFP reports on food security, rather than development, indicators. FFP is currently more closely examining emergency programmes and trying to identify the relevant indicators they want implementing partners to report. Many of the current reporting requirements revolve around understanding the timeliness of LRP purchase and delivery and the number of beneficiaries reached and disaggregation by age categories.

Many of the FFP projects are closing out and final reports are coming in. USAID expects a lot of interest from Congress – especially around the issue of the cost-effectiveness of alternative ways of providing food aid.

USDA – LRP Pilot

The United States has come under increasing pressure to provide cash instead of in-kind donations for food aid. In response, the 2008 Farm Bill authorized a four-year $16 million LRP pilot that is administered by USDA. To address the lack of empirical data on LRP, and the objections of US agricultural interests to LRP, the pilot seeks to understand the timeliness and cost-efficiency of LRP relative to in-kind food donations; the potential for adverse market impacts associated with LRP; and, to a lesser extent, the quality of food provided through LRP compared to in-kind aid. The LRP pilot's reporting requirements were designed to facilitate data collection and learning about these issues.

The LRP pilot funded 22 field-based projects in 19 countries – 12 development projects and 10 emergency projects. However, consistent with the pilot's authorization, 60 percent of the funding went to emergency projects. USDA has released a Request for Proposals (RFQ) for a final evaluation of the LRP pilot. Implementing PVOs will submit final reports by the end of September 2011.

Questions and Answers

Conference participants posed the following questions to presenters.

1. *Did USDA consider using indicators of food safety other than aflatoxin – for example, oxidation of oils in blended foods?*
    a. At a minimum, all of the USG programmes require compliance with recipient country quality standards. Beyond those standards, USDA wanted to specify an approach that would be feasible in the implementing countries and determined that aflatoxin was the most appropriate measure.
2. *Does USDA plan to assess the impacts of its LRP pilot and, if so, when?*
    a. USDA is planning an impact assessment after the pilot is completed.
3. *Will resources for LRP be extended?*
    a. None of the agencies represented could say for certain whether resources would be extended.

Session 4: USDA LRP Reporting Requirements

The fourth session focused on understanding the various approaches conference participants were employing to meet reporting requirements for USDA LRP pilot field-based projects. The session consisted of two presentations – a panel of four recipients of USDA LRP grants presenting their approaches to market data collection followed by breakout group discussions and a presentation by WFP's Vulnerability and Mapping (VAM) Unit on market data collection.

Measurement approaches to USDA data

Four presenters – Rupert Best, Sr. Technical Advisor - Agriculture and Environment, Catholic Relief Services; Bryan Crawford, Design and Development Officer, Integrated Food and Nutrition, World Vision International; Blake Audsley, Market Analyst, P4P Coordination Unit, WFP/Rome; and Tobias Flaemig, P4P Country Coordinator, WFP Malawi presented their approach to collecting data for USDA reporting.

WFP

WFP is collecting data to understand four potential categories of results associated with LRP. These include:

- Indicators of procurement cost and administrative procedures;
- Prevailing and historic market conditions;
- Impacts on local and regional agricultural producers, low-income consumers, programme recipients, and agricultural sector in general; and
- Impacts of LRP purchases on prices for producers and consumers.

However, a one-off local purchase is not likely to generate impacts on producers, consumers, recipients, and the agricultural sector. Furthermore, estimating the effects of LRP on market prices is an analytically challenging exercise and the necessary data are often not available. For instance, many countries generate some market data but it may not match the geographic market relevant to the local procurement action, may be unreliable, and may contain gaps in time series – all of which limit the analyses that are possible.

How WFP approaches data collection and analysis depends on the data available and the prevailing market conditions in a given country. In Mali, for instance, good time series data on weekly wholesale and retail prices permit detailed value chain mapping and gross margin analysis. On the other hand, inconsistent data, incomplete time series, and a lack of secondary price data at the level of relevant local markets in Tanzania limits WFP's ability to identify the effects of LRP. In Malawi, WFP relies on available secondary price data in markets near local procurement sites to "flag" situations where market prices move above their historical range of variability of speed of change or in response to an LPR action.

Challenges to better understanding of the effects of LRP on local markets include identifying and incorporating the boundaries of relevant markets (including cross-border market catchment areas), understanding and incorporating lagged price effects in analyses, linking surplus production analysis to net buyer/seller status.

