This presentation represents the preliminary strategic direction of a multi-year, whole-of-government, U.S. strategy to address food security in a Feed the Future country or region. It describes partner country progress and outlines how U.S. investments will align in support of partner country priorities. This document has not yet been approved or funded but will form the basis of a multi-year strategy in development.
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Malawi’s Unique Context

Malawi Faces a Unique Combination of Challenges

A nation of poor farmers
- 80% smallholder farmers
- 60% rely on subsistence agriculture
- 70% of HHs have less than 1Ha of land
- Over 50% of food supply in one crop (maize)
- High population density (533 per km² in 2008)
- High disease burden

The 2004/2005 drought

Malawi’s Hunger Season Threatens Millions

The New York Times
Nov 2, 2005

- 4.7 million Malawians required food aid (~40% of population)
- Three major droughts in the past 20 years
- Emergency responses cost hundreds of millions of dollars
Malawi Plays Highly Visible Leadership Role on Food Security

- Globally Recognized for Leadership
  - Food and Agriculture Organization’s Agricola Medal (2007)
  - UN outstanding performance award in Food Security (2010)
- Current Chair of the African Union
  - Launched African Food Basket Initiative
  - Founded African Food and Nutrition Day
- Next Chair of COMESA

“As long as I am President, I do not want to be going to other capitals begging for food.”
**Operating Environment**

**Exceptional Commitment to Agriculture Development = Results**

**Government commitment**
- Food Security is Malawi’s No. 1 domestic policy issue
- Strongly Country-owned plan (ASWAp) – development began 2007
- 1 of few countries to meet CAADP spending and growth targets (13% of budget on ag, 8.5% ag GDP growth in 2009)
- CIP Review in September 2010 – only country in Southern Africa with a signed Compact (April, ‘10)
- New national irrigation strategy (Green Belt Initiative)
- Strong government focus on agricultural research

**Achieved maize self-sufficiency**

**Per capita maize production, kg, 2000-2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Maize deficit</th>
<th>Maize surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reduced poverty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>%Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total poor</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultra poor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exceptional Commitment to Reducing Undernutrition = Results

- Highest-level political commitment with strong and dynamic Secretary for Nutrition – Dr. Mary Shawa
- Department of Nutrition and HIV and AIDS in the Office of the President
- GoM making substantial budget commitments towards implementing national nutrition strategy
- National Nutrition Policy and Strategic Plan since 2007
- Functional Food and Nutrition coordination mechanisms in place

### Reduced undernutrition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underweight</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stunting</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Malawi on track to meet MDG 1 nutrition indicator
Malawi GDP growth 2001-2009
Source: World Bank

Strong macroeconomic fundamentals—including low inflation and improved debt levels—have resulted in strong economic growth.

Malawi Indicators for Future Success

Other indicators

Performance on selected indicators
Source: Freedom House 2010

Rule of Law

Anticorruption

Score (out of 7)

Score (out of 7)
## Operating Environment

### Risks to Food Security in Malawi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Contributing factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Poor nutritional options and behaviors | - Low diversity and inadequate supply of nutritious foods available for consumption (e.g., maize > 50% of energy supply)  
- Poor nutritional behaviors around child feeding practices and utilization of available foods |
| Under developed markets       | - Low crop diversification - primary export crop, tobacco, facing threats (55% of trade, 17% of GDP)  
- Volatile maize market affects access to primary food crop  
- Challenging policy environment limits private sector market development |
| Low agricultural productivity | - Limited asset base, particularly small landholding and weak human capital  
- Entirely rain-fed production system increasingly threatened by environmental degradation and climate change (<1% of land irrigated) |
| High population density and growth | - Population density is expected to increase to an estimated 1,250 – 1,650 people per km² in 2040 (population itself is expected to triple by 2040) putting further pressure on available resources |
Our FTF Strategy Addresses Risks to Food Security

Proposed USAID FTF strategic focus areas

1. Impact nutritional outcomes through behavior change communications and food access and availability

2. Invest in high potential value chains (dairy and legumes) to develop domestic and export markets and improve nutritional options
   - Build market linkages
   - Improve Land Productivity
   - Promote gender equitable market-driven solutions to value chain inefficiencies

3. Increase engagement with government to continue to improve policy environment

GHI addresses population density and growth
Aligned to Government Priorities and Donor Activities

Fully aligned with GoM priorities

- Directly supports government priorities outlined in ASWAp
  - Food Security and Risk Management
  - Market Development
  - Land and Water Management
  - Institutional Strengthening

Coordinated with other donors

- Leverages USAID comparative advantages
- Builds on other donor investments, e.g.,
  - USAID / Irish Aid MOU
  - World Bank / EU infrastructure
  - EU / JICA / AfDB irrigation development

- Works through CAAPD process
  - Technical review in 2010
  - Donor coordination committee
  - Business meeting in March 2011
Integrated Across US Government Activities

