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Evaluation - purpose

1. To assess how (and to what effect) STDF’s work on P-IMA has delivered results and impacts linked to the STDF’s theory of change.

2. To identify key findings, conclusions, and recommendations to inform and improve any ongoing/future work on P-IMA.

3. To draw additional lessons to strengthen future STDF knowledge work on other topics.
Evaluation - questions

**Relevance.** To what extent did the objectives and **design of P-IMA** respond to the needs of stakeholders for an effective and efficient decision-making process for prioritizing SPS INVESTMENT options?

**Coherence.** To what extent has STDF's work on P-IMA been aligned with other relevant work including SPS capacity evaluation tools?

**Effectiveness.** To what extent were the objectives of STDF’s work on P-IMA achieved, including the objectives of stakeholders who used P-IMA?

**Efficiency.** How well were the resources used?

**Impact.** To what extent has P-IMA contributed to impact on SPS capacity and to sustained structural change in stakeholders’ decision-making processes for prioritizing SPS investments?

**Sustainability.** To what extent are the results of STDF’s work on P-IMA, and stakeholders’ use of P-IMA, likely to continue in the long term?
Methodology - sample x 12 P-IMAs

STDF supported P-IMA

- COMESA - Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Rwanda, Uganda (STDF/EIF co-financed project)
- Ghana
- Madagascar
- Belize
- CARICOM region
- Ecuador
- Bangladesh

P-IMA used on own initiative

- TradeMark Africa - regional level
- Winrock International, Philippines - Building Safe Agricultural Food Enterprises (B-SAFE)
- International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) - Better Enforcement of Standards for Safer Trade (BESST) feasibility study with WOAH/OIE
- Bahamas Agricultural Health and Food Safety Authority (BAHFSFA)
- CABI international

59 people interviewed
2015 onwards
Country visits to Kenya & Uganda
Secondary doc review

59 people interviewed
2015 onwards
Country visits to Kenya & Uganda
Secondary doc review
Methodology - ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Definition. Extent to which each dimension of the P-IMA work was fulfilled, according to the sub-question and indicator used to answer each sub-question.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>3 Fulfilled. No additional actions are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2 Fulfilled to a satisfactory extent; would benefit from additional actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>1 Fulfilled to a partial extent and requires considerable remedial actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0 Not fulfilled and requires urgent attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconclusive</td>
<td>? Insufficient data to draw conclusions and answer the sub-question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decision-making challenges

“The Philippines is one among many developing countries that experience a number of challenges of resource allocation.

Most of these countries are confronted by the reality that governmental resources and funding from the private sector and non-governmental organizations are often limited, thereby allowing only select investments to be pursued among a long list of competing options.”

P-IMA framework design

- Transparent
- Inclusive
- Participatory + ownership
- Evidence-based
- Accountability
- Aligned with reality
- Robust analysis
  - Piloted, collective process
Coherence

- Gender & environment
- Alignment with STDF Strategy
- SPS Capacity evaluation tools (PVS Pathway, IPPC PCE, food control system tool, etc.) encouraged for use with P-IMA

“the P-IMA framework complemented and built on the findings and results of the PCE Tool. Having access to the PCE findings gave stakeholders confidence that the phytosanitary investment options reflected real needs, linked to the National Phytosanitary Strategic Plan” [Madagascar]

- In practice ... 20% P-IMA reports
Complete information
Waiting for a capacity evaluation

Reality imperative

Coherence

Capacity evaluation tools and P-IMA

Confidence to act on P-IMA prioritized capacity building options

Score 9/10
Effectiveness: outcomes

42 of the 73 prioritised SPS capacity building options (CBO) were taken forward = 57% ~ a good result! [estimated, incomplete data set]

Number of ways in which 42 priority SPS capacity building options were taken forward into decision making and subsequently used. Some SPS options were used in more than one way (n = 47).