Learning Alliance

Five of the Private Volunteer Organizations implementing LRP field-based projects (CRS, Mercy Corps, World Vision, Land O'Lakes, and ACDI/VOCA) formed the LRP Learning Alliance to share data and learning on the effectiveness of LRP. The Learning Alliance employs a standard M&E system to provide information for project reporting and impact assessment. It is specifically designed to evaluate the timeliness and cost-effectiveness of LRP, impacts on local market prices, and market development impacts.

The Learning Alliance has developed a comprehensive set of tools and procedures to collect data on market prices, project costs, planned and actual procurement volumes, detailed information on food distribution and on cash transfers and vouchers, and beneficiary numbers. Learning Alliance members collect market price data from traders and from secondary sources as applicable. Project records provide data on costs, distributions, and beneficiary numbers.

The Learning Alliance is generating substantial quantities of consistent data across countries and types of projects. These data provide an opportunity for reasonably rigorous analysis of the timeliness and cost-effectiveness of LRP relative to in-kind food aid and the impacts of LRP on food prices. However, collecting the necessary data has proven challenging. Specific challenges include:

- The analytical complexity of estimating impacts on prices and markets;
- Unreliable secondary data;
- Significant data collection burden for short projects;
- Limited field office capacity for data collection and analysis;
- Difficulty drawing conclusions on much more than immediate impacts; and
- Data collection tools that must accommodate different types of projects (LRP, food vouchers, cash transfers) and reporting requirements (USDA vs. USAID).

Questions and Answers

Conference participants posed the following questions to the panel.

1. *Are there specific components aimed at strengthening government MIS or is this happening in an ad-hoc way?*
    a. WFP: In Malawi, WFP has engaged with Agriculture Extension Support (AES) in the Ministry of Agriculture to foster continuity of data collection. But if data collection is donor driven and one exits, the department struggles to keep the system running. We need to find a way to build more efficient systems and to do this within one or two years is ambitious. And this is talking just about data collection, not even analysis.
    b. WFP: There are a lot of proposals within WFP to strengthen MIS capacity. But, sustaining MIS is not a one-off and we need to engage governments for the long term; the donor community, not just individual organisations, needs to be involved.
2. *Have P4P and the Learning Alliance discussed harmonizing data collection and analysis?*
    a. WFP: We have had informal conversations but this meeting is part of the engagement. NB. Within WFP we have very different approaches in the three countries in which WFP is implementing field-based projects.
    b. World Vision: The Learning Alliance evaluation will only include projects implemented by members of the alliance.
3. *In countries where a PVO and WFP are both implementing LPR field-based projects, are the purchases happening in the same area and is there therefore opportunity to share MIS?*
    a. We are purchasing in the same areas in Mali, Niger, and Burkina Faso. In these countries, a lot of the data collection is done by government.
    b. The PVOs have more enumerators while WFP relies mainly on government data systems. We have information that should be shared and I would hope that this becomes a priority for us all as a community [to work together to strengthen MIS]. In general, governments in Sahelian countries are more involved in collecting price data.

Breakout Groups Report Back

Conference members separated into two breakout groups to answer the following three questions.

1. *What data and/or analyses are necessary to understand the market impacts of LRP?*
2. *What is feasible to produce from a data collection and analysis perspective?*
3. *How can we facilitate or support better market data collection in the future?*

There are two key challenges in understanding the market impacts of LRP – data collection and analysis. Data collection represents a substantial investment in time and money and we need to find ways to collect data more efficiently. Technology is improving the efficiency of data collection but most technology-based systems will require donor support. In particular, SMS-based data collection systems are an interesting approach but are not sustainable without government investment. Government needs to see value in this and we should be advocating for this for the long term. Perhaps we could get regional bodies interested in moving this agenda forward. We could also try to get donors to fund the institutional capacity building within government to establish SMS systems.

Another approach to improving data collection efficiency is to identify the basic data we need and focus on establishing efficient systems for collecting these data. For instance, if we knew more about how markets were integrated, we could monitor fewer markets. We could also do a better job of distinguishing the situations where we need relatively straightforward monitoring data and when we need more complex evaluation data that require a greater level of rigor and apply appropriate data collection methods in each case. We need to balance what is needed academically against what is practical and feasible to collect. WFP's use of flags (Malawi) is a promising approach to improving the efficiency of analysis – recognizing the minimum required for decision making and efficiently extracting that information from the data.

