
SYNTHESIS OF LESSONS LEARNED FROM NAIPs AND RAIPs FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

NOVEMBER 2020



AUDA-NEPAD
AFRICAN UNION DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

CAADP

TABLE OF CONTENT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	2
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
I. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION	42
II. OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY	45
2.1. Objectives	45
2.1.1. General Objective	45
2.1.2. Specific Objectives	45
2.2. Scope of the study	46
2.3. Key Deliverables	46
2.4. Methodology	46
- Data collection phase and report drafting	
III. SYNTHESIS OF LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM NAIPs AND RAIPs FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION	47
3.1. Lessons and recommendations from NAIPs	48
3.2. Lessons and recommendations from RAIPs	93
3.3. General conclusions and recommendations	121
IV. ANNEXES	129

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The AUDA-NEPAD would like to thank the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) for their financial support in undertaking this stock-taking study on the lessons learned from the NAIPs and RAIPs implementation.

We are also grateful to the consulted stakeholders as part of this study, especially in the prevailing context of confinement and travel restrictions as part of the measures to combat the COVID-19 pandemic across the continent and the world . More specifically, we extend our appreciations to the officials from the selected RECs and countries including: the EAC Secretariat (Tanzania), ECCAS Commission (Gabon), ECOWAS Commission (Nigeria), Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Malawi, Rwanda, Togo. Their inputs were critical to draft the content of this report and for the subsequent endorsement of its findings.

The report also benefitted from the valuable inputs from key informants from relevant institutions supporting the RECs and countries in the NAIP and RAIP implementation . Their responses were important considering their unique third party perspectives in supporting the nearly 2 decades of CAADP implementation. As such, we are grateful to the consulted resources persons from the World Bank, GIZ, USAID, FARA , Hub Rural, CAADP Non-State Actors Coalition (CNC), Emerge Centre for Innovation – Africa (ECI-Africa), USAID Policy Link, AGRA, IFPRI and ReSAKSS.

Last but not least, the perspectives of colleagues from the AUC-DARBE, as the continental body mandated by Heads of States to support the CAADP implementation also informed the findings of this report. We extend our appreciations accordingly to Dr Godfrey Bahigwa, Dr Simplicie Nouala, Dr Laila Lokosang and Mr Komla Prosper Bissi.

Dr Augustin Wambo Yamdjeu

Head of Agriculture Unit , AUDA-NEPAD

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AFD	Agence Française de Développement
AFS	agriculture and food security
AIFs	Africa Improved Foods
AIG	Agriculture Investment Guide
APPDF	Agriculture Public Private Dialogue Platform
AR4D	Agricultural Research for Development
ASARECA	Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa
ASWAp	Agriculture Sector-Wide Approach Programs
ASWG	Agricultural Sector Working Group
AU	African Union
AUDA-NEPAD	African Union Development Agency - NEPAD
AWG	Agriculture Working Group
BR	Biennial Review
CAADP	Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Program
CAP	Common Agricultural Policy
CCAF	Consultative Committee on Agriculture and Food
CDP	ECOWAS-Community Development Programme
CEMAC	Economic and Monetary Community of Central Africa (Communauté économique et monétaire de l'Afrique centrale)
CEPGL	Economic Community of the Great Lakes Countries
CIPS	inter-ministerial strategic steering committee
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
COVID-19	Coronavirus Disease 2019
CROP	Regional Orientation and Steering Committee
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
CTOP	Coordination Togolaise des Organisations Paysannes et de producteurs agricoles
CTP	Technical Steering Committee
DAERE	Departement Agriculture, Environnement et Resource en Eau
DAEWR	Department of Agriculture, Environment and Water Resources
DPRS	Development and Poverty Strategy
EABC	East Africa Businesses Council
EAC	East African Community
EAC-ARDS	EAC Agriculture and Rural Development Strategy
EAC-FSAP	EAC Food Security Action Plan
EACSOFF	East African Civil Society Organizations Forum
EAFF	Eastern Africa Farmers Federation
EAGC	Eastern Africa Grain Council
EALA	East African Legislative Assembly
ECCAS	Economic Community of Central African States
ECOAGRIS	Ecowas Agriculture Regional Information System
ECOWAP	ECOWAS Agricultural Policy
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States

EDPRS	Poverty Reduction Strategic Plan
EMC	Executive Management Committee
EU	European Union
FAO	UN Food and Agriculture Organization
FASDEP	Food and Agriculture Sector Development Policy
FISP	Farm Input Subsidy Program
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit / German development agency
GTPTFSA	Groupe de Travail des Partenaires Techniques et Financiers du Secteur Agricole
Hub Rural	Platform for Rural Development and Food Security Support in West and Central Africa
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IFJ	Investing for Food and Jobs
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
JSR	Joint Sector Review
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDAs	Ministries, Departments and Agencies
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MEL	Monitoring and Evaluation Learning
METASIPs	Medium Term Agricultural Sector Investment Plan I & II
MIFA	Incentive Mechanism of Agricultural Funding
MTEF	Medium Term Expenditure Framework
MwAPATA	Malawi Agricultural Policy Advancement and Transformation Agenda
NAIP	National Agriculture Investment Plan
NAIPFSN	National Agriculture Investment Plan for Food Security and Nutrition
NAIPs	National Agriculture Investment Plans
NAP	National Agriculture Policy
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NSA	non-state actors
NST	National Strategy for Transformation
P2RS	Programme de renforcement de la résilience à l'insécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle au Sahel
PAF	Performance Assessment Framework
PAP	Priority Action Plan
PDDA	Master Plan of Agricultural Development
PEPISAO	Projet« Élevages et pastoralisme intégrés et sécurisé en Afrique de l'Ouest»
PER	Public Expenditure Reviews
PPPs	Public-Private Partnerships
PRAPS	Programme Régional d'Accès à la Prévention et aux Soins
PREDIP	Projet régional de dialogue et d'investissement pour le pastoralisme et la transhumance
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
PSTA	Strategic Plan for Agriculture transformation
R&D	research and development
RAAF	Regional Agency for Agriculture and Food
RAIP	Regional Agriculture Investment Plan

RAIP-FSN	Regional Agriculture Investment Plan and Food Security and Nutrition
RDB	Rwanda Development Board
RECs	Regional Economic Communities
ReSAKSS	regional System of Strategic Analysis and knowledge Management
RTEI	Revue Technique Externe Independante
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
TFPs	Technical and Financial Partners
ToRs	Terms of References
ToR	Terms of Reference
TWGs	Technical Working Group
USAID	Cooperation Agency of the United States of America
WAICSA	West Africa Initiative for Climate Smart Agriculture
WEAMU's	West African Economic and Monetary Union
YOA	Year of Agriculture and Food Security

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

For the past two decades, the African agricultural policy landscape underwent a significant structural transformation. The first decade was shaped by the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) under the Maputo Declaration in 2003 and under Malabo Declaration in 2014 known as the Declaration on “Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved livelihoods” This adoption engaged the continent around seven(7) Commitments, designed to achieve transformation by 2025: (i) recommitment to CAADP principles and values, (ii) enhancing investment finance in agriculture, (iii) ending hunger by 2025, (iv) halving reducing poverty by half, by 2025, through inclusive agricultural growth and transformation, (v) boosting intra-Africa trade in agricultural commodities and services, (vi) enhancing resilience of livelihoods and production systems to climate variability and other related risks, and (vii) mutual accountability to actions and results. An attendant **CAADP Results Framework 2015-2025** (hereafter, “Results Framework”) was developed as a key tool for translating Africa’s agricultural development vision and goals into tangible outcomes and for tracking, monitoring and reporting on progress as well as for facilitating mutual learning and accountability. This resulted in a set of Technical Guidelines on “Country CAADP Implementation Guidelines under the Malabo Declaration” was developed based on a long participatory process and approved by member states in April 2016 during the 12th CAADP PP meeting. Since the launching of these guidelines, the AUDA NEPAD as a lead institution of the process is mobilizing support to countries and RECs to domesticate the Malabo declaration. After four (4) years of implementation of these guidelines, it is timely to conduct a thorough assessment and document the main lessons learned from the NAIP and RAIP formulation and implementation in order to inform future operations.

This study seeks to engage key CAADP constituencies across several countries and RECs to conduct a thorough assessment of and document the main lessons learned from the NAIP and RAIP formulation and implementation to inform future operations.

Through a participative and consultative process involving all the stakeholders (state actors and non-state actors) and key informants at country, RECs and international levels, the methodological approach is as follows:

- ▶ **Inception meeting**
- ▶ **Desk review**
- ▶ **Data collection phase(consultations)**
- ▶ **and reporting**

The executive conclusions and recommendations emerging from the lessons learned from NAIPs and RAIPs formulation and implementation are summarized in the following table around the four thematic areas: Policy & Planning, Investment Finance, Coordination & Cooperation and Monitoring & Accountability.

NAIPs

CONCLUSIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS

POLICY & PLANNING

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The CAADP planning, formulation and implementation processes through “the “Country CAADP Implementation Guidelines under the Malabo” are being adopted and adapted by all the countries and RECs as a tool for formulating and implementing the NAIPs and RAIPs with non-identical path and patterns of adoption, adaptation and capacity. ▶ In all the countries under investigation, the planning and formulation process of the NAIPs is being structured (Côte d’Ivoire, Ghana, Malawi, Rwanda and Togo) in terms of alignment with the national, regional continental and international reference documents, inclusiveness, CAADP Round Table organization, stocktaking assessment, and high-level political representation. However, the process is more embedded and structured in the country planning and formulation process in Rwanda than other countries under investigation. This good performance cannot be achieved without the government and DPs’ financial support to the process. ▶ The NAIPs are widely owned and known to key stakeholders and top management at national levels, but their knowledge to and ownership by the general public and beneficiaries cannot be evidenced. In terms of implemented instruments, all the countries are not at the same level. Some countries are well advanced as related to the implementation of these instruments (Ghana, Rwanda) than others (Côte d’Ivoire, Malawi and Togo). ▶ The CAADP planning and formulation processes have some impact on improvements in the enabling environment with more inclusive policy dialogue providing platform for all stakeholders. This created a growing concurrence on the important role that the agriculture sector plays in economic growth, poverty reduction and transformation. This can be attributed to the impact of the CAADP planning structures and processes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The anchorage of planning and formulation process of the NAIP observed in all countries should be sustained. However there is a cost associated with this good achievement. In this respect, there is a need for a continuous government financial support to the process. The accumulated experiences should be capitalized and scaled up to other countries on the continent. ▶ There is a need to translate the NAIPs document into local languages for large dissemination and reaching out. In order to enhance the NAIP ownership, the government should not only communicate more on NAIP through advocacy and policy dialogue but also make the NAIP the reference working document in the agricultural sector ▶ It is also important that some countries that are lagging behind ((Cote d’Ivoire, Malawi and Togo) in terms of instruments’ implementation for agricultural transformation to learn from well-performed countries (Ghana, Rwanda). Moreover, the instruments approach developed by Togo in the formulation process is commendable and should be replicated in other countries or scaled up as it gives not only more precision and clarity in what one intends to achieve but also and most importantly how one implements it. |
|---|---|

FINANCE & INVESTMENT

- ▶ In all the countries under investigation, the budgeting processes of the NAIPs are guided by the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) for the whole country. The Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) used as the tool for the NAIP budgeting process in all countries under investigation is relevant and appropriate but needs to be anchored in the budgeting process of the country except in Rwanda where the budgeting system is more structured.
- ▶ Currently, all the countries under investigation are underperformed in terms of public expenditures to agricultural sector for meeting the Malabo target commitment of 10%. This is a significant setback compared to the previous biennial review of 2017. The highest budget share performance is achieved in Ghana (9.7%) for an agricultural growth performance of 4.65% whereas the lowest budget share is achieved in Côte d'Ivoire (3.2%) with a growth performance of 3.62%. Rwanda recorded a growth performance of 5.3% against a budget share of 4.33%. Togo recorded a growth performance of 3.32% for a budget share of 4.47% whereas Malawi recorded 4.3% against a budget share of 6.86% in 2019.
- ▶ In all the countries, a diversity of incentives policy and legislative reforms have been put in place to attract the private sector's investment with limited impact on agriculture (Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Malawi) and no impact (Togo). The case of Rwanda in terms of institutional arrangements and reforms (Rwanda Development Board) and approach (investment in infrastructures) is relevant and attractive as they prepare and secure private investments. Other countries may learn from the Rwanda experiences.

The Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) as a tool for budgeting is appropriate and should be pursued and reinforced as it improves efficiency of public expenditure, improves predictability of resource flows and improves efficiency, raises resource consciousness and promotion of output or outcome focused approaches, and improves accountability. In practice, at this stage, only the Rwanda budgeting system can be recommended for other countries for its merits.

There is need to increase public expenditures to agriculture and attract private investments in agriculture through: (i) creating and enabling business environment (legislative, fiscal policies, key reforms instruments in Ghana and Rwanda); (ii) building capacities in deals and negotiations with private investors; and (iii) developing a culture of transparency and accountability.