- Informing next investment options
- Develop organisation strategy
- Feasibility Study
- National action plans
- Integrated into an entity's own plans
- Funding proposals prepared
Effectiveness: versatility

- Different uses
- Virtual & hybrid modalities
- Decision criteria
Efficiency: value for money

**STDF**
USD 472,000
PG & PPGs

+ Staff time budgeted for knowledge work and project management

**Funds leveraged for SPS capacity building**
USD 2.89 Million

*STDF supported + organisations who applied P-IMA on own initiative*
Efficiency: MEL

- Good ~ progress of P-IMA work, promotion, dissemination ... given resources

- Challenges - obtaining information after P-IMAs completed
  - Outcome and impact data
  - Whose responsibility?
  - How to gather data? ~ data base
  - Time and resources
A. Impact: contribution to SPS capacity

Of the 42 SPS CBO taken forward, 15 have further contributed to impact ... and impacts still emerging

Number of ways in which 15 priority SPS capacity building options were either funded and/or contributed to improved SPS legislation, SPS capacity, or access to export markets. Some SPS options made several contributions (n=28)

USD 2.89 m

Funds leveraged
New/updated legislation, regulations
SPS capacity improved
Market access improved
**Intention:** P-IMA to feed into decision-making related to SPS capacity building as an *ongoing process*

**Result:** Not mainstreamed ~ esp. national levels
- In some countries after P-IMA was completed the capacity building options were not taken forward ...

**Why?**
1. Unclear *how* the prioritised capacity building options would be taken forward and by *whom*?
   Which organisation/ministry/ ...???
2. Unclear *what* “mainstreaming” looks like
3. Insufficient *planning*

✓ Some progress e.g. Uganda SPS committee
✓ Potentially becoming mainstreamed in *individual organisations*, e.g., not-for-profits
  - BUT! - only one P-IMA so far applied / organisation
The challenge

“... the approach was overly reliant on international expertise and not sufficiently rooted in regional/national processes. One of the limitations was that this work did not create sufficient regional capacity on P-IMA to facilitate the re-use and institutionalization of this approach to facilitate SPS decision-making on an ongoing basis. This reduced the sustainable uptake by many countries”
Sustainability

**Solution:** Train a pool of new P-IMA experts at regional level to apply P-IMA frameworks independently

**Result:** No P-IMA frameworks applied by new P-IMA “experts”

**Why?**
Why is P-IMA not sustainable?

1. Lack of supporting **structure** for newly trained P-IMA experts

   **No P-IMAs have been updated**

   **Small group trained / P-IMA**

   **Linked to mainstreaming**

   “P-IMA has no home”

   **Process**

   **Skills**

   **Mandate**

   **Resources**

   **Ownership**

   **After training and P-IMA was completed ...**

   “There was no follow up, we were just **left hanging**. How can I as an individual organise to apply P-IMA again in future? I don’t have the mandate, I don’t have any resources, I can’t pay for D-Sight.”
Why is P-IMA not sustainable?

2. Training approach
   - Materials ~ good
   - Training tools ~ good

Assumption
   - *one off* training will be sufficient for novices to become expert P-IMA facilitators
   - insufficient practice & experience

Need a different training strategy ~ BUT

The window of opportunity is closing!
Conclusions - key take aways

- Highly relevant and effective
- Good indications of impact ~ contribution to SPS capacity
- Great value for money from investing in applying P-IMA

- Scope to improve coherence of P-IMA with capacity evaluation tools in *practical* terms
- Scope to increase engagement with donors & financial institutions
- Scope to strengthen MEL ~ what happens *after* P-IMA?

- Current approach to P-IMA is not sustainable
  - Mainstreaming ~ ownership & planning insufficient
  - Training strategy ~ still reliant on a few P-IMA experts
Recommendations

1. Adopt an integrated strategic approach to the P-IMA work moving forward –
   - Workshop to review the recommendations from the Evaluation. Stakeholders who have used P-IMA + STDF partners
   - Develop a strategy to address sustainability and mainstreaming.

2. Develop a new training strategy aimed at building the sustainability of P-IMA and eliminating reliance on the two global P-IMA experts.
Recommendations

3. Partner with organisations at regional and/or national levels and build their capacity to provide “P-IMA services” to other organisations incl. public and private sector
   - Training in how to apply P-IMA
   - Guidance in mainstreaming P-IMA
   - Which organizations would be best suited?

4. Consider piloting a strategic approach to improving the sustainability of P-IMA though one or two STDF Project Grant (PG) in one/two region (s)
Recommendations

5. Identify, develop and operationalize stronger practical synergies and linkages between the capacity evaluation tools and P-IMA
   - Workshop
   - And other means

6. Increase engagement with donors and financial institutions
   - Support the applications of P-IMA
   - Funding SPS capacity building options
   - Use of existing P-IMA analyses to inform bilateral donor programming
   - Scaling of P-IMA
Recommendations

7. Expand MEL processes to strengthen data collection after P-IMA ~ outcome & impact levels

- Workshop with stakeholders to develop process – e.g.,
  - What data needs to be collected
  - How will it be collected
  - Roles, responsibilities, commitments
- Additional STDF human resources
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