We also need to improve the availability of data. In this regard, there are some promising efforts to get those who collect data to make it available as open source. We also need to support comprehensive data systems but working to develop such systems through individual projects is not feasible. The resulting market information is haphazard and scattered, even if made available as open source. Market data collection requires a coordinated national approach. Collecting and disseminating market price data used to be part of agricultural extension in Africa. But the advent of cell phones has given many farmers access to real-time data on prices and fewer governments are investing in broad market data systems.

FAO should be playing a key role in this but is not. There is a role for donors to work with national statistical entities to identify who is interested in building up an MIS and then bringing those with the expertise to the table. This could also happen through NEPAD or CAADP. However, this is a long-term strategy that will require a concerted effort and does not address immediate data needs.

FEWS NET is collecting information from national systems in a number of countries. One purpose is simply to document what is going on in the markets in terms of price. But there is little information on market characteristics/integration, volumes, commodities, number of traders. USAID has been developing a market integration index for some of these markets, but it is very expensive.

Meaningful analysis is difficult because data is often not particularly timely and may be of poor quality. Validation is important to improving data quality. We can also improve data quality by collaborating on data collection so as to minimize enumerator and respondent fatigue.

FEWS NET is working with WFP to see how to define data and share this data. Each month a market price watch is produced and flags things that are out of the normal bounds. The intent is to develop the capacity to predict where markets are going in the next six months, but traders can probably do this better. Welcome collaboration in contributing data to the pool.

The Earth Institute has developed a technologically based data collection system to track and respond to disease outbreaks and is also adapting the system to agricultural data. The system uses SMS technology to register pregnant women and new-born children with community health workers. Data is sent automatically to a centralized system on regional and national levels. Real time analysis raises flags when data show increased levels of various diseases, e.g. malaria, and feeds data back to the clinics through community health workers. In Nigeria, the system has a GIS component to link health data to geography. This system is flexible and can be adapted to different sectors. It is currently being piloted for agriculture in Haiti and Tanzania to disseminate market prices and improve crop forecasts. The system collects comprehensive data from farmers when they register and then subsequent data collection (updating) is less intensive.

WFP's Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM) Unit activities to support P4P M&E (VAM)

In this presentation, Jean Martin Bauer, Regional Programme Officer, West Africa & P4P Focal Point, WFP Dakar described how the VAM Unit supports P4P with market analysis. He used a number of examples from West Africa to illustrate the challenges inherent in analyzing market price movements and analytical techniques for addressing these challenges. He concluded that it is quite difficult to identify market impacts of LRP or cash/voucher programs.

Questions and Answers

The presentation raised the following questions and answers.

1. *How do we make sure that we are using the same and consistent methods for establishing the cost of production?*
    a. WFP: Liberia, Sierra Leone and Southern Sudan are post conflict countries and the cost of production is above IPP for rice. The Norman Borlaug Institute of Agriculture is studying and while awaiting their findings, we are looking into the pricing in these three countries because of the issue of production costs versus import parity.
2. There is a lot of context behind each category. For instance, why do smallholders sell more than they buy – storage, cash needs etc.? This contextual information is critical to enable better decision making.

Session 5: Potential for Collaboration

The final session explored the potential for collaboration, the value of peer review, and how to facilitate collaboration and peer review. The session opened with presentations from a panel of four, followed by questions and answers, breakout group discussion, and report back from the breakout groups.

Panel discussion - Collaboration and Peer Review

The session opened with presentations from a panel composed of Paul Guenette, Senior Vice President -Corporate Affairs, ACDI/VOCA; Alex Winter-Nelson, Department of Agricultural & Consumer Economics, University of Illinois; Innocent Matshe, Director of Training, African Economic Research Consortium; and Laura Melo, Regional Programme Advisor, P4P (Latin and Central America), WFP Panama.

ADCI/VOCA

We are at a moment in time when donors are demanding more and better M&E to ensure accountability, understand the causal relationships between activities and results, and rigorously demonstrate the impact of their investments. Furthermore, donors are asking for finer indicators and more nuanced reporting. So, where before we needed only aggregate market data for indicator reporting, now we need household level data on indicators such as infant consumption and food utilization. In the face of increasingly demanding M&E requirements, funding levels are all falling so we are trying to do more with less.