The experiences of RDB (Rwanda Development Board) are appealing and can be replicated in other countries. RDB is responsible for overall private sector investments and supports public private dialogue (PPD) mechanisms and value chain (VC) platforms in collaboration with PSF to address key challenges in private sector development.

In Ghana, the established Incentive Base Agriculture Financing Scheme (risk guarantee instrument to push and encourage banks to loan more to agriculture) is commendable and can inspire other countries.

COORDINATION & COOPERATION

All the countries under investigation have a coordinating institutional arrangement set up partnered by steering committee or other arrangements integrating various stakeholders with sometimes well-defined roles and responsibilities. However, in the implementation phase, the coordination set up is not effective due to internal bottlenecks and the lack of operating budget provided by the government and thus is not operational

- ▶ There is a need to reinforce the inter-sectorial and inter-departmental coordination through policy dialogue platforms and active engagement and participation of stakeholders in Rwanda, Ghana and Malawi.
- ▶ It is important to put in place a single reference framework for consultation which will be representative in the steering and decision-making in Togo
- ▶ The establishment of an inter-ministerial Task Force led by a TFP as in the case of Côte d'Ivoire is an excellent example of coordination and can inspire other countries.
- ▶ The steering mechanisms and platforms put in place in Rwanda viz. the Agricultural Sector Working Group (ASWG), the Sector Wide Approach (SWAp) group, the Sub Sector Working Groups (SSWGs) and Joint Action Development Forum (JADF) have enhanced the internal agricultural sector coordination. This is an excellent example of well-established coordination system that can be reproduced in other countries.

MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY

The NAIP's monitoring and evaluation framework is inspired by the national systems. The M&E is seen as a mandatory part of the NAIP. However, in practice, the system does not seem to be working as it should due to some bottlenecks. The lack of funding for data collection and the weak coordination are the main challenges faced by the countries. In the case of Rwanda, the establishment of CPAF (Common Performance Assessment Framework), DPAF (Development Performance Assessment Framework) and Performance contract has reinforced the M&E system.

- ▶ There is a need to strengthen the capacities of central as well as the decentralized services of the ministries involved in the implementation and M&E system of the NAIP in order to build an effective and efficient M&E system in Côte d'Ivoire.
- ▶ Support financially the M&E system and institutions for achieving the expected results in Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Malawi.
- ▶ The benefits provided by CPAF (Common Performance Assessment Framework) and DPAF (Development Performance Assessment Framework) and Performance contract in the implementation of PSTA4 in Rwanda are significant. Other countries should use these tools for accountability.

RAIPs	
CONCLUSIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	
<p>The planning and formulation processes of the RAIPs in all the RECs under investigation were aligned with the regional, continental and international reference documents and the CAADP Round Table was inclusive. A stocktaking assessment sometimes away from the CAADP principles was undertaken and the RAIPs formulation benefited from a high-level political representation. If the RAIPs are known and owned by top management at regional and national levels, their knowledge and ownership to the national constituencies are not evidenced. The RAIPs implementation process faces challenges such as climatic and security crises, unclearly defined – roles and responsibility of stakeholders and lack of synchronization of the RAIP with NAIPs formulation to ensure complementarity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ It is urgent to synchronize the formulation process of the RAIP and the NAIPs to ensure their complementary implementation, strengthen the political and legislative framework, and more clarity on the roles and responsibilities of non-state actors is required for an effective the implementation of the RAIP ▶ The current reliance and dependency on DPs funding at the expenses of community/ regional funding mobilization is a path to be reversed to ensure ownership, sustainability and sovereignty. ▶ There is a need to operationalize all the implementing instruments of the RAIP for the agricultural transformation to take place in the region. ▶ There is an urgent need to improve the institutional arrangements of implementation of RAIPs in the ECOWAS currently shared between the different sub-regional institutions(RAAF, CILLS, CORAF, AFRICARICE,, UEMOA etc) under the leadership of the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Water resources) with limited capacity

FINANCE & INVESTMENT

The EAC and ECOWAS's budgeting cycle is annual. But the budget process in ECCAS is not done annually and not in a transparent and accountable manner. ECOWAS has a steering committee that meets annually to prepare the budget of each operational programme. In the planning and formulation of the RAIPs, the budget contributions are supposed to come mainly from the member states complemented by DPs and private sector resources. However, in practice, the member states failed to contribute as they should to the RAIPs budget thereby exposing the RECs to be highly dependent on DPs support. In fact, the CAADP target of 10% of public expenditure to agriculture is not met by the RECs, a significant setback compared to the 2017 Biennial Review

Moreover, the weak policy, legal and institutional frameworks do not facilitate the private sector mobilization in all regions.

- ▶ There is a need to establish a dedicated framework for the private sector and to secure and guarantee regional private investments, for regional projects and programmes' funding.
- ▶ Through policy dialogue, the AUDA-NEPAD should bring to the attention of Member States the urgent need to support agriculture by increasing their public expenditure to agriculture in compliance with the Malabo Declaration if the continent is to achieve the agriculture transformation
- ▶ The experiences of ECOWAS structuring its budgeting cycle in annual cycle and each operational programme has a steering committee that meets annually to define the budgets, is an excellent example of budgeting process. This is commendable and can inspire other RECs.

COORDINATION & COOPERATION

All the RECs under investigation have a coordination mechanism involving various stakeholders for planning and formulating their RAIPs. However, the implementation of these mechanisms is only effective in EAC and ECOWAS. The Federation of West African Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FEWACCI) bringing together National Associations reinforces the RAIP coordination mechanisms in ECOWAS. In ECCAS, the technical monitoring committees in charge of coordination were not put in place due to the reform process initiated at the ECCAS level. The RAIPs are faced with a lack of operating budget for their coordination mechanisms. The regional private investment mobilization is a big challenge in all the RECs.

- ▶ Reinforce the coordination process by establishing and ensuring the operation of the Regional Council on Agriculture, Food and Nutrition (CRAAN) in ECCAS.
- ▶ Efforts should be made to mobilize the operating budget for the coordination of the RAIPs
- ▶ The establishment and the operationalization of Federation of West African Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FEWACCI)—that brings together National Associations and serves as a liaison office is a good step in coordination of the RAIP in ECOWAS. This is commendable and needs to be reinforced. It can be replicated in other RECs.

MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY

ECOWAS and EAC have their own M&E systems which indicators to be monitored for RAIP implementation derived from the CAADP Results Framework. However, ECCAS's M&E system is based on the AUDA-NEPAD Mutual Accountability Framework.

The ECOAGRIS database system has strengthened the M&E system and the findings are widely disseminated and accessible in ECOWAS, contrary to the other regions.

A Joint Sector Review (JSR) is organized annually in each region. However, there is no platform for sharing JSR experiences with other countries within EAC and ECCAS contrary to ECOWAS. There are insufficient resources to enable representation of full complement of experts from partner states and non-state actors in all regions.

- ▶ There is a need to establish a dedicated monitoring and evaluation unit for the ECCAS-RAIP and a platform for sharing JSR experiences with other countries and RECs should be established at regional level and more internal funding is needed to keep operational the M&E system overall.
- ▶ For ECOWAS-RAIPs, efforts should be made to avoid the fragmentation of small projects and to design a large program in which several small projects could be integrated according to their common objectives, for a common planning and monitoring.
- ▶ There is a need to have a monitoring-evaluation focal point for each project to better value the results in the framework of results-based reporting and to strengthen their capacities for improved performance.
- ▶ The ECOAGRIS is ECOWAP information tool. It is the agriculture platform for the region providing agriculture related information and data for stakeholder access and use. Its database system has strengthened the M&E system in ECOWAS at local, national and regional levels. ECOAGRIS is an excellent example of agriculture platform for the region providing agriculture related information and data for stakeholder access and use. It has filled an important gap as an important MIS for the implementation of ECOWAP. The accumulated experiences are commendable and can be replicated in other RECs.

A summarized synthesis of the formulation and implementation process, lessons learned and recommendations by country and REC emerging from the study are presented in the following tables.

The detailed description is presented in the following chapters.

COTE D'IVOIRE

NAIP			
	PROCESS	LESSONS LEARNED	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	<p>Côte d'Ivoire has followed the CAADP process for formulating and implementation of its NAIPs. At the launching of the second generation of its NAIP, a guidance note on the different steps was prepared by the Permanent Secretariat and presented to all the actors of the sector. The formulation was inclusive as all the stakeholders were involved. It was also aligned to national, regional and international reference documents. It was based on the stocktaking assessment and a situation analysis on agriculture and food security which led to the identification of NAIP2 areas of investment including the implementation of policy measures. It also accommodated new emerging issues such youth and women. A compact was signed and a donors' Round Table organized. A high level political representation and the engagement of all stakeholders to support the process were some visible success factors. However, the lack of ownership is more glaring. The NAIP is still seen as the "MINADER business" not as a reference working document by all the State and non-state actors. In order to improve the business environment governance of the agriculture sector, 13 policy reforms were identified. However, the current assessment of implemented reforms is mixed.</p>	<p>The alignment practice, the participative and inclusive approach, the high level political representation are ingrained in the formulation and implementation process in Côte d'Ivoire as corroborated by the first and the second generations practices mainstreamed in the NAIPs. However, the lack of ownership is more glaring and the current assessment of implemented reforms is mixed.</p> <p>In addition, the country failed to meet the overall commitment to CAADP Process in 2019.</p>	<p>The practices underlying the success of the process in Côte d'Ivoire that need to be highlighted and scaled up by other countries are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ the high political and leadership representation of the NAIP (at the national level by the Prime Minister and at the local level by the District Officers); ▶ the search for a participatory and inclusive approach; ▶ the continuous account of emerging and local development issues ▶ the search for building a consensus in the process of formulation and implementation. <p>There is an urgent need to communicate more around the NAIP and improve implemented reforms.</p> <p>Encourage the country to reinforce and sustain its alignment practices to national, regional, continental and international policies and programmes for a sustainable transformation of agriculture in Côte d'Ivoire and to take necessary steps to be on-track on the overall commitment to CAADP Process during the next Biennial Review.</p>

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">FINANCE & INVESTMENT</p>	<p>The national budget cycle is 12 months and the budgeting process of the NAIP is aligned with the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) for the whole country.</p> <p>However, Côte d'Ivoire is continuously underperformed in terms of public expenditures for meeting the Maputo target commitment of 10% (3.2% in 2019) for and estimated growth performance of 4.2%.. Based on the IFPRI simulation model for the period 2018-2025, the estimated investment required by the public and private sectors to achieve the Malabo target is about 65% by the private sector and 35% by the public sector. The target level of public expenditure of 8.8% is required to achieve an annual growth rate of about 6.45% according to this estimation. Côte d'Ivoire has opted for the "volume approach" rather than the "percentage approach" as suggested the Maputo Declaration (10% of national budget).)</p> <p>In addition, untimely and delayed mobilization of government funding hinder fluent project/programmes implementation.</p> <p>The private sector consultation framework for the implementation of the NAIP put in place since 2013 has functioned as it could despite the expected commitments of the private sector to support the NAIP. The fiscal incentives policies put in place by the government have not induced private investments. The second generation of the NAIP with a focus on "agro-poles" seduced the private sector. Unfortunately, the lack of clarity in the process does not attract private sector's investments. The recent assessment of NAIP2 confirmed a reversed trend of private investment in the agriculture sector (NAIP2 Assessment, 2018-2019).</p>	<p>Despite numerous established fiscal incentives by the Ivorian State, the agricultural sector is not attractive to private investment. Moreover, the lack of clarity in the process of "agro-poles" in the second generation of the NAIP does not attract private sector's investments.</p> <p>The country continues to be underperformed in public expenditures to agriculture and in enhancing access to finance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The IFPRI simulation model by which a target level of public expenditure 8.8% is required to achieve an annual growth rate of about 6.45% for the period (2017-2025) should be implemented in order to transform agriculture. ▶ Côte d'Ivoire must increase public expenditures significantly in order to achieve the projected transformation in the context which the lack of clarity in the process of implementing the "agro-poles" does not attract private sector's investments. ▶ Existing fiscal policies to attract private investment must be strengthened, creating enabling and secure business environment and complementary incentives policies need to be identified in order to attract private sector's investments. ▶ It is necessary to attract private investments in agriculture through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ creating enabling business environment through legislative and fiscal policies, ▶ developing skills in deals and negotiations with private investors <p>Attract private investment, increase public expenditures to agriculture and enhance access to finance.</p>
--	---	---	--

COORDINATION & COOPERATION

The NAIPs in Côte d'Ivoire are coordinated by the National Steering Committee (NSC) and the Permanent Secretariat in charge of planning, programming and monitoring of programs and projects. The coordination system set up is not operating as intended due to (i) the lack of dedicated staff to monitoring and evaluation and to lead the PS-NAIP, (ii) the lack of budget to ensure the effective operation of the PS, namely a dedicated budget to monitoring-evaluation and (iii) the possibility for the different ministerial departments in charge of the NAIP to execute projects and programs outside of the NAIP. The system is supported by three consultation frameworks (private sector, professional associations and civil society organizations, and technical and financial partners). However, the consultation framework for the professional associations and civil society organizations is not effective due to lack of operating budget. The Technical and Financial Partners coordination framework is operating well despite the low absorption capacity.