**Complementary USAID Investments and History of Coordination**

- Leadership on family planning and population growth
- Strong history of integrated agriculture, health and nutrition programming
- FtF focuses in area of high disease burden
- Malaria and HIV programming to address high disease burden
- GHI+ status—build on success of GHI, PEPFAR coordination
- Parallel focus on women through FtF economic advancement and GHI empowerment

**Whole of Government Effort**

- Department of State diplomatic strategy
- Potential joint-USDA aflatoxin reduction program, Food for Progress, Cochran Fellows
- Peace Corps PAPA
- Millennium Challenge Corporation watershed management program (upper Shire River)
Technical Approach

Fact Based and Focused Strategic Choices

1. National/community based programs focused on behavior change, fortification and capacity building

   Improved nutritional behaviors

2. Invest in high potential legume and dairy value chains

   High potential value chains

3. Improve policy making capacity by working with private sector/civil society, government champions, other donors, and regional organizations

   Policy engagement
USAID/Malawi Nutrition Strategy is Designed to Leverage Impact

**LEVERAGE:**
- Complementarity of GHI and FtF in a 2-level nutrition strategy for increased impact
- USAID/Irish Aid MOU to support both national and local level impacts through the 1,000 Days Initiative introduced by Secretary Clinton

**IMPACT:**
- 1 million children reached
- 25% reduction in stunting
- 25% reduction in underweight
- 25% reduction in maternal anemia
- 25% reduction in child anemia
Agriculture and Nutrition: Mutual Reinforcement for Impact

**National-level efforts**

- Fortification
  - Vitamin A (oil, sugar)
  - Iodized salt

- Supplementary foods (e.g., RUTF production using groundnut production)

- National behavior change communications (BCC) (e.g., radio campaign)

- GoM Capacity Building (e.g., Ministry staff)

- Support to GoM Nutrition Surveillance system

- Health Systems Strengthening

**Community-based efforts**

- Community-based treatment of acute malnutrition (CMAM)

- Community-based BCC
  - Care Group model
  - Farmer-based groups

- Crop diversification / increased dietary diversity

- Capacity Building of District level GoM (e.g., front-line extension workers)

- Nutrition Information Systems
  (adapting market information systems model)

Jointly implemented through FtF and GHI
## Strategic Focus - Value Chains

### 3-Step Process for Identifying High Impact Value Chains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Is there a clear business case? | - Market opportunity (domestic, export)
- Existing private sector players
- Profitable
- Low market distortions |
| 2    | Will it provide broad income, gender and nutrition impact? | - Benefits broad group (producers and consumers)
- High nutritional value
- Multiplier effects (gender, soil fertility) |
| 3    | Opportunities for innovation and leveraging resources? | - New procurement options (USAID Forward)
- Leverage USG, GoM, Donor resources
- Build strategic new partnerships (CG centers, Higher Ed…) |

High-impact value chains
## Strongest Business Cases in Legumes and Dairy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legumes</th>
<th>Production MT, 2010 MoAFS</th>
<th>Gross margin %, estimate</th>
<th>Market opportunity</th>
<th>Export</th>
<th>Growth 4-yr CAGR</th>
<th>Effect of gov’t market interventions</th>
<th>Estimated small holder producers Thousands, 2009</th>
<th>Consumption % of population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground nuts</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>▪ Supplemental foods ▪ Oil potential</td>
<td>6 processors-buyers ▪ Demand in S. Africa, Europe</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>□ Low □ High</td>
<td>5,010</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigeon peas</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>▪ Supplemental foods</td>
<td>5 processor-buyers ▪ Huge demand in India</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>□ Low □ High</td>
<td>3,492</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soy beans</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>▪ Corn/soy blend ▪ Oil potential ▪ Feed</td>
<td>5 processor-buyers ▪ Demand in S. and E. Africa</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>□ Low □ High</td>
<td>2,149</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy (fresh milk)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>▪ Huge latent-demand ▪ Growing consumption</td>
<td>▪ Short-demand in Zimbabwe, Zambia</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>□ Low □ High</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Broad Impact

#### Legumes
- Increasing dietary diversity
- Improved nutritional value over other staples
- Commonly consumed food
- Source for therapeutic foods for vulnerable populations
- Traditionally grown and processed by women
- Significant opportunity to support women’s economic advancement
- Soil fertility from nitrogen fixation
- Potential replacement crops for burley tobacco
- Reduce imports

#### Dairy
- High protein source
- Potential target for vitamin fortification
- Commonly consumed food
- Source for therapeutic foods for vulnerable populations
- 45% of MBG committee members are women
- Dairy programs are achieving gender equality in division of labor and distribution of assets
- Creates additional demand sink for legumes as animal feed
- Develops national animal health capacity