In this environment, effective collaboration is necessary and survival requires it. Emerging examples of collaboration include Esoko (SMS system for agricultural market information), Learning Alliance, P4P, FtF program is proposing new unified M&E systems and indicators that should reflect the whole of US government and harmonize M&E between USAID and USDA.

As necessary as collaboration is, facilitating and catalyzing collaboration is tricky. FAO, Ministries of Agriculture, and civil society organisations should all be involved in collecting, organizing, cleaning, and analyzing food production, prices, and conditions at the national and global levels. However, motivation is often too low to get the job done.

The donors are beginning to coordinate funding for MIS. It may be worth working through NEPAD for CAADP to get mandated national and appropriate MIS systems that will get buy in from national governments for country led planning for the donor community to support development of national MSI within the government.

We must keep looking in each of our work plans for opportunities for collaboration. For example, projects can do joint impact evaluation. An M&E working group – perhaps as a spin-off of this meeting could facilitate greater collaboration. Our M&E officer wants to participate in a peer group. Could there be an M&E summit on indicators to put all food security and M&E experts together to talk? We all have the same challenges – high expectations/requirements and low resources. There are good things happening that need to be shared.

University of Illinois

There is a growing convergence of interest between academics and practitioners brought on by an increasing demand for rigor in M&E. There is a surplus of analytical capacity in universities. There is a tendency to go back to the usual channels such as MSU or Cornell but we are also there and many others. But we see over and over again that there is a transaction cost to using this capacity and if you are to do this type of rigorous impact evaluation, there is a cost to doing this. Third party funding is a real issue and part of the collaboration should be to identify up front the resources to support rigorous impact assessment and other analytical methods.

There may also be an opportunity to transform how we engage in peer review. For example, we could collaborate through peer review in developing and implementing an M&E process. The Learning Alliance provides a good model of this approach. P4P is a pilot not just for LRP but also for collaborative approaches to supporting rigorous M&E.

AERC

AERC is in the business of capacity building because we have been unable to sustain the type of analysis and level of rigor required to address the continent's problems. This is a great need for collaboration to bring different players and information together to address the challenges of smallholder farmers.

The data hub will build the capacity of individuals and also institutions within our network. Effective collaboration requires more than just bringing actors together and making them work together. We need a similar way of looking at things – a similar way of trying to get a result out and understanding of what that result can do for the solution we are seeking. Faculty research also has spill-over effects on the rest of the system with which we collaborate.

Our modality involves collaboration along institutions, themes and individuals. We have, most obviously, the universities. But also within the network we have the policy institutes that are normally sidelined in the process of building capacity and collaboration. Depending on the opportunities available in each country, we try to foster collaboration between all those who talk to policy makers, to farmers, to extension officers, to market and business organizations. We need all these components to be in sync with each other so we have access to a rich and diverse base of information in each region.

We foster collaboration among individuals. This is more difficult that it seems. Academics can be difficult to deal with as they are all individualistic. But when they are in one room and talking from the same page, it is a unique achievement. We hope we can get our academics collaborating with farmers, development agencies, policy makers, business people, and others.

Academics are critical to the peer review process. They can provide a closer attention to detail, context, and how analysis is conducted. People who have the freedom to spend days thinking about a single idea are uniquely situated to address these issues.

WFP

Country offices did not have the capability to deal with the scale, complexity, and dimension of the P4P M&E system. Therefore, we need to collaborate with others to make it work.

But let's not lose sight of the purpose of the M&E system. We need to understand the dynamics, impacts, and mechanism of P4P but the information has limited utility if it does not inform/influence policy, communicate lessons in a practical manner, or provide information relevant to improving programme performance. An M&E system that generates information without putting systems in place that help improve implementation has limited utility.

WFP is not the only organization doing this work and needs to align its learning with what has been done before and what others are doing now. We should be collaborating with national institutions and look at what governments and others are doing so we can pass on knowledge and capacity we are developing. Collaborating with governments allows us to position issues of markets and smallholders among young people who are future leaders.