A innovative approach in the setting up of the consultation frameworks in the NAIP2 is that these frameworks were organized by strategic themes as related to the development orientations with organized multi-stakeholder groups instead of by categories of actors in the NAIP1 (Private sector, TFPs, IPOs and civil society)

- ▶ Despite the established three levels coordination system (Technical Secretariat, the three consultation frameworks, steering committee), the system is not fully operational due to the lack of operating budget and internal dysfunction.
- ▶ There is a need to strengthen the coordination system and the consultation frameworks in the NAIP2
- ▶ Provide the consultation framework of professional associations and civil society organizations with adequate financial resources for their activities in order to have a more effective coordination chain.
- ▶ In order to strengthen the consultation system of the NAIP through the National Steering Committee (NSC) and the Permanent Secretariat, it is urgent to provide them with (i) the dedicated staff to monitor and evaluate and to lead the PS-NAIP, (ii) the adequate budget to ensure the effective operation of the PS, namely a dedicated budget to monitoring-evaluation and (iii) the possibility for the different ministerial departments in charge of the NAIP to execute projects and programs outside of the NAIP.
- ▶ The recommendation of the recent review of the Côte d'Ivoire's NAIP to restructure the Permanent Secretariat taking into account elements that hinder its fluent implementation should be considered seriously in view of the ambitious expectations of the NAIP2.
- ▶ The innovative and commendable approach in the setting up of the consultation frameworks in the NAIP2 around strategic theme as related to the development orientations with organized multi-stakeholder groups instead of by categories of actors in the NAIP1 (Private sector, TFPs, IPOs and civil society) should be pursued.
- ▶ Despite the merit of the coordination system in place, efforts
- ▶ should be made to restructure the steering committee and its mandate, to provide operating budget for regular meetings.

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY</p>	<p>The NAIP's monitoring and evaluation framework is inspired by the national systems put in place within the framework of development programmes/plans namely, the DSRP and the PDDA.</p> <p>However, in practice, the system does not seem to be working as planned due to some bottlenecks (inability to adapt and adjust to the new system, lack of additional resources for the M&E, absence of SAKSS). However, since 2019, with the support of IFAD, the Ministries of the agricultural sector have been able to develop and validate in 2020 a monitoring-evaluation document for the NAIP with defined indicators.</p> <p>It has two main objectives: (i) the operational monitoring and evaluation of projects launched during the period; and (ii) the strategic monitoring and evaluation of program implementation, i.e. the overall impact of NAIP</p> <p>The logical framework for monitoring-evaluation of the implementation of NAIP 2 will include :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Common indicators to all AADP signatory countries ▶ Specific indicators to Côte d'Ivoire's NAIP 2, not included in this common portfolio of indicators 	<p>Drawing lessons from the existing fragmented M&E system during the first implementation of the NAIP, the current trend is to build a robust, unified and harmonized M&E system during its second generation.</p> <p>The country recorded good progress in fostering peer review and Mutual Accountability during the two subsequent Biennial Reviews but failed to meet the overall commitment to Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results in 2019.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Strengthen the capacities of central services, as well as the decentralized services of the ministries involved in the implementation and monitoring-evaluation system of the NAIP in order to build an effective and efficient M&E system ▶ Support financially the M&E system and institutions in order to deliver. ▶ Develop collaboration with SAKSS nodes to better support national monitoring activity. <p>Encourage and support the setting-up of a robust, unified and harmonized M&E system, sustain the good progress in fostering peer review and Mutual Accountability.</p>
---	--	---	--

GHANA

NAIP			
	PROCESS	LESSONS LEARNED	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	<p>Ghana has increasingly done well in the process of planning, formulation, and implementation of CAADP principles through IFJ, the current National Agriculture Investment Plan (NAIP). The formulation and the design of the NAIP (Investing for Food and Jobs (IFJ): an Agenda for Transforming Ghana's Agriculture (2018-2021) was inclusive representing main stakeholders. It is also participative and aligned to national, regional and international reference documents. The CAADP round table was held and the stocktaking assessment was carried out. The IFJ is not widely owned and known. The involvement at the highest level of the State has contributed significantly to the success of the process. But the lack of funding and effective coordination greatly slow down the effective implementation.</p>	<p>Despite the continuous good progress in Completing National CAADP Process, the Republic of Ghana faces challenges in its implementation namely in terms of broad ownership of programmes, definition of roles and responsibilities of private sector and key partners.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The anchorage of planning and formulation process of the NAIP should be sustained and structured. However there is a cost associated with this good achievement. In this respect, there is a need for a continuous government financial support to the process. ▶ Sustain the good progress in Completing National CAADP Process and improve the implementation of the NAIP in terms of broad ownership of programmes, definition of roles and responsibilities of private sector and key partners.

FINANCE & INVESTMENT	<p>The NAIP budgeting is aligned to the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF). The NAIP budget comes from public, private, DPs and other sources. The budget is approved by the parliament and the budgeting process is inclusive.</p> <p>To create enabling environment for the private sector investment, the country has established the Ghana Incentive Base Agriculture Financing Scheme (risk guarantee instrument to push and encourage banks to loan more to agriculture) and a diversity of dialogue platforms and tools which are commendable.</p> <p>Despite the efforts made by Ghana in public expenditure, the CAADP target of 10% has not been met. However, the share of agricultural sector expenditure in national expenditure has continuously increased from 6.5% in 2014 to 9.7% in 2019.</p> <p>A diversity of DPs support the agriculture sector. Despite the enabling environment and incentives measures being created for the private sector investments, the expected outcomes are disappointing</p>	<p>Despite the good progress made by the Republic of Ghana in Completing National CAADP Process, the country continuous to be underperformed in public expenditures to agriculture, the implementation of NAIPs is strongly dependent on national budget at the expenses of the private investment and private innovating communication platforms such as: Agriculture Investment Guide (AIG), Investor Tracking System and also Ghana Incentive Base Agriculture Financing Scheme.</p>	<p>Ghana should continue to increase public expenditures to agriculture. Also there is an urgent need to involve the private sector at all levels of the process and enhance private innovative communication platforms in agriculture Thus, the Public-Private Dialogue Forum (APPDF) established by MoFA and organized and hosted by Private Enterprise Federation (PEF) with Government as the Co-Chair should be operationalized for the benefit of the IFJ.</p>
---------------------------------	--	---	--

<p style="text-align: center;">COORDINATION & COOPERATION</p>	<p>All the investment plans are coordinated the National Development Planning Commission under the Ministry of Planning through cross-sectorial working groups. The NAIPs are coordinated by the MoFA partnered by a Steering Committee.</p> <p>The IFJ is clear on roles for both private and public sector. However, not all the actors are aware of their roles and duties. The private sector is organized but not strong enough and will need further support to strengthen their capacity for their voices to be heard. The ASWG and the public private dialogue platform that is yet to function effectively. Currently, there are very few farmer organizations which are organized, strong and vocal. A code of conduct is being prepared for improving coordination at all levels.</p>	<p>Despite the well-designed coordination mechanism from METASIPs to IFJ in Ghana, their implementation is faced with some challenges in terms of weak coordination across sectors and stakeholders, communication among stakeholders in the agricultural sector at all levels. In addition, not all the actors are aware of their roles and duties.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ There is an urgent need to strengthen the coordination through capacity across sectors and among stakeholders and clarify and emphasize on the role and the responsibilities of all stakeholders in Ghana. To enhance coordination, the Ghana's ASWG through an ad hoc committee is formulating a code of conduct or guideline based on the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). If this code of conduct is adopted by all stakeholders, the coordination will be improved significantly. ▶ The implementation of the METASIPs of Ghana should be improved in terms of coordination across sectors and stakeholders, communication among stakeholders in the agricultural sector at all levels
<p style="text-align: center;">MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY</p>	<p>There is a monitoring framework for the national development plan to which the technical ministry (MOFA) report. Ghana has a robust M&E system linked at three levels (district, Regional and National level). Each NAIP is developed with its M&E plan. The M&E is seen as a mandatory part of the NAIP. However, the robust M&E system established by Ghana needs to be improved in terms of capacity building and resources mobilization. A annual Joint Sector Review (JSR) is organized. The government is developing a web based M&E system.</p>	<p>Despite the continuous good progress made by the Republic of Ghana in Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results including fostering Peer Review and Mutual Accountability during the two subsequent Biennial Reviews, some challenges persist in terms of well-resourced communication and reporting systems</p>	<p>The well-articulated M&E system developed in Ghana is appropriate and can be adapted by other countries. However, strong collaboration, coordination, capacity building and funding are required for effective accountability and monitoring systems in Ghana</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Ghana should sustain the good progress in Mutual Accountability and improve resources allocation to communication and reporting systems.

MALAWI

NAIP			
	PROCESS	LESSONS LEARNED	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	<p>The NAIP has been developed through an extensive consultative and participatory process involving all key stakeholder groups. The consultations were organized with different constituent groups such as technical departments of the Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development, other line Ministries, Private Sector as well as Civil Society. The formulation of the NAIP was inclusive involving key stakeholders including the cross-cutting interests. It is also aligned to national, regional, continental, and international reference documents. The CAADP Round Table Discussion was held. The stocktaking on donor alignment (SDA) was prepared jointly by development partners. The planning hierarchy of Malawi ranged from the National Vision 2020 to the National Development Plan called Malawi Growth and development Strategy (MGDS III) (2017-2022) followed by the Agriculture Sector Wide Approach (ASWAp). The high-level involvement of the State in the NAIP process was also noticeable. The NAIP is widely owned and known to many stakeholders at national level, but its popularity to the general public is not obvious.</p>	<p>Compared to the agricultural policy making processes previously in place, the Malawi's Agriculture Sector-Wide Approach Programs (ASWAp) are aligned to key and strategic policy documents resulting in desired improvements in participation, ownership and use of evidence. However, a number of presidential initiatives, donor-funded projects, and the budgeting process are still not aligned to ASWAp due to the non-well-defined timeline and poor account of diverse stakeholders' views.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The planning and policy process of the NAIP in Malawi is recommendable and should be replicated for the future NAIPs. However, there is a need to disseminate the NAIP to the general public. ▶ Enhance the alignment of the Malawi's ASWAp to key and strategic policy documents and align presidential initiatives, donor-funded projects and the budgeting process to ASWAp.

FINANCE & INVESTMENT	<p>The NAIP budget has been developed and contributions were received from various stakeholders. The budget projections were aligned to the Medium-Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEFs). Malawi is continuously underperformed in terms of public expenditures to agriculture sector for meeting the Maputo target commitment of 10% (6.86% in 2019) with the agricultural growth rate of 4.3% in 2019. The establishment of Donor Committee in Agriculture and Food Security (DCAFS) in the implementation of NAIP in Malawi contributed to the success of the NAIP because it played an important role by providing funding for several projects. Besides the off-budget support from DCAFS donors, NGOs also mobilise significant funding from other sources including funds mobilised by their head offices, funds received from non-DCAFS donors, and from domestic sources. Non-traditional sources provide substantial funding for the agricultural sector. Some of these are from related sectors such as climate change, resilience or private sector development. International evidence shows that farmers are the main financiers of the sector and are expected to make important contributions through co-financing of most NAIP activities. Private agribusiness and SMEs receiving matching grants or participating in PPPs also make contributions. Given the broader scope of the NAIP beyond the confines of MoAIWD, two other important sectors have also been considered as sources of funding: trade and nutrition.</p>	<p>Malawi remains underperformed in public expenditures to agriculture and still faces challenges such as funding mobilization, fiscal and internal financial management, multi-sectorial and private sector support, monitoring and evaluation despite the alignment of its Agriculture Sector-Wide Approach Program (ASWAp) to CAADP framework. A continuous significant discrepancy between the planned and effective investment characterizes the budgeting allocation often biased to the Farm Input Subsidy Program (FISP).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Effort should be made to increase the public expenditures to agriculture sector in Malawi. ▶ The establishment of Donor Committee in Agriculture and Food Security (DCAFS) in the implementation of NAIP is commendable and can inspire other countries. ▶ Increase public expenditures to agriculture, improve funding mobilization, fiscal and internal financial management, multi-sectorial and private sector support, monitoring and evaluation and align the planned and effective investments.
---------------------------------	--	---	--