#### Spill-over effects
- Soil fertility from nitrogen fixation
- Potential replacement crops for burley tobacco
- Reduce imports

#### Gender
- Traditionally grown and processed by women
- Significant opportunity to support women’s economic advancement
- 45% of MBG committee members are women
- Dairy programs are achieving gender equality in division of labor and distribution of assets

#### Nutrition
- High protein source
- Potential target for vitamin fortification
- Commonly consumed food
- Source for therapeutic foods for vulnerable populations
- 45% of MBG committee members are women
- Dairy programs are achieving gender equality in division of labor and distribution of assets
- Creates additional demand sink for legumes as animal feed
- Develops national animal health capacity
### Innovation and Leverage

#### Legumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Link producers with local RUTF industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to multi-donor funded Financial Inclusion project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build on USG programs at USDA, MCC, Peace Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage donor investments by Irish Aid, EU and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build on GoM and Government of India investments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New relationships with CG centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New private sector aggregators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dairy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dairy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial sector innovator – livestock insurance, access to credit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leverage investments from FICA, EU and JICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage USDA expertise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private sector investors in breeding operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Geographic Focus to Maximize Impact

- **Great need**
  - Builds on numerous health programs
    - Area of highest disease burden
    - Highest rates of undernutrition (15-20+% underweight) and poverty (41-51%)
  - Supports GoM crop diversification (e.g., potential replacement for tobacco)

- **Biggest opportunity**
  - Highest ground nut, soy production (opportunity to expand pigeon pea)
  - Largest gap in dairy supply

- **Built on other investments**
  - Area of recently ended I-LIFE Title-II program (e.g., farmers groups, small scale irrigation, care groups, VSL groups)
  - Planned investments of other actors
    - MCC multi-donor NRM program
    - Planned NASFAM expansion
    - Greenbelt Initiative
## Technical Approach - Legumes

### FTF Focus in Legumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary constraints identified</th>
<th>FTF focus</th>
<th>Linked to other efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient seed availability</td>
<td>Expand seed availability by increasing seed production, building agro-dealer capacity</td>
<td>Expand seed multiplication (Irish Aid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor land productivity</td>
<td>Invest in soil fertility, water harvesting and conservation agriculture</td>
<td>Develop irrigation (EU, World Bank, JICA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor market linkages</td>
<td>Develop output markets for key crops (inc. addressing aflatoxin for groundnuts)</td>
<td>Climate change adaptation (MCC, Norway, JICA, DFID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High transportation costs</td>
<td>Non-FtF funded joint-USAID financial inclusion project with focus on ensuring gender equitable access</td>
<td>USDA aflatoxin R&amp;D efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial/risk management services</td>
<td></td>
<td>USDA/WFP P4P local procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Build, refurbish rural infrastructure (World Bank, EU, AfDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint financial inclusion program (WB, DFID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insurance (WB, UNDP, NICO Insurance)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Technical Approach - Legumes**

**Change Agent and Technical Approach**

- **USAID**
  - Financing
  - Access to finance
  - Capacity building

- **Seed producers**
  - Seeds

- **Agrodealers/Aggregators**
  - Inputs
  - Extension
  - Market information
  - Production

- **Smallholder producers**
  - Processors, Exporters

**A sustainable model**

**Benefit to change agent (aggregators)**
- Increase market opportunities
- Invests in small holders to gain higher quality, higher volume production

**Benefit to smallholders**
- Reduced post-harvest losses
- Higher prices for better quality product
- Regular off-take (market access)
- Access to other services (market information, extension, social services)
## FTF Focus in Dairy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary constraints identified</th>
<th>FTF focus</th>
<th>Linked to other efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of dairy cows</td>
<td>Expand breeding programs—continued gender equitable distribution of productive assets</td>
<td>Expand herd size (imports and breeding) (World Vision, Heifer International, and Land O’ Lakes), JICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of feed</td>
<td>Linkages with legume producers—especially women</td>
<td>Private sector feed companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor production practices</td>
<td>Improved feeding, management</td>
<td>Food security (World Vision, EU, and Heifer International)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulking group capacity</td>
<td>Build governance, service delivery capacity and focus on increasing women in MBG leadership positions</td>
<td>Build capacity (World Vision, EU, and Heifer International)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Provide access to financing for cooling equipment</td>
<td>Provide equipment (World Vision, EU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial/risk management services</td>
<td>Non-FtF funded joint-USAID financial inclusion project with focus on ensuring gender equitable access</td>
<td>Joint program – GoM, DFID, World Bank, UNDP, Nico Insurance, NBS Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Non-FtF funded joint-USAID financial inclusion project with focus on ensuring gender equitable access**
Benefits to smallholders

- Regular off-take to cooling equipment
- Higher price from processors due to better quality/standards
- Access to
  - Market information (prices)
  - Extension services
  - Social services (e.g., nutrition education)
Technical Approach - Policy