Questions and Answers

The panel presentations raised the following questions and answers:

1. *From a country perspective, what is the practical mechanism for harmonizing data collection and fostering partnerships for data sharing?*
    a. The relevant models for collaboration will vary by country and the type of support needed in a particular country. In Rwanda, universities have an abundance of relevant skills but seem motivated more by earning money than doing the job. National institutes are another potential collaborator but need capacity building support at the lowest level (e.g., compensating data collectors). We need to work with them beyond the timeframe of a single project to build long-term capacity.
2. We hear a lot about increasing demands for rigorous M&E and also that resources to support it are increasingly scarce. *Should we not be looking for ways to make M&E more efficient?* Perhaps one approach is to develop criteria for determining when we need a very rigorous (and high cost) M&E system and when something less complex (and lower cost) would do. This approach may reduce the obstacles to funding M&E.
    a. This is not possible. It is very difficult to come up with a cut off for rigor standards.
3. We trained Learning Alliance field-based staff on the data collection tools and monitoring framework and disseminated information to the field offices. Since those trainings, collaboration has largely been between each organization's headquarters and their field offices. We have experienced some of the same pushback from field offices in their reaction to implementing a global M&E system that P4P has described.
4. Capacities to implement the M&E system vary across countries. In some countries, extension needs just a little support and the same for universities. In some countries we have just gone commercial. In other places we are now engaging universities especially

on qualitative studies. Even with government, the degree of collaboration depends on resources and the financial bottom line.

   a. FtF has put a lot of resources into M&E and to implement efficiently, e.g. single baseline for multiple projects. Money is not always the answer.
   b. Reaching into universities to support M&E is "hit and miss". But to the extent that it supports a student earning a degree, this has to be a value in itself. If you are buying the services commercially, you won't contribute to the kind of capacity we are trying to leave behind.
   c. It's difficult to make long-term commitments through annual appropriated funds. The Farm Bill does not provide for capacity building and technical assistance. It is important for those that can advocate help influence the drafting of legislation that allows for technical assistance so USDA can be more flexible in terms of capacity building and technical assistance.

5. Collaboration around data collection and analysis is a great idea and is a public good.
6. We face an increasing need to demonstrate results we can sell and these are increasingly quantitative results and usually economic results. Need to take risk. Unless M&E processes are set up correctly, you can't justify and show the risk was worth taking.

Breakout Groups Report Back

The breakout groups were asked to answer three questions.

1. *Is collaboration feasible or desirable?*
2. *If so, in what areas, how could we facilitate/catalyze collaboration and who should be involved?*
3. *What specific recommendations do you have for next steps in advancing collaboration/peer review?*

Feasibility/Desirability of Collaboration

- Collaboration around data collection and analysis is highly desirable. It contributes to collaborative learning and sharing and makes more efficient use of resources. There is great potential for sharing data sets and perhaps using AERC as a collaborative hub.
- There is potential to share some data collection tools and methods and possibly some training between the Learning Alliance and WFP, e.g. on development and agricultural marketing and capacity building.
- There is potential value in joint training but these are often ad-hoc projects and the feasibility would have to be reviewed on country by country level.
- Collaboration is most desirable and feasible when organizations' objectives align. For example, FEWS NET is interested in improving food security and needs very specific indicators for this. Collaboration is valuable only to the extent that others' data or methods contribute to indicators of food security.
- Collaborating organizations can capitalize on each other's comparative advantages.

- Collaboration requires a willingness to come together and share information and learning. We need to recognize that there is a cost to collaboration – in time, effort, and resources. Financial resources are not always necessary to facilitate collaboration but the results of the collaboration have to be worth the cost to all parties. A neutral convener can help facilitate effective collaboration.
- Donors rarely require or encourage collaboration so there is little external incentive to invest the resources in collaboration. Data and analyses are thus rarely shared with others.
- Privacy/confidentiality issues with household data may constrain collaboration around sharing data.
- There is an opportunity to compare and share data between P4P and LRP.
- Peer reviews at the country level are a natural opportunity for collaboration.

Promising Areas for Collaboration and Who Should be Involved?

- Collaboration is more appropriate at the regional/national level than at the global level because of regional specificities. IICA, ACTESA, ECOWAS, etc. are potentially good collaboration partners.
- Linking farmers to markets, and topics within this, is a promising area for collaborative learning. It is perhaps best to focus initially on the LRP and M&E for LRP.
- Technical working groups and inter-agency gatherings could be more strategic about collaborating and dedicating resources to support collaboration.
- We should be collaborating on creating influence using our results.