COORDINATION & COOPERATION	<p>The NAIPs in Malawi are coordinated through the Secretariat of the Ministry of Economic Planning and Public Sector Reforms through Sector Working Groups which bring together agriculture, trade, lands, environment. The Secretariat hosted in the Department of Planning assists with coordination in the Ministry between departments and within the structures at different levels. The heads of offices at different levels are designated as NAIP coordinators and they ensure that all activities are aligned to the NAIP.</p> <p>Existing coordination structures for the NAIP are articulated around Government and multi-stakeholder platforms. The government Platforms include the Office of the President and Cabinet (OPC), Executive Management Committee (EMC), Senior Management Team (SMT), Departmental Meetings; the Multi-Stakeholder Platforms comprises the High Level Forum (HLF), Public-Private Dialogue Forum (PPDF), Development Cooperation Group (DCG), Agricultural Sector Working Group (ASWG), and Technical Working Groups (TWGs) Commodity Platforms. The Donor Committee in Agriculture and Food Security (DCAFS) aims at deepening dialogue, coordination and cooperation among development partners and the Government. The Executive Management Committee (EMC) is the main instrument for inter-ministerial coordination. The DPs also play an important role in guiding and coordinating the sector. There is a limited coordination between government ministries and departments and other stakeholders. There is also a lack of internal coordination and across sectors.</p>	<p>Despite the signing of CAADP Compact in 2010, Malawi still faces limited coordination between government ministries and departments, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), academia, the private sector, and development partners hampering policy design, formulation, implementation and lack of internal coordination and across sectors.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The sharing role of the DCAFS, EMC and DPs in the NAIP coordination in Malawi was important for the success of the implementation of the NAIP. Thus, this practice should be pursued in the coming NAIPs. ▶ There is a need to improve the inter-departmental coordination and the coordination across sectors. ▶ Improve inter-departmental coordination and among stakeholders, internal coordination and across sectors in the policy design, formulation and implementation.
---------------------------------------	--	---	--

MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY	<p>The M&E guidelines are provided by the National M&E master plan hosted at the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development and Public sector reforms. All the programmes' M&E are aligned to the master plan. Sector-wide M&E systems in place consolidates information from district structures and below to a National Agriculture Management Information System (NAMIS) at national level. The implementation of the sector-wide M&E system and related NAMIS built on the NAP M&E strategy. According to the NAP, the DAPS in MoAIWD has primary responsibility for M&E and will collaborate with the National Statistical Office, MoITT, MoLHUD, among others. The main challenge faced by the second generation ASWAp M&E system to a large extent relates to financing especially where surveys are concerned. In other words, one of the constraints is the lack of adequate funding for a sector-wide M&E system instead of the prevailing project-specific M&E.</p>	<p>Despite the good progress in terms of Fostering Peer Review and Mutual Accountability during the two subsequent Biennial Reviews, the current M&E system is incomplete in terms of indicators, baselines and targets, information flows and proper empirical data.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The well-aligned M&E system to National master plan developed in Malawi is appropriate and can be adapted by other countries. However, the main challenge facing the second generation of the ASWAp M&E system relating to funding should be quickly addressed ▶ In this respect, it is recommended that each new project or Program supporting the agricultural sector irrespective of the funding source (be it government or donor financed) earmarks a percentage (1-2%) of its budget towards strengthening the design and operation of a sector wide M&E system. ▶ Malawi should sustain the good progress in Fostering Peer Review and Mutual Accountability and improve the current M&E system in terms of indicators, baselines and targets, information flows and proper empirical data.
--	---	---	--

RWANDA

NAIP			
	PROCESS	LESSONS LEARNED	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	<p>The planning process of investment programmes in Rwanda is a well-structured process across the sectors of the economy. The formulation and the designing of the PSTA4 was inclusive involving the key stakeholders. In the planning process of investment programmes, a Round Table was organized. The PSTA4 was designed in such a way that it is aligned with the various global, continental, and national processes, notably the SDGs, Malabo and the NST. Prior to this step, an agriculture sector stocktaking assessment was carried out and its findings served to finetune the targets and priorities of the PSTA4. The MINAGRI has two implementing agencies: the Rwanda Agriculture and Animal Resources Development Board (RAB) and the National Agricultural Export Board (NAEB). Previous phases of PSTA have put in place several relevant steering mechanisms which become operational during PSTA 4 implementation. Although the formulation of the PSTA4 was successful with the high-level involvement of the state, its ownership by all the stakeholders is not obvious.</p>	<p>Contrary to the PSTA I and II, the PSTA III and PSTA IV are ingrained in the Malabo declaration process, consistent with the National Strategy for Transformation (NST1) and are comprehensive as gender, youth and social protection and incentives are mainstreamed in the formulation of the NAIPs. Rwanda has persistently maintained a good progress for Re-commitment to CAADP Process including Completing National CAADP Process during the two subsequent Biennial Reviews</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ There is a need to translate the PSTA4 document into Kinyarwanda and further disseminate it to the districts for their knowledge; ▶ In order to enhance the NAIP ownership, the government should not only communicate more on NAIP through advocacy and policy dialogue but also make the NAIP the reference working document in the agriculture sector; ▶ It would be very helpful that the MINAGRI initiates dialogue with all key players to ascertain common understanding of the role to be played by every constituency in following up on the planned content of the PSTA4 ▶ Sustain and anchor the alignment of the NAIP to the National Strategy for Transformation (NST1), comprehensive formulation of the NAIP, the good progress for Re-commitment to CAADP Process including Completing National CAADP Process during the next Biennial Reviews

FINANCE & INVESTMENT	<p>The budget projections were based on the Medium-Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEFs), ensuring linkages with existing (sub) sector plans and budgets, as well as other Ministerial (sub) sector plans. While the private sector is the real driver of growth in agriculture, the PSTA 4 investments have been estimated from a public-sector perspective. It is vital for resource mobilisation, planning and budgeting for the full implementation of the proposed plan.</p> <p>Rwanda's public expenditure in agriculture sector 4.33% in 2019 is still less than 10% (CAADP commitment). However, the agricultural growth recorded during the period was 5.03% due to the good governance, political will and accountability.</p> <p>The set-up of Rwanda Development Board (RDB) has facilitated the mobilization of the overall private sector investments to the NAIP. RDB is an excellent example of public-private partnerships translating policy into action.</p>	<p>Despite Rwanda remains underperformed in public expenditures to agriculture and the weak involvement of the private sector in the PSTAs, Rwanda continues to be a well-performed country in the agricultural sector. The initiatives (Rwanda Development Board (RDB) and Africa Improved Foods (AIFs)) are an excellent example of public-private partnerships translating policy into action.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) as a tool for budgeting is appropriate and should be pursued and reinforced as it improves efficiency of public expenditure, improves predictability of resource flows and improves efficiency, raises resource consciousness and promotion of output or outcome focused approaches, and improves accountability. In practice, at this stage, only the Rwanda budgeting system can be recommended for other countries for its merits. ▶ There is a need to reinforce the private sector's contribution to the funding (which is vital for resource mobilization) of the NAIP for its successful implementation. ▶ The experience of the RDB is commendable and can inspire other countries. ▶ Increase public expenditures to agriculture, attract private investment and up-scale the good practices.
COORDINATION & COOPERATION	<p>The existing internal coordination emphasizes on the responsibilities of outcome leaders who operationalize results chains at different levels, build synergy among priority areas, support output implementation by the various actors, streamline synergies between RAB, NAEB, SPIU and MINAGRI through increased functional guidance, and inform annual planning by thorough feedback on implementation lessons learnt and best practices. Institutional arrangements between the MINAGRI and DPs are appropriate for an effective implementation of the PSTA4. The Agricultural Sector Working Group (ASWG), the Sector Wide Approach (SWAp) group, the Sub Sector Working Groups (SSWGs) and Joint Action Development Forum (JADF) are steering mechanisms and platforms put in place for a successful implementation of the PSTA4.</p>	<p>The various policy dialogue platforms established by the Ministry of Economy and Finance, and the strong engagement and active involvement of stakeholders facilitate and enhance the inter-sectorial collaboration required to ensure inclusive sustainability and resilience.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The coordination mechanism put in place for the implementation of the PSTA4 is successful, replicable and should be capitalized by other countries and regions. ▶ There is a need to reinforce the inter-sectorial collaboration through policy dialogue platforms and active engagement and participation of stakeholders. ▶ Enhance the inter-sectorial collaboration through policy dialogue platforms and active engagement and participation of stakeholders.

MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY	<p>Rwanda M&E system is a well-articulated system supported by institutional arrangements. It is a robust system given the ambitious plan and what is at stake. The PSTA 4 M&E framework proposes a two-tiered monitoring structure: (i) A Strategic Results Framework, focusing on the key outputs and indicators related to transformation; (ii) A Linked Operational Framework, which includes the lower level (sub) outputs and indicators with targets and related activities and costs. The PSTA 4 Strategic Results Framework has been built to incorporate key indicators reflecting commitments and ambitions of the agriculture sector towards various global, continental, and national processes, notably the SDGs, Malabo and the NST. The government has also established an e-M&E system for accountability. The establishment of CPAF, DPAF and performance contract has significantly reinforced the M&E in Rwanda. Nutrition data were not regularly collected and validated by the government. However, there is a lack of a dedicated platform for the government to engage the beneficiaries like farmers, women and youth on a regular basis. The NAIP technical review is part of the overall CAADP implementation process, and is informed by other key CAADP-related reviews and analyses, including Agriculture Joint Sector Review (JSR) assessment and JSR reports.</p>	<p>Despite the good performance in meeting the overall commitment of Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results and the improvement M&E system, there is a lack of a dedicated platform for government to engage the beneficiaries (farmers, women and youth) on a regular basis.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The well-articulated and robust M&E system built in the current PSTA 4 and supported by institutional arrangements with an ambitious plan is a well-structured and commendable system that can be adapted by other countries. ▶ There is a need to establish a dedicated platform for the government to engage the beneficiaries like farmers, women and youth on a regular basis. ▶ Efforts should be made to optimize alignment and avoid proliferation of indicators to be reported on in the agriculture sector ▶ Rwanda should sustain the good performance in meeting the overall commitment of Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results and the improvement M&E system, establish a dedicated platform for government to engage the beneficiaries (farmers, women and youth) on a regular basis.
--	---	--	---

TOGO

NAIP			
	PROCESS	LESSONS LEARNED	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	<p>The NAIP formulation process in Togo was participative and inclusive are corroborated by the consultative process, the organization of National Round Table and the signing of the compact by the representative stakeholders. The process is also aligned to the national NDP, ECOWAP/CAADP and other regional and international instruments. This step was preceded by a sectorial stocktaking assessment of which findings served to elaborate the vision and actions plans. The exercise benefited also from the capitalization of past achievements and good practices of the first generation NAIP-FS. The NAIP is weakly owned and known to many stakeholders at national level, but its popularity to the general public is not obvious</p>	<p>The first and second generations of Togo's NAIP are built on accumulated past achievements, good practices and holistic approach. But inadequate budget allocations results in inconsistent and ineffective implementation.</p>	<p>In addition to the participative, inclusive and alignment process that characterized the formulation of the NAIPs in Togo, the instruments approach developed by Togo should be replicated in other countries or scaled up as it gives not only more precision and clarity in what one intends to achieve but also and most importantly how one implements it.</p> <p>The capitalization of past achievements, good practices and holistic approach built in the formulation of Togo NAIP are commendable and should be sustained. Better budget allocation is required for consistent and effective implementation.</p>
	<p>The policy and legal framework of the NAIP-FNS is enforced by the decree N°2016-186/PR approving the National Agricultural Policy for the period 2016-2030. An Agricultural Orientation Act is being elaborated to enforce its anchoring.</p>		
	<p>An innovative and commendable approach that Togo has integrated in the NAIP-FNS (2017-2023) is the instruments approach giving not only more precision in what one intends to achieve but also and most importantly how one implements it.</p>		

FINANCE & INVESTMENT	<p>The NAIP is based on the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) of the country. The budgeting process is elaborated annually involving all the stakeholders and is voted in the parliament after its adoption by the government. It is published and made accessible to all through the ministry of finance website.. The NAIP-FNS is declined every year into a budgeting/programming or a rolling three-year budgeting/programming. The budget is developed based on the mobilization of public and Development Partners (DP).resources, which reached 45.52% and 54.48% respectively in the case of NAIP1.</p> <p>The country is engaged to mobilize 50% of the budget of the second generation of the NAIP from internal resources.</p> <p>In terms of public expenditures, Togo is underperformed to meeting CAADP target of 10%. Except for 2008 where public expenditures share reached 10%, it recorded 6.4% and 5.3% in 2010 and 2018 respectively</p> <p>The private investment is attracted in the agricultural sector through the establishment of “agro-poles” and of incentive measures. Currently there is a weak involvement of the private sector.</p> <p>To boost and attract private investment to the agricultural sector, a high level meeting was organized under the leadership of the Presidency Office with participants from members of government, the Central Bank of West African States (BCEAO), Technical and Financial Partners, sub-regional development banks (BOAD, BIDC).commercial banks and local guarantee institutions in support to the promotion of investment in the agricultural sector and to finance the small and medium enterprises.</p>	<p>Despite the increased overall public resources funding in the country and to the agricultural sector in Togo, the Maputo commitment of 10% was not met during the implementation of the first and the second generations of NAIPs. The lack of formal and operational mechanism does not facilitate the engaged commitment of development partners and there is a weak involvement of the private sector.</p>	<p>The NAIPs are too dependent on external funding. Efforts should be made to reverse the trends by increasing public expenditures in compliance with the Malabo Declaration.</p> <p>The new option of “agropoles” enshrined in the new generation of NAIP is commendable but should be used as a real tool to open up and diversify opportunities for a real transformation of agriculture in Togo.</p> <p>Emphasis should also be placed on incentives policies to attract private investments to support agriculture</p> <p>Sustain the increase of the overall public expenditures to agriculture and establish a formal and operational mechanism to engage development partners</p>
---------------------------------	---	--	---