Policy Engagement and Strengthening

- Civil society/private sector
- Donor community
- Bilateral engagement
- Key Government Actors
- Regional economic communities

Evidence-based policy environment

* Government interventions can limit competitiveness, dampen production and crowd out the private sector
* Strengthen advocacy and build capacity to improve the policy environment for growth
### Technical Approach - Policy

#### Policy Strengthening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Focus</th>
<th>FtF interventions</th>
<th>Potential partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Build private sector, civil society capacity</strong></td>
<td>▪ Build capacity to assess policy impacts, develop policy agendas, and influence government—focus on elevating women in policy dialogue</td>
<td>▪ Farmer based organizations (e.g., NASFAM, Farmers’ Union)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Increase Malawi’s presence in regional economic communities and other regional bodies</td>
<td>▪ Grain Traders and Processors Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase regional integration</strong></td>
<td>▪ Continue to strengthen donor coordination mechanisms</td>
<td>▪ Southern African Trade Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Develop donor alignment on priority areas for engagement</td>
<td>▪ USAID/East Africa, Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Align USG policy engagement around FTF strategy</td>
<td>▪ COMESA/ACTESA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthen donor coordination</strong></td>
<td>▪ Engage in on-going policy dialogue and capacity building with key government officials and agencies to increase evidence-based policymaking</td>
<td>▪ Donor coordination mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continue bilateral engagement</strong></td>
<td>▪ State Department</td>
<td>▪ DCAFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ MCC</td>
<td>▪ ASWAp-SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ USDA</td>
<td>▪ Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop government capacity</strong></td>
<td>▪ Parliament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Ministries of Agriculture, Industry and Trade and Development Planning and Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Impact of Flat-Line or Expanded Budget Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat-line FY10 budget (From...)</th>
<th>Expanded Budget (To...)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nutrition - TBD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core FTF investments (7 districts)</td>
<td>654,000 lifted from poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>278,000 lifted from poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition $3 million</td>
<td>Nutrition - TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag DA $12 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278,000 lifted from poverty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Expanded geographic reach (17 districts)
- Broaden scale of value chain investments
- Expanded Care Group model
## Resources and Impact

### A Comprehensive and Coordinated Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USAID</th>
<th>USG Partners</th>
<th>Development Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feed the Future (Ag. DA)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Department of State</strong></td>
<td><strong>Irish Aid</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High potential value chains</td>
<td>- Diplomacy</td>
<td>- Nutrition, seeds, agro-processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Land productivity</td>
<td>- <strong>MCC</strong></td>
<td>- EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Policy engagement</td>
<td>- Electric supply</td>
<td>- Irrigation, diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Sector</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>Watershed management</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>World Bank</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Financial inclusion</td>
<td>- <strong>USDA</strong></td>
<td>- Irrigation and land management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>- Aflotoxin reduction</td>
<td>- <strong>JICA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maternal and child health</td>
<td>- School feeding programs</td>
<td>- Irrigation and land management, livestock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Norway</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family planning</td>
<td>- <strong>Peace Corps</strong></td>
<td>- Climate change, gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Infectious diseases</td>
<td>- Health, business, environment</td>
<td>- <strong>DFID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Democracy and Governance</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>USDA</strong></td>
<td>- Climate change, seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Legislative strengthening</td>
<td>- Aflotoxin reduction</td>
<td>- <strong>AfDB</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td>- School feeding programs</td>
<td>- Irrigation, rural infrastructure, institutional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Biodiversity</td>
<td>- <strong>Peace Corps</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>Implementing Partners</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adaptation/Landscapes</td>
<td>- Health, business, environment</td>
<td>NGOs, INGOs, Civil Society, Private Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>African Development Foundation</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>Private Sector</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Higher Education Development (HED) for addressing Agro-ecosystems</td>
<td>- Farmers groups, dairy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Resources and Impact

### Projected Impact

#### Focus areas

**Geography**

1. Southern central region and northern part of southern region (7 districts – population of 4.6 million in 2010; 5.3 M 2015)

**Value chains**

1. Ground nuts
2. Soybeans
3. Pigeon peas
4. Dairy

**Interventions**

- Integrated $15M/year intervention
  - Nutrition behavior change
  - Market linkages and seed supply for legumes
  - Increasing dairy supply
  - Improved land productivity
  - Policy engagement

#### Goal level indicators (for selected target region)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty</strong></td>
<td>By 2015, lift 278,000 people from poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- From 2 million out of a population of 4.6 million in 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To 2.1 million out of an estimated future population of 5.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- From 45% to 39% prevalence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nutrition</strong></td>
<td>By 2015, reduce number of underweight children &lt;5 by...[UNDER DISCUSSION]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost per person out of poverty: $54/yr, $270 over life of program**
Thank you