Recommendations

- We need to put more effort into making sure that M&E data feeds into the design of future programmes and sharing data for this purpose. Often, there is a disconnect between M&E work and the needs of practitioners.
- Design M&E systems with versatile data collection instruments/methods and visualization applications.
- Specific recommendations to facilitate collaboration include:
    - Schedule and formal collaboration events;
    - Dedicate resources to supporting collaboration (e.g. academic partners need funds to work with us);
    - Establish collaboration working group;
    - Develop a learning agenda; and
    - Engage partner organizations.
- The AERC data hub should consider a model similar to that employed by Macro International, which manages the Demographic and Health Surveys, for posting reports and summary data online to facilitate collaboration.

- There could be potential for integrating data on LRP with the Earth Institute's GIS application.
- It is important to develop M&E systems and processes collaboratively rather than asking for comments after the fact. This might apply to selecting relevant indicators or designing analyses, e.g., collaboratively developing an approach to estimating the impacts of LRP rather than presenting an approach that MSU already developed for discussion. This collaborative approach would make better use of each partner's comparative advantage.
- Start designing M&E systems in the realm of the possible and limit the scope to what is feasible.
- Coordinate with existing structures – such as the Home-Grown School Feeding technical group meetings – to facilitate collaboration. Coordinate calendars for these events so we can synchronize opportunities.
- Have clarity of purpose about collaboration. Don't let the collaboration process become more important than the work.
- Create a hub portal where everyone can share information.
- Create an agro symposium to have peers comment on what is being produced.

Next Steps in Facilitating Collaboration

- Develop a learning and sharing plan.
- Determine whether collaboration should be at the country, regional, or global level.
- Specific opportunities for collaboration include:
    - In the **immediate term** - Learning alliance, AERC, Feedback on MSU LPR proposal.
    - In the **short term** – Upcoming meeting of the Learning Alliance (September) and P4P annual review.
    - In the **medium term** – Proposed regional meetings, USAID meetings on creating hub/portal for data sharing.
    - In the **long term** – Participate in research, develop a community of practice, maintain communication channels, identify learning questions across groups, identify advocacy opportunities.

Annex A – Meeting Agenda

Agenda for WFP's P4P M&E Technical Meeting, DuPont Hotel, Washington DC, 19-20 April, 2011

Tuesday, April 19		
Time	**Topic**	**Description**
9:00 – 9:45	Opening remarks/introductions (WFP, Facilitator)	Welcome and overview of meeting objectives, outline of meeting approach
Session 1: WFP's Local and Regional Procurement (LRP)		
9:45 – 10:15	How WFP buys: LRP and the P4P pilot (WFP)	Introduction to WFP approaches to local and regional procurement – standard LRP and the P4P pilot.
10:15 – 10:30	Coffee break	
10:30 – 11:00	Assessing the impact of standard LRP (MSU)	A proposed approach for assessing the impact of WFP's standard LRP.
11:00 – 12:00	Break out groups	Break out groups (3) to discuss and critique the proposed LRP impact assessment approach and assess its wider relevance.
12:00 – 12:45	Report back	Groups report back
12:45 – 1:45	Lunch	
Session 2: Monitoring and Evaluation for P4P		
1:45 – 2:10	Monitoring and evaluation for P4P (WFP)	A description of WFP's M&E system for P4P.
2:10 – 2:55	Break out groups	Break out (3) groups to discuss M&E approach, challenges, and prospects for sharing data or collaborating on M&E.
2:55 – 3:45	Report back	Groups report back
Session 3: Putting P4P back into an overall context		
3:45 – 4:15	African Economic Research Consortium introduction (WFP/AERC)	Introduce AERC and its role in P4P.
4:15 – 4:45	USG perspectives on LRP objectives and reporting (USDA, USAID)	Review of USG objectives for LRP and reporting requirements/needs.
4:45 – 5:30	Wrap up/summary, outstanding questions/issues, & lead in to next day (Facilitator)	

Annex A – Meeting Agenda

Agenda for WFP's P4P M&E Technical Meeting, DuPont Hotel, Washington DC, 19-20 April, 2011