COORDINATION & COOPERATION	<p>All the state and non-state actors involved in the implementation of the NAIPs in Togo have clearly defined roles and responsibilities as indicated in the institutional arrangements of the NAIPs and the signed Compacts. The improvement of the legal framework and business environment through the establishment of enabling environment, the land and State Code and the Law of Agricultural Orientation is commendable,</p> <p>The inter-sectorial coordination is carried out through the Technical Steering Committee chaired the Permanent Secretary. It is supported by the inter-ministerial strategic monitoring committee (CIPS), the CTP, the CROPs and the various frameworks for dialogue and thematic working groups, among others.</p> <p>For the coordination of development partners at the national level, the government has a Directorate General for Aid Mobilization and Partnership (DGMAP) within the Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation.</p> <p>At the sector level, there are: the working group of TFPs in the agricultural sector, the CIPS, the CTP and the CROPs.</p> <p>The development partners intervening in the agricultural sector have their own coordination mechanism through the Country Strategy Papers.</p>	<p>The different established instruments for monitoring and coordination (CIPS, CTP, CROP, GTPTFSA and multi-actor steering committee) are commendable despite shortcomings (lack of operating budget, unclear role of the private sector, low engagement of donors) identified.</p>	<p>For a better participation of civil society in achieving the results of the PNIASAN, it is important to put in place a single reference framework for consultation (strengthening of the OP/CSO framework), which will be representative in the steering, decision-making and monitoring bodies of the implementation of the PNIASAN (mission to monitor projects of supervision).</p> <p>The accountability of the actors in the implementation process reinforces the ownership of the NAIPs and facilitates the contribution of all the actors towards the achievement of results</p> <p>Operationalize the established instruments for monitoring and coordination and multi-actor steering committee, clearly define the role of the private sector, engage donors in the formulation and implementation of the NAIP.</p>
---------------------------------------	--	--	---

MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY	<p>The M&E system of the NAIPs in Togo should have been a parcel part of the national M&E but it is yet to be operational.</p> <p>The Management Information Systems (MIS) and the M&E systems of the ministry of Agriculture exist but are not connected either between themselves, or with external systems and as the results of M&E are not utilized by the MIS. The agricultural sector holds joint annual sector reviews with the technical and financial partners. But some of the recommendations from these reviews are not implemented due to lack of financial resources or lack of relevant expertise.</p> <p>The interventions supported by the DPs contribute to the achievement of the selected indicators.</p> <p>The execution of the NAIP's budget is voted in parliament. The government is held accountable to the achievements of the NAIP by Parliament and stakeholders, including citizens.</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation results and performance reports are widely disseminated and accessible. However, not all actors/stakeholders are aware of its dissemination.</p> <p>.The annual organization of the National Forum of Togolese Peasants (FNPT) under the leadership of the Head of State witnesses the government's commitment to the transformation of agriculture in Togo.</p>	<p>Despite the alignment of the NAIP to the Result Framework of the CAADP, the good progress made by Togo in fostering Peer Review and Mutual Accountability in 2017, the existing arrangements for monitoring and evaluation, institutional mechanism for conducting the joint sector review, provision of the required indicators for the elaboration of the Biennial Review, framework for monitoring all the interventions are lacking. In addition the Management Information Systems (MIS) and the M&E systems of the ministry of Agriculture are not connected either between themselves, or with external systems and are not utilized by the MIS.</p>	<p>The MIS and M&E systems in place are adequate but need to operationalize through the established linkages. Moreover, efforts should be made by the government to implement the recommendations from the joint sector reviews</p> <p>Last but not least, all the interventions in the agricultural sector, even if they are not carried out by the Ministry, deserve to be monitored and capitalized on. Hence the need for a broader framework for monitoring interventions is urgently needed.</p> <p>Sustain the alignment of the NAIP to the Result Framework of the CAADP, the good progress in fostering Peer Review and Mutual Accountability, set up the arrangements for monitoring and evaluation, institutional mechanism for conducting the joint sector review, provide the required indicators for the elaboration of the Biennial Review and establish framework for monitoring all the interventions.</p>
--	---	--	---

ECCAS

RAIP			
	PROCESS	LESSONS LEARNED	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	<p>The inclusive participation of all stakeholders in the process of formulating and implementing of the ECCAS-RAIP was made possible through the sensitization phase of the stakeholders and the consultation meetings. This made it possible to have a focused vision on the regional priorities. The process was preceded by an assessment of the region's situation within the framework of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and the strategic documents of some institutions resulting in the Common Agricultural Policy and the ECCAS-RAIP. The latter resumes the strategic axes of the CAP and takes into account some priorities identified in the national documents. This resulted in the ECCAS-RAIP document that is in line with the continental results framework (AU) of CAADP (2015-2025) and covers all the areas that contribute to agricultural transformation in the community. However, the PRIASAN was developed while the drafting of national investment program documents and the analysis of strategic options were not yet completed. The ECCAS-RAIP is known by top management level and the CAADP team at the regional and national levels but it is not known and owned by national and local constituencies and owned.</p> <p>The policy and legislative framework is gradually improving in favor of the RAIP implementation. Several policies have been developed at the sub-regional level (e.g., common regulations on the approved pesticides in the CAEMU zone, and convergence efforts are noticeable between the CAEMU and the ECCAS).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The lack of synchronization in the process of formulating of the RAIP and the NAIPs is the significant impediment to fluent implementation of the RAIP-FSN. Member states perceives the RAIP as an independent programme rather than the complement to the NAIPs. ▶ The ECCAS-RAIP is known by top management level and the CAADP team at the regional and national levels but it is not known and owned by national and local constituencies and owned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The sensitization of stakeholders at various stages of the ECCAS RAIP formulation and implementation process and their involvement in the consultation meetings promoted participation and inclusiveness and enabled the identification for a focused vision on the region's priorities during the ECCAS-RAIP formulation and implementation process. However, it is necessary to strengthen the political and legislative framework for the implementation of ECCAS-RAIP through regional integration policies such as: common regulations on the approved pesticides in the CAEMU zone and to accelerate the convergence efforts between CEMAC and ECCAS. ▶ There is an urgent need to synchronize the planning and formulation process of the RAIP and the NAIPs for a fluent implementation of the RAIP-FSN ▶ There is a need to disseminate the ECCAS-RAIP at country levels through advocacy and policy dialogue at the same time of dissemination of the NAIPs in the member states

FINANCE & INVESTMENT	<p>The RAIP budget has been developed on the basis of the financial contribution of member states. The budget process is not done annually and not in a transparent and accountable manner. Despite the delayed formulation and implementation of the ECCAS-RAIP, the Development Partners supported the regional plan at the Donors Round Table organization. A roadmap was elaborated and a steering committee was set up to follow up on the commitments.</p> <p>The committee led by the Gabonese Minister of Agriculture comprises all stakeholders: Development Partners (ADB), Technical Partners (FAO) and Producers' Organizations (PROPAC). Unfortunately, the lack of counterpart financial contribution by the member states to the Special Regional Fund for Agricultural Development (FSRDA) established in 2009 of which 1% of the RAIP-FNS budget represents the operation costs hindered the operation of this steering committee</p> <p>The CAADP's target of 10% of public spending on agriculture has not been met in the ECCAS region. It is about 2.46% in 2019.</p>	<p>The allocation of budget to investment plans in the ECCAS is adequate, relevant and articulated despite the shortcomings noted in the design related to the financial analysis and information mechanisms. Moreover, the CAADP objective of 10% of public expenditure on agriculture has not been reached and the private sector does not have a dedicated framework to secure and guarantee its investments</p>	<p>The financial contribution of the member States is important to boost the dynamics of investment in the agricultural sector. To this end, the REC should further sensitize and inform member States on their complementary and coordinating role in the identification and implementation of regional projects for the benefit of States and thus promote the achievement of the CAADP target of allocating 10% of public expenditure to agriculture.</p> <p>In addition, the community should urgently put in place a dedicated framework for the private sector and to secure and guarantee regional private investments, for regional projects and programmes' funding</p> <p>Sustain the adequate , relevant and articulated budget allocation to investment plans in the ECCAS and improve the design in term of financial analysis and information mechanisms</p>
---------------------------------	--	---	--

COORDINATION & COOPERATION	<p>The coordination of the process should have been ensured by the Regional Council on Agriculture, Food and Nutrition (CRAAN), the steering body in charge of the CAADP implementation process and of RAIP-FNS, established in Brazzaville. Unfortunately, the ECCAS failed to establish the coordination between the three bodies that comprises the Regional Council i.e. the political body which is the steering committee, the thematic group and the public body which is the technical monitoring committee in charge of coordination were not put in place due to the reform process initiated at the ECCAS level. Hence, The RAIP-FNS is coordinated by the former Agriculture and Rural Development Department instead of an independent structure.</p> <p>The private sector is not organized, strong and dynamic in the region. So are the fishery, aquaculture, farmers and fish farmers organizations</p>	<p>Despite the recognition of institutional collaboration between the ECCAS and other Regional Economic Communities (REC), the existence of coordination unit, the participation and funding of the RAIP-FNS, the established coordination and the collaboration mechanism through the operation of the Regional Council on Agriculture, Food and Nutrition (CRAAN), the independent steering body in charge of the CAADP implementation process of the ECCAS-RAIP are yet to be effective.</p>	<p>Reinforce the coordination process by establishing and ensuring the operation of the Regional Council on Agriculture, Food and Nutrition (CRAAN), the independent steering body in charge of the CAADP implementation process of the ECCAS-RAIP in view of establishing the coordination between the three bodies that comprises the Regional Council i.e. the political body which are the steering committee, the thematic group and the public body as the technical monitoring committee in charge of coordination.</p> <p>Enhance the effective coordination and clarify the collaboration mechanism, strengthen the coordination unit, improve participation and increase funding.</p> <p>Ensure the organization of strong and dynamic regional private sector and professional associations (fishery, farming and aquaculture) frameworks or platforms to serve as exchange platforms for facilitating regional private investments and inter-sectorial dialogues</p>
MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY	<p>There is no dedicated monitoring and evaluation unit or department for the RAIP-FNS at ECCAS, The Regional Investment Plan is monitored through the AUDA-NEPAD Mutual Accountability Framework, which provides information on the implementation of the CAADP process in Central Africa at the RAIP-FNS level. Hence, a CAADP expert was recruited to support the region in developing monitoring indicators.</p> <p>The planning, monitoring and evaluation systems of the Regional Agricultural Investment Plan will be largely guided by the SADC Policy for Strategic Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (SPME, 2012).</p>	<p>Despite the well-structured M&E system based on the AU mutual accountability framework, the regional data collection and management system are lacking there is an urgent need to reinforce the political will for delivering on Malabo commitments, the lack of fully established inclusive institutionalized mechanisms and platforms for CAADP Mutual Accountability and peer review persists in the region</p>	<p>There is an urgent need to establish a dedicated monitoring and evaluation unit for the ECCAS=RAIP to ensure its fluent implementation</p> <p>There is an urgent need to establish a regional data collection mechanism, to reinforce the political will for delivering on Malabo commitments, and to be on-track on fully established inclusive institutionalized mechanisms and platforms for CAADP Mutual Accountability and peer review</p>

EAC

RAIP			
	PROCESS	LESSONS LEARNED	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	<p>The formulation and the design of the RAIP were consultative and participatory and the CAADP Round Table inclusive. The EAC RAIP is widely known by top management level and the CAADP team but it is difficult to ascertain that it is widely known and owned. The RAIP is aligned to RDP. The capacity of the EAC to mobilize resources and to implement RAIP is a big challenge. An annual stakeholders' reflection meeting on progress, challenges and lessons learned in implementation of the RAIP and continuous monitoring and evaluation during implementation of the instruments is established. The EAC has an Agricultural Strategy but it is not clear that it is sector-wide and roles of non-state actors are not well articulated.</p>	<p>Although the EAC RAIP formulation process is participatory, inclusive and aligned, it is still not widely owned and widely known and its implementation process is not complemented by the NAIP implementation processes in the EAC partner states and failed to meet its benchmark target in 2019.</p>	<p>There is an urgent need to increase awareness on the RAIP through advocacy and policy dialogue and to mainstream it into member states national investment plans in the EAC. The Policy and legislative framework need improvement to ensure funding for implementation of the RAIP. More clarity on the roles and responsibilities of non-state actors is required for effective implementation of the RAIP.</p> <p>Foster ownership, communication and complement the implementation of RAIP with that of NAIP and take necessary steps to meeting its benchmark target in the next Biennial Review.</p>