Wednesday, April 20		
Time	**Topic**	**Description**
8:30 – 9:00	Recap (Facilitator)	Review of Tuesday
Session 4: USDA LRP Reporting Requirements		
9:00 – 9:40	Panel – Measurement approaches to USDA data	Panel of WFP and 3 PVOs to discuss specific approaches to data collection to support USDA reporting requirements
9:40 – 10:20	Break out groups	Break out groups (2) to discuss approaches to USDA data collection - facilitated by VAM
10:20 – 10:45	Report back	Break out groups report back
10:45 – 11:15	WFP's Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM) Unit activities to support P4P M&E (VAM)	Importance of market data and VAM market monitoring activities.
11:15 – 11:30	Coffee break	
Session 5: Potential for Collaboration		
11:30 – 12:30	Panel discussion - Collaboration and peer review (WFP, AERC, University of Illinois)	Discuss potential for collaboration, value of peer review, and how to facilitate collaboration and peer review.
12:30 – 1:30	Lunch	
1:30 – 2:30	Break out groups	Break out groups (3) to discuss the feasibility of collaboration and how to facilitate future collaboration and peer review.
2:30 – 3:30	Report back	Break out groups report back
3:30 – 3:45	Coffee break	
3:45 – 4:30	Wrap up and closing remarks (WFP, Facilitator)	

Annex B - Participants

Name	Title	Organization
Paul Guenette	Senior Vice President -Corporate Affairs	ACDI/VOCA
Rupert Best	Sr. Technical Advisor - Agriculture and Environment	Catholic Relief Services
Alex Winter-Nelson	Department of Agricultural & Consumer Economics	University of Illinois
Jamie Fisher	Chief, Local & Regional Procurement	US Department of Agriculture (USDA)
Gary Eilerts	Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET) Programme Manager	USAID
Susan Bradley	Sr. Policy Advisor, Bureau for Food Security	USAID
Winston J. Allen	Senior Evaluation Specialist	USAID
Jean Martin Bauer	Regional Programme Officer, West Africa & P4P Focal Point	WFP Dakar
Alesha Black	Associate Programme Officer	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
Grace Funnell	Sr. Programme Advisor, Food Security	Mercy Corps International
Seth Miller	Programme Analyst, Local & Regional Procurement	US Department of Agriculture (USDA)
Ken Davies	P4P Coordinator	WFP Rome
Willis Kosura	Programme Director	African Economic Research Consortium
Ann Kelly	P4P Focal Point	Howard G. Buffett Foundation
John Lamm	Programme Analyst	US Department of Agriculture (USDA)
Bryan Crawford	Design and Development Officer, Integrated Food and Nutrition	World Vision International
Frank Orzechowski	Sr. Advisor, Monetization & Commodities	Catholic Relief Services
Juan Andrade	Department of Food Science & Human Nutrition	University of Illinois
Kristen Penn	Office of Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative	USAID
Adam Norikane	Policy Analyst - Food for Peace	USAID
Tobias Flaemig	P4P Country Coordinator	WFP Malawi
David C. Hatch	Associate Deputy Director General	Inter-American Institute for Cooperation in Agriculture (IICA)
Laura Melo	Regional Programme Advisor, P4P (Latin and Central America)	WFP Panama
Blake Audsley	Market Analyst, P4P Coordination Unit	WFP Rome
Doug Kreiger	Consultant (design of P4P M&E system)	WFP Rome
Kate Freeman Kennedy	Energy & Income Generation Specialist	Earth Institute

Name	Title	Organization
Emily Hogue	Policy Analyst	USAID
Emmanuela Mashayo	P4P Country Coordinator	WFP Rwanda
Alan de Brauw	Sr. Research Fellow - Markets Trade & Institutions	International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
Bob Myers	Commodity, Market Analysis & Policy	Michigan State University
Jack Keulemans	Head, Field Food Procurement Support Unit	WFP Rome
Innocent Matshe	Director of Training	African Economic Research Consortium
Aulo Gelli	Senior Research Manager	Partnership for Child Development
Erin Means	Programme Analyst, Foreign Agricultural Services	US Department of Agriculture (USDA)
Magda Ismail	Senior Advisor, Office of Global Hunger and Food Security	USAID
Paul Macek	Sr. Director, Integrated Food and Nutrition	World Vision International
Mads Frandsen	Donor Relations Officer	WFP Washington
Clare Mbizule	Programme Advisor, P4P Coordination Unit	WFP Rome
Dave Tschirley	Department of Agriculture, Food & Resource Economics	Michigan State University
Sarah Longford	Sr. Programme Advisor, P4P Coordination Unit (Facilitator)	WFP Rome