FINANCE & INVESTMENT	<p>The RAIP budget is developed based on the financial contribution of member States. Without significant financial resources allocation by the public sector and an enabling policy environment, agriculture is unlikely to be viewed as profitable business by the private sector which is the major source of finance to the agricultural sector anywhere in the world. The Public Expenditure Reviews (PER) are done annually. The EAC Region is not on track with meeting the CAADP target of 10% public expenditure to agriculture. The EAC Parliamentary Committee on Agriculture exists. The private sector investment is attracted through strengthening the policy, legal and institutional frameworks. There are public-private dialogues organized by value chain.</p>	<p>Despite the good progress made by the EAC for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process in 2017, the region continues to be underperformed in public expenditures to agriculture and in attracting domestic private investment in 2019. The funding of the RAIP is faced with the weak capacity of EAC Secretariat resulting in limited absorptive capacity, mismatch between the planned budgets and available resources and misalignment. However, the private sector investment challenges are addressed through strengthening the policy, legal and institutional frameworks.</p>	<p>The imperative for the financial resources mobilization to the agricultural sector in the EAC is the establishment of a policy and institutional environment conducive to attracting the private sector. Increased mobilization of budget allocation from member states is an urgent requirement for effective implementation of the RAIP.</p> <p>Sustain the good progress for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process and increase public expenditures to agriculture, attract domestic private investment and increase financial supports to the EAC Secretariat.</p>
---------------------------------	--	--	---

COORDINATION & COOPERATION	<p>The overall implementation and coordination institution of the RAIP is the EAC Secretariat through the Sectorial Minister Councils. The coordination between public and private actors is done through engagement with the Non State Actors Forum. The Development Partners is engaged with the REC through the Development Partners Consultative Forum. The REC established the Projects Coordination Unit to ensure efficient management of DPs resources. A large number of regional stakeholders are involved in the EAC agriculture and food security agenda and the Community is acutely aware of the need to coordinate these stakeholders to achieve the development goals assigned to the sector. Several regional organizations representing private sector and farmers exist among others: East Africa Business Council, East African Farmers Federation. These are strong organizations that have capacity to influence the regional agenda but implementation of their recommendations is a challenge. Coordination within EAC institutions is well provided in the EAC Treaty, its protocols including the Common Market Protocol and the 5th Development Plan. The coordination across sectors that are relevant to agriculture is achieved through an inter-ministerial coordination team</p>	<p>Despite the existence of the Projects Coordination Unit through Joint Assistance Strategy, the coordination is faced with the lack of clear inter-departmental coordination structures within the EAC Secretariat.</p> <p>There are strong organizations in EAC that have capacity to influence the regional agenda but implementation of their recommendations is a challenge.</p>	<p>Different coordination platforms are well established in East Africa Community. However, effort should be made in the coordination of stakeholders through effectiveness of clarity and responsibility of each one of the actor in the EAC agricultural sector and also in the improvement of taking into account the recommendations of regional organizations representing private sector and farmers to achieve the development goals assigned to the sector.</p> <p>Enhance Coordination and provide clarity in inter-departmental coordination structures within the EAC Secretariat.</p>
---------------------------------------	---	--	---

MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY	<p>The M&E is part of the RAIP and the budget execution is reported back through Audits, Public Expenditure Reviews (PER), Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) and presentation of budget statements to the East African Legislative Assembly (EALA). The indicators to be monitored for RAIP implementation are derived from the EAC CAADP Results Framework. The EAC has a Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) at all levels from the Secretary General's Level to the Technical Officers including the directorate of Productive Sector. The M&E findings are not widely disseminated and the RAIP is known but more sensitization is needed. The EAC region organizes a Joint Sector Review (JSR) annually. There is no platform for sharing JSR experiences with other countries and the lack of operating budget hindered participation of partner states and non-state representative experts to organized meetings.</p>	<p>Despite the existence of a unit responsible for Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) and the recognition that M&E system in mutual accountability processes, the EAC's Department of Agriculture and Food Security is deficient in terms of sectorial M&E specialists and procedure, governance structures, inadequate accountability forums and limited involvement of key stakeholders.</p> <p>Moreover, the M&E findings are not widely disseminated and there is no platform for sharing JSR experiences.</p>	<p>A platform for sharing JSR experiences with other countries and RECs should be established at regional level and more fund is needed to keep operational the M&E system overall.</p> <p>The EAC Monitoring and Evaluation Learning (MEL) should be improved in terms of sectorial M&E specialists and procedure, governance structures, accountability forums and involvement of key stakeholders.</p>
--	---	--	---

ECOWAS

RAIP			
	PROCESS	LESSONS LEARNED	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	All the governments of ECOWAS member countries, economic and technical institutions, organizations of non-state actors, CILSS Experts, TFPs, research institutions participated in the design and formulation of the RAIP and in the CAADP round table. The RAIP takes into account both the public sector and the private sector, in particular the non-state actors. In terms of planning frameworks. The formulation hierarchy ran from the Community Development Plan, the regional agricultural policy (ECOWAP), national agricultural policies and finally to national agricultural development plans. The RAIP-FNS is therefore a component of the Community Development Plan. The formulation of NAIPs benefited from stocktaking assessments undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Water Resources with the support of the Hub Rural. The findings were then shared with and benefited from comments and observations all the stakeholders. Although this ongoing assessment approach has its internal merits for ECOWAS, an independent assessment ensuring a coherence of the RAIP with ECOWAP is likely to complement the existing internal stocktaking by providing a more complete and prospective view identification of t current and future opportunities and challenges of the region. The successive planning frameworks are aligned from top to bottom with the community strategic framework designed by all departments / directorates. The design goes from vision to priority areas from which all departments and directorates derive their specific priority areas aligned with the core areas.	Contrary to the formulation of the ECOWAS RAIP, the ECOWAS RAIP-FSN is built on past lessons learned and accumulated past achievements and challenges, is comprehensive and tuned to regulations and investment instruments to support member States, professional organizations and the private sector.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The anchorage of the planning and formulation process through the adaptation of the CAADP process (Aide-memoire) is relevant and should pursued be for a region with existing planning and formulation processes. The need for synchronization of this regional planning and formulation process with that of national processes remains a challenge. The ECOWAS is often confronted with budgetary arbitration issues in the face of regional and country priorities. The current reliance or dependency on DPs funding at the expenses of internal mobilization is a pattern to be reversed to ensure ownership and sustainability. ▶ ECOWAS should complement its existing internal stocktaking assessment by an independent stocktaking assessment which is likely to provide a more complete and prospective view on the identification of current and future opportunities and challenges of the region with a view to ensuring coherence between the RAIPs and ECOWAP
			<p>Last but not least, there is an urgent need to operationalize all the implementing instruments of the RAIP for the agricultural transformation to take place in the region. Further efforts should be made to improve on the institutional arrangements of implementation of RAIPs currently shared between the different sub-regional institutions(RAAF, CILLS, UEMOA etc) under the leadership of the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Water resources) with limited capacity</p>

POLICY & PLANNING (CONTINUED)	<p>The programs and projects are designed and derived from this process. Often there are budgetary arbitration issues in the face of regional and country priorities. In addition, the region experienced many recurring climatic (drought, flood), security crises which hamper or destroy the efforts to implement the RAIP. The RAIP has technical, regulatory, financial and organizational Implementation instruments: (i) Technical implementation instrument; (ii) Regulatory Implementation mechanism; (iii) Financial Implementation instrument (ECOWADF); (iv) Organizational Implementation instruments. The RAIP dictates the annual work plan of the Directorate of Agriculture & Rural Development of the ECOWAS Commission. From the RAIP, programs and projects are proposed, which in turn is linked with the ECOWAS Vision as well as the priorities.</p>		<p>Sustain the capitalization of past lessons learned, accumulated past achievements and challenges in the process of formulating a comprehensive and a tuned RAIP to regulations and investment instruments to support member States, professional organizations and the private sector</p>
FINANCE & INVESTMENT	<p>The planned funding is mainly mobilized from the Member States, the DPs and the private sector. The region's budgeting cycle is twofold: (i) At the ECOWAS level, the budget cycle is annual (January to December); (ii) Each operational programme has a steering committee that meets annually to define the programmes, plans and budgets. Several DPs are supporting the RAIP financially but mainly operational are USAID, AECID, DDC, WB, FAO, JICA, GIZ, EU, AfDB, Swiss Cooperation, Spanish cooperation, among others. The CAADP target of 10% of public expenditure to agriculture has not been met by the region (4.21% between 2014 2019) even though a few countries have made tremendous progress and only 6 countries have met the Maputo target. The Region has a Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) involving all sectors related to Agriculture. Besides, there is a regional Parliamentary Committee on Agriculture with specific sessions dedicated to agriculture.</p>	<p>Despite the good progress made by the ECOWAS for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/ Malabo Process in 2017, the region continues to be underperformed in public expenditures to agriculture and in attracting domestic private investment. The strong dependency on external funding that is source of fragility of the regional food sovereignty.</p>	<p>Efforts have to be made by the Member States to increase their public expenditure to agriculture in order to meet the CAADP target of 10% and to attract domestic private investment .increase their public expenditure to agriculture in order to meet the CAADP target of 10% and to attract domestic private investment.</p> <p>Sustain the good progress for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/ Malabo Process, increase public expenditures to agriculture and attract domestic private investment, increase the Community resources to funding of the RAIP currently strongly dependent on external funding.</p>

COORDINATION & COOPERATION	<p>All six ECOWAP stakeholder groups (private sector, professional organizations, research institutions, government, civil society organizations, technical & financial partners) contribute to RAIP implementation. The Federation of West African Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FEWACCI) that brings together National Associations has its Executive Secretary domiciled within the ECOWAS Commission to serve as liaison. FEWACCI is deeply involved on a day to day basis in the RAIP coordination mechanisms. There is a medium-term Regional Development Plan of 5 years. The Directorate of Agriculture & Rural Development is the coordinator while all stakeholders have their clear roles and responsibilities. There exists the ECOWAP Donor Group which is coordinated by the Directorate of Agriculture & Rural Development. This was a regulation passed with a compact signed and being implemented. The ECOWAP Donor Group does not have its coordination mechanisms, it was designed specifically to help in the governance of the ECOWAP/RAP/NAIPs. The coordination (structured around the Directorate of Agriculture & Rural Development, the Regional Agency for Agriculture and Food (ARAA/RAAF) and the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Water Resources (DAEWR)), within the Department of Agriculture works very well: (i) at the ECOWAS level; (ii) at National level; and (iii) at regional and national levels combined with other RECs. However, the impact of the Department of Agriculture is limited due to limited human and financial capacities in face of budgetary arbitration.</p>	<p>Contrary to the prevailed situation in the past, the establishment of RAAF, the framework of policy dialogue and consultation, the increasingly aligned interventions of Technical and Financial Partners and socio-professional institutions to the ECOWAP policies and priorities and the ECOWAS leadership, strengthen programmes implementation, improve the participation of stakeholders and enhance coordination.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ There is a need to reinforce the coordinating of DPs' actions at regional and country level for a successful implementation of the RAIP. ▶ Effort should be made to address the financial constraints that limits the impact of the Department of Agriculture in terms of coordination of the RAIP. <p>Improve coordination through strengthening of the RAAF, enhancing the framework of policy dialogue and consultation, reinforcing the alignment of Technical and Financial Partners to the ECOWAP policies and priorities, strengthening programme implementation and improving the participation of stakeholders.</p>
---------------------------------------	--	---	---

MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY	<p>At the continental level, the CAADP develops a CAADP Results Framework and this framework forms the basis for the ECOWAP M&E Results Framework (RF). ECOWAS through its central ECOWAS M&E unit under the office of the ECOWAS Vice President has a regional Community Strategic Framework that guides design, implementation, and reporting. REC has a database system called ECOAGRIS. It operates as a platform whose objective is to strengthen information systems at different local, national and regional scales to meet information needs for monitoring the food and nutritional situation, for vulnerability analysis, for decision support. Typically, the Regional Agency for Agriculture & Food (RAAF) based in Lomé has its M&E system taking the RAIP into account. In the case of projects for which the RAAF did not establish a monitoring-evaluation mechanism from the beginning, the necessary activities are planned during the planning stage, to conduct monitoring-evaluation operations. The M&E findings are produced mainly in annual reports, factsheets and books and are widely disseminated and accessible including on websites. Thus, the RAIP is known at continental, regional and country levels. Even partners at global level know and value it. The institutional reform of ECOWAS has fostered consistency between planning and monitoring-evaluation with the creation in the agencies of strategic planning and monitoring-evaluation positions by involving monitoring-evaluation from the planning stage.</p>	<p>Despite the recognition of the value of M&E as a key component of Mutual Accountability for Action and Results and the existence of M&E regional framework and the merit of ECOAGRIS system, the sustainability of the system hinges on its continuous funding that currently depends largely on development partners.</p>	<p>Efforts should be made to avoid the fragmentation of small projects and therefore, manage to design a large program in which several small projects could be integrated according to their common objectives, for a common planning and monitoring.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ It is expected that ECOWAS adopt a management fees policy in order to take part of the funds allocated by the donors to finance impact evaluations and the designing of new projects. ▶ There is a need to have a monitoring-evaluation focal point, who intervene at all levels of the monitoring-evaluation chain, on each project to better value the results in the framework of results-based reporting and to strengthen his/her capacities. ▶ There is a need to mobilize internal funding for the M&E and the ECOAGRIS systems. <p>The M&E regional framework and the ECOAGRIS system have merits but need to be sustained as both systems are continuously dependent on external funding at the expenses of internal resources.</p>
--	--	---	---

I. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

For the past two decades, the African agricultural policy landscape underwent a significant structural transformation. The first decade was shaped by the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) under the Maputo Declaration adopted by the AU Assembly of Heads of State and Government in 2003. The overall objective of CAADP was to “help African countries achieve a higher level of economic growth through agriculture-oriented development” and thereby “eradicate hunger and reduce poverty through agriculture”. The commitment to allocate a minimum of 10% national budget and to achieve 6% annual growth of the agriculture sector are two important components that best provide a synopsis of the Maputo Declaration.

Under CAADP, countries design national agricultural development strategies and plans by explicitly taking into account regional complementarities and trade. The National Agricultural Investment Plans (NAIPs) based on specific country’s priorities are focused mainly on productive investments and cover the different sub-sectors, i.e., agriculture livestock, fisheries, and forestry. The Regional Economic Communities not only support the preparation of national programs, but also launch similar participatory processes to design regional programs complementing the national programs, while taking into account the spill overs and regional economies of scale in investment and policy. In addition, national programs are designed on the basis of common principles to facilitate regional collaboration. The RAIP combines investments and public policy instruments (regulations, incentives, etc.).

As results, during the first decade, agricultural sector spending increased on average, by more than 7 percent annually between 2003 and 2010. The rapid increase in agricultural sector expenditures was not sufficient however to allow Africa as a whole to achieve the Maputo target. The reason is that overall government expenditures rose much faster, reaching double digit rates of annual growth. A total of 13 countries - Burundi, Burkina Faso, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Zambia, and Zimbabwe - have met or surpassed the 10 percent target in one or more years since 2003.

Moreover, as of June 2012, 40 African countries have engaged the CAADP process, some 30 have signed CAADP compacts and 23 have finalized investment plans through a participatory and rigorous planning exercise, achievements which contrast with past decades in the agricultural sector.

After a decade of CAADP implementation, in June 2014 in Malabo (Equatorial Guinea), the CAADP experienced a qualitative leap through the adoption of seven Commitments in the “Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved livelihoods” by the AU Heads of State and Government. These Commitments, designed to achieve transformation by 2025, comprise: (i) recommitment to CAADP principles and values, (ii) enhancing investment finance in agriculture, (iii) ending hunger by 2025, (iv) halving reducing poverty by half, by 2025, through inclusive agricultural growth and transformation, (v) boosting intra-Africa trade in agricultural commodities and services, (vi) enhancing resilience of livelihoods and production systems to climate variability and other related risks, and (vii) mutual accountability to actions and results.

An attendant **CAADP Results Framework 2015-2025** (hereafter, “Results Framework”) was developed as a key tool for translating Africa’s agricultural development vision and goals into tangible outcomes and for tracking, monitoring and reporting on progress as well as for facilitating mutual learning and accountability. A key challenge for operationalizing the Results Framework is ensuring adequate data is accessed and used, and credible analysis is undertaken, not only in monitoring progress but also in helping to inform future planning and programming. It is of critical importance to ensure that existing National Agricultural Investment Plans (NAIPs) can be effectively appraised and, where new ones are being formulated, designed in ways that are sufficiently rigorous and consistent with the CAADP goals and commitments in the Malabo Declaration. Following the Malabo Declaration, a set of Technical Guidelines on “Country CAADP Implementation Guidelines under the Malabo Declaration” was developed based on a long participatory process and approved by member states in April 2016 during the 12th CAADP PP meeting.

Upon the official launch of the Guidelines, the African Union Commission and the AUDA-NEPAD have been leading the process of mobilizing support to counties and RECs to domesticate the Malabo Declaration. The exercise most aimed at making sure that there is clear anchoring Malabo commitments in national and regional instruments, as well as effective advancing of policy reforms to develop inclusive agriculture systems. The domestication of the Malabo also entailed the alignment by the countries on a biennial review and performance scorecards built on the CAADP Results Framework to ensure a focus on results and accountability.

During the second decade, on public agriculture expenditure as a share of total public expenditure, member States have allocated public spending in agriculture at various rates ranging from 0.1 percent to 17.7 percent. Only four (4) Member States namely: Burundi, Burkina Faso, Mali and Mauritania have met the target between 2017 and 2019, a drop from 10 countries in the previous Biennial Review (BR). Overall only 8.2% of the member States reached or surpassed the ten percent (10%) commitment suggesting an overall decline in the scores from the previous period which was 21.2%.

Equally like in Maputo (2003), in Malabo (2014), African Union member States recommitted to achieving a minimum of 6% growth rate of the agriculture value added per annum in order to reduce poverty significantly. Of the forty (40) Member States that reported on the growth rate of the agriculture value added indicator, only three (3) are on-track for consistently achieving at least 6% annual growth rates. These are Angola, Gabon and Liberia. This is a significant drop from the inaugural BR reporting period in which 18 countries had annual growth rates of at least 6% (Biennial Review, 2019).

Based on the 2017 and 2019 Biennial Review reports, the average scorecard of the selected countries and Regional Economic Communities (RECs) is summarized in the following table 1:

Table 1: Average scorecard of the selected countries and Regional Economic Communities (RECs)

Country/REC	Biennial Review					
	2017 (benchmark: 3.94)			2019 (benchmark : 6.66)		
	Nb of Reports submitted	Nb of Counties on track	Average score	Nb of Reports submitted	Nb of Counties on track	Average score
Countries						
Côte d'Ivoire	1		3.5 (NOT)	1		4.79 (NOT)
Ghana	1		3.9 (NOT)	1		6.67 (OT)
Malawi	1		4.9 (OT)	1		4.81 (NOT)
Rwanda	1		6.1 (OT)	1		7.24 (OT)
Togo	1		4.9 (OT)	1		5.14 (NOT)
RECs						
ECOWAS Headquarters (Nigeria): 15 countries in the region	14	5	3.62 (NOT)	15	2	4.96 (NOT)
ECCAS Headquarters (Gabon): 9 countries in the region	9	0	2.35 (NOT)	8	5	3.22 (NOT)
EAC Headquarters (Tanzania): 13 countries in the region	8	5	4.20 (OT)	12	1	4.00 (NOT)

Source: Biennial Reviews, 2017, 2019.

OT=On-Track, NOT= Not On-Track

It is therefore timely to conduct a thorough assessment and document the main lessons learned from the NAIP and RAIP formulation and implementation in order to inform future operations.

II. OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 OBJECTIVES

2.1.1 GENERAL OBJECTIVE

Because the African Union institutions have been supporting the domestication of the Malabo Declaration for several years now since the vision statement was made public back in June 2014, it would be appropriate to ascertain that there has been value in the exercise. As such, overall, this consultancy will seek to engage key CAADP constituencies across several countries and RECs to conduct a thorough assessment of and document the main lessons learned from the NAIP and RAIP formulation and implementation to inform future operations.

2.1.2. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

SPECIFIC PRIMARY OBJECTIVES

From some previous CAADP stakeholder engagements, it has clearly emerged the need that having an overview of the various experiences on NAIP and RAIP formulation and implementation would be a useful exercise to help document key lessons learned and inform the way forward for improved processes of the RAIPs and NAIPs. Therefore, the objective of the consultancy is to conduct a thorough assessment of the main lessons learned from the NAIP and RAIP processes.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

1. Identify RECs and countries with unique and successful experiences, as well as challenges, in planning and implementing their RAIPs and NAIPs
2. Assess whether and what linkages exist between a REC's RAIP and the NAIPs of their Member States;
3. Review the roles and responsibilities played by various stakeholders in RAIP and NAIP formulation and implementation
4. Assess relevant practices and lessons learned in the formulation, implementation of their RAIPs and NAIPs by the selected RECs and countries that will add value to the process in future
5. Highlight key success factors in rolling out a RAIP and a NAIP in the selected countries and RECs
6. Formulate recommendations on mitigating the identified challenges, scaling up successes and domesticating these practices by other countries and RECs

2.2 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The assignment will consider undertaking assessments based on facts through highlights of best performing RECs and countries in comparison to under-performing RECs and countries. Assumptions can be drawn from the Biennial Review Scores and or other evidence based research and analysis undertaken by technical experts within the CAADP scope.

Such an exercise shall ultimately provide us with enough evidence on the best possible ways to continue to support RECs and their member states in applying good practices and success stories in driving their agriculture transformation efforts on the ground. Ultimately, the findings from the study will be disseminated to the entire CAADP fraternity, and in particular to RECs and member States to improve their existing practices in terms of planning and implementation of their RAIPs and NAIPs.

2.3 KEY DELIVERABLES

Key deliverables are:

Inception Report: Consisting of full scope review of existing literature documenting lessons learned on NAIPs and RAIP formulation and implementation; key questions to be answered in each of the selected countries and focusing on the NAIP and RAIP process in the countries and RECs. This report will be discussed at an inception meeting between AUDA-NEPAD and the consultant. It will be submitted within two weeks after contract signature.

Draft Report: Containing a maximum of 10 pages of synthesized set of lessons and recommendations on how to take them to scale and adopt/adapt them in other countries and RECs. The report will be discussed by stakeholders at a virtual technical validation meeting organized by AUDA-NEPAD, in which the consultant will also take part, and comments incorporated as appropriate. Draft report to be submitted within 6 weeks after Contract signature;

Presentation: A PowerPoint presentation on the major findings and key recommendations to be submitted within 6 weeks after Contract signature;

A final report: Should be full report as well as an executive summary, research/study findings and incorporating comments from the technical meeting of stakeholders. The report should also emphasize how the identified best practices could be domesticated in other countries and RECs. Final report to be submitted within 9 weeks after Contract signature.

The Terms of Reference (ToRs) of the assignment are presented in Annex A.

2.4 METHODOLOGY

Through a participative and consultative process involving all the stakeholders (state actors and non-state actors) and key informants at country, RECs and international levels, the methodological approach is as follows:

- ▶ Inception meeting
- ▶ Desk review
- ▶ Data collection phase(consultations)
- ▶ and reporting

The data collection is articulated around the four thematic areas: Policy & Planning, Finance & Investment, Coordination & Cooperation and Monitoring & Accountability.

The detailed presentation of the methodological approach is presented in Annex B.

III. SYNTHESIS OF LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM NAIPs AND RAIPs FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

The following synthesis of lessons learned from NAIPs and RAIPs formulation and implementation is presented around the four thematic areas: Policy & Planning, Investment Finance, Coordination & Cooperation and Monitoring & Accountability.



3.1. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM NAIPS

CÔTE D'IVOIRE

	PROCESS	LESSONS LEARNED	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	<p>The second generation of the National Agricultural Investment Program was formulated under the leadership of a Permanent Secretariat (PS), composed of the Technical Departments of Planning representing the four Ministries directly involved in the agro-sylvo-pastoral and fisheries sectors: the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MINADER), the Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries (MIRAH), the Ministry of Water and Forestry (MINEF), and the Ministry of Health, Environment and Sustainable Development (MINSEDD). Within the PS NAIP, a Task Force comprising the planning departments of the four technical ministries has been put in place for the daily monitoring of the process (NAIP2, 2018-2025).</p> <p>A guidance note was prepared and shared with all the stakeholders at different stages leading to the identification of key investment areas. A resources mobilization Round Table for the implementation of the second generation NAIP was organized on November 20, 2017 followed by the signing of the compact by the stakeholders in Côte d'Ivoire.</p> <p>The formulation of the NAIP is based on the stocktaking assessment and a situation analysis on agriculture and food security in the country. These assessments were widely discussed with stakeholders and led to the identification of NAIP2 areas of investment plan including the implementation of policy measures (as related to the "agro-poles", land security, agriculture statistic etc.) (Côte d'Ivoire's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>The different categories of stakeholders involved in the formulation process of the second generation NAIP are the Government through the Prime Minister's Office and all the ministries, State institutions, the private sector under the leadership of the General Confederation of Enterprises of Côte d'Ivoire, including financial institutions, insurance companies, technical and</p>	<p>The alignment of the Côte d'Ivoire's first generation NAIP (2005-2010) to the Master Plan of Agricultural Development (PDDA) and to Development and Poverty Strategy document (DPRS)-2009-2013-elaborated in consistency with common agricultural policies such as CAADP-NEPAD under the Maputo Declaration, CAADP-ECOWAP and the Malabo Declaration in 2014, (ii) ECOWAP-CAADP; (iii) The Malabo Declaration of agriculture transformation; (iv) the Sustainable Development Goals;(v) ECOWAP at 10; and (vi) National Development Plan(NDP) of Côte d'Ivoire (2016-2020) is commendable. These alignment's practices are ingrained in the formulation process in Côte d'Ivoire.</p> <p>When continental and country-level link up, a major momentum can be created. However, country with disregard to the established governance structure of its NAIPs faces dysfunction in the implementation of its investment plans (ST-PNIA, 2017; PNIA 2010-2015; PNIA II 2018-2025; GIZ Report, June 2020, Côte d'Ivoire).</p>	<p>The practices underlying the success of the process in Côte d'Ivoire that need to be highlighted and scaled up by other countries are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ the high political and leadership representation of the NAIP (at the national level by the Prime Minister and at the local level by the District Officers); ▶ the search for a participatory and inclusive approach; ▶ the continuous account of emerging and local development issues ▶ the search for building a consensus in the process of formulation and implementation. <p>There is an urgent need to communicate more around the NAIP and improve implemented reforms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Encourage and support the country to reinforce and sustain its alignment practices to national, regional, continental and international policies and programmes for a sustainable transformation of agriculture in Côte d'Ivoire

<p>financial partners led by the FAO, professional agricultural organizations, civil society organizations (ST-PNIA, 2017).</p> <p>For a better account of women and youth, five (05) specific workshops were conducted during the regional workshops to the benefits of groups of youth and women with a size from 15 to 20 participants per workshop.</p> <p>The salient steps in the mobilization of decision-makers and TFPs of the NAIP process are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ the launching of the process activities by the Prime Minister, ▶ Chairing of the validation workshop of the first generation NAIP by the Chief of Staff of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development and the Chief of Staff of the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries ; ▶ Involvement of the TFP leader in the Task Force: ▶ Organization of two meetings within the TFP consultation framework (validation of the draft strategic framework, validation of the second generation NAIP and amendment of the draft compact). ▶ An inter-ministerial meeting was held to approve the second generation NAIP (ST-PNIA, 2017). <p>Despite the inclusive formulation of the program at its design phase, the NAIP was not widely communicated and owned. In fact community leaders and mass communication (e.g. community radios) was not involved in the implementation of the NAIP (Côte d'Ivoire's consultation, 2020). Moreover the lack of ownership is more glaring for institutions under the technical leadership of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MINADER) and other actors. The NAIP is still seen as the "MINADER business" and not as a reference working document by all the state and non-state actors (NAIP2 Assessment, 2018-2019).</p> <p>The NAIP1 was aligned to the objectives of the Agricultural Development Master Plan (PDDA 1992-2015) that served as</p>	<p>The active involvement of stakeholders namely the non-state actors (NSA) identified in the process of formulation of the first generation of NAIP as well as other reference policy documents like PRSP and the NAP is reinforced during the formulation of the second generation of the NAIP through the setting up of "institutions pools". Moreover, the consensus building at each step of formulation through multi-sectorial and sectorial meetings leading to approved NAIP by all the stakeholders is commendable and ingrains these practices in Côte d'Ivoire. However, the lack of ownership is more glaring and the current assessment of implemented reforms is mixed.</p> <p>Other key success factors in the process of formulation of NAIPs in Côte d'Ivoire are: (i) high level political representation(at national level, Prime Ministry and at the local level, district officer; participative and inclusive approach; (ii) the account for local development issues through target groups' regional workshops and consultations; (iii) the supports of TFP through institutional support's credit lines to the African Development Bank (AFB), World Bank and FAO TCP's projects; (iv) IFPRI technical support; (v) the ECOWAS financial support. The anchoring of these practices as prescribed by the Malabo Declaration ensures</p>	<p>The active involvement of stakeholders namely the non-state actors (NSA) identified in the process of formulation and implementation, the consensus building at each step of formulation through multi-sectorial and sectorial meetings, high level political representation, the account for local development issues, the supports of TFP to agriculture, IFPRI technical support, the ECOWAS financial support are commendable and should be pursued. However, communication around the NAIP and implemented reforms must be improved.</p> <p>Encourage the country to sustain the good progress for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process and take necessary steps to be on-track on the CAADP based Cooperation, Partnership & Alliance and CAADP based Policy & Institutional Review/ Setting/Support for the next Biennial Review.</p>
---	---	--

<p>a reference document for the preparation of the 2009-2013 PRSP (RCSA, 2015). As a component of the NDP, the agriculture sector is considered the main source of growth and poverty reduction.</p> <p>The NAIP is also aligned to the international and regional policy instruments - namely: (i) the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP) (ii) the West African Regional Agricultural Policy (ECOWAP) (iv) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (NAIP2, 2018-2025).</p> <p>Côte d'Ivoire's second-generation of the NAIP is part of the National Development Plan 2016-2020 adopted in 2016 through a consultative approach involving various ministries (ST-PNIA, 2017).</p> <p>The agricultural growth scenario for 2018-2025 carried out by the International Food Policy and Research Institute (IFPRI) and the Ivorian Center for Economic and Social Research (CIRES) have enabled the shaping of the a vision of the Ivorian agro-sylvo-pastoral and fisheries sector by 2025. It aims at achieving growth targets based on the selected scenario (NAIP2, 2018-2025).</p> <p>The NAIP's implementation instruments are summarized in five key principles:</p> <p>(i) The strengthening of governance structures related to planning, programming, and monitoring-evaluation of sector policies and investments. (ii) a greater integration of business needs to encourage private participation and the development of entrepreneurship in the sector (iii) a better vertical integration for a greater synergy between research, production and processing activities (iv) a better horizontal integration for enhanced coordination between the agricultural and related sectors - environmental and social in particular (v) a better territorial integration in order to take greater account of the specificities of each region of Côte d'Ivoire. In response to the need for better territorial integration, 9 "Integrated Agricultural Development Poles" have been created.</p>	<p>a successful implementation of the NAIPs in Côte d'Ivoire (ST-PNIA, 2017).</p> <p>Côte d'Ivoire continues to make good progress for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process during the two subsequent Biennial Reviews but failed to meet the overall commitment to CAADP Process in 2019 due to CAADP based Co-operation, Partnership & Alliance and CAADP based Policy & Institutional Review/ Setting/Support (BR, 2017; BR. 2019).</p>	
--	---	--

<p>The mechanisms to ensure the operation of these instruments are:1) regulatory measures (land laws, operationalization of the agricultural orientation law, the forestry code, the investment code, tax incentives, etc.); 2). Budgetary measures (allocation of more resources); 3). Administrative measures to improve the performance of ministry interventions) (Côte d'Ivoire's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>In order to improve the business governance environment of the agriculture sector, 13 policy reforms were identified. However, the recent assessment of implemented reforms is mixed. In fact for six of these reforms, the achievements are poor. These reforms are related to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ strengthening the regulations of the input sector ; ▶ improving the regulatory framework and governance of commercialization ; ▶ improving the framework for processing agricultural, fishery, forestry and pastoral products ; ▶ Establishment of an institutional framework for the management of food reserves; ▶ Strengthening and implementation of health safety regulations; ▶ Adaptation of customs procedures to the challenges of the sector. <p>For four of these reforms, the related actors are not satisfied and discussing are still under way. These reforms are related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The regulations relating to the plant, water and forest sectors, and environmental resources; ▶ The implementation and dissemination on transhumance Act (NAIP2 Assessment, 2018-2019). 		
---	--	--

FINANCE & INVESTMENT	<p>The budget cycle is 12 months (Côte d'Ivoire's consultation, 2020). The budgeting process of the NAIP is aligned with the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) for the whole country. This was done with a view to aligning sector priorities with the national budget. However, the budget's execution has remained "traditional: with no regards to accountability of the actors involved in the financial implementation of programs (RCSA, 2015).</p> <p>There has been a review of public expenditure financed by FAO in 2018. The agricultural sector is supported by the following DPs: FAO, WFP, AFD, EU, WB, IFAD, ADB, IDB, USAID, JICA, GIZ, KfW, Canada, Netherlands, Korea (Côte d'Ivoire's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>The evaluation of the NAIP revealed that the private sector consultation framework for the implementation of the NAIP put in place since 2013 functioned as it could despite the unmet expectations of funding of the NAIP by the private sector (ST-PNIA, 2017). The second generation of the NAIP with a focus on "agro-poles" seduced the private sector. Unfortunately, the private sector investment finance is still weak due to unclear process. The private sector is the lead institution</p> <p>The NAIP is seen by the private sector as "the technical ministry or MINADER business" and not a joint business with an active involvement of all the signed compact's stakeholders.</p> <p>Public expenditures allocated to agriculture remain below the Maputo target commitment of 10% of the national budget – an average of 3.68% of budget share for a growth rate of 4.53 over the 2014-2019 period-.</p>	<p>When the overall strategy of implementation of the NAIP is consistent with the expectations of the agricultural sector, funding mobilization is facilitated (PNIAII, 2017 – 2025, Côte d'Ivoire).</p> <p>Despite numerous established fiscal incentives by the government of Côte d'Ivoire, the agricultural sector is not attractive to private investment. Moreover, the lack of clarity in the process of "agropoles" in the second generation of the NAIP does not attract private sector's investments. (PNIAII, 2017 – 2025, Côte d'Ivoire).</p> <p>Despite the good progress made by the CÔTE D'IVOIRE for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process in 2017, the country continues to be underperformed in public expenditures to agriculture and in enhancing access to finance (BR 2017; BR 2019).</p>	<p>The search for consistency between the overall strategy of implementation of the NAIP with the expectations of the agricultural sector should be complemented by a more accountable budgetary system to secure private investments</p> <p>Existing fiscal policies to attract private investment must be strengthened. Encourage and sustain the establishment of fiscal incentives by the government of Côte d'Ivoire and necessary steps should be taken to attract private investment in agricultural sector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ It is necessary to create enabling business environment through legislative and fiscal policies and develop skills in deals and negotiations with private investors <p>The IFPRI simulation model by which a target level of public expenditure 8.8% is required to achieve an annual growth rate of about 6.45% for the period (2017-2025) should be implemented in order to achieve the planned transformation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Encourage Côte d'Ivoire to sustain the good progress for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process and take necessary steps to increase public expenditures to agriculture and enhance access to finance for agriculture development
---------------------------------	--	---	--

<p>In addition, untimely and delayed mobilization of government funding hinder fluent project/programmes implementation resulting in discrepancies between allocated and executed budgets over a given period. Finally, while private investment has been stimulated by fiscal incentives policies put in place by the government, the private investment finance mobilized under the NAIP has remained below the planned targets (NAIP2, 2018-2025; NAIP2 Assessment, 2018-2019).</p> <p>Models simulated by the IFPRI for the period 2018-2025 resulted in the estimated investment required by the public and private sectors to achieve the Malabo target, i.e. about 65% by the private sector and 35% by the public sector, with total expected public spending to rise gradually to reach a minimum of 8.8% in 2025 (NAIP2, 2018-2025). The recent assessment of NAIP2 confirmed a reversed trend of private investment in the agriculture sector (NAIP2 Assessment, 2018-2019).</p> <p>Despite the fact that the objective of 10% public investment has not been achieved, the country has been able to implement some projects with significant results in terms of agricultural sector development. According to the IFPRI simulation model for Côte d'Ivoire, it is not necessary to reach the level of 10% public expenditure to achieve the transformation of its agriculture: a target level of public expenditure of 8.8% is required to achieve an annual growth rate of about 6.45% for the period (2018-2025)</p>		
---	--	--

COORDINATION & COOPERATION	<p>The first generation of NAIP (NAIP I) was based on a national governance structure, established specifically for its implementation and monitoring. It comprised a National Steering Committee (NSC) ensuring compliance with the strategic orientations of NAIP I, a Permanent Secretariat in charge of planning, programming and monitoring of programs/projects, and three consultation frameworks - one dedicated to the private sector, one to professional associations and civil society, and the third to Technical and Financial Partners (TFPs). However the NAIP Steering Committee (NSC-NAIP) and the NAIP permanent Secretariat (PS-NAIP) have not operated as planned due to : (i) The lack of dedicated staff to monitoring and evaluation and to lead the PS-NAIP, (ii) the lack of budget to ensure the effective operation of the PS, namely a dedicated budget to monitoring-evaluation and (iii) the possibility for the different ministerial departments in charge of the NAIP to execute projects and programs outside of the NAIP (NAIP2 Assessment, 2018-2019; Côte d'Ivoire's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>Contrary to the formulation process, the participation of various stakeholders is lacking at national and district levels. In fact, the NAIP implementation process is perceived as not inclusive by the various stakeholders (national public actors, representatives of ministries and supervisory agencies) involved in the NAIP (NAIP2 Assessment, 2018-2019).</p> <p>There is a group of technical and financial partners of the agriculture and environment sector, co-chaired by FAO and AFD which meets once every 2 months (Côte d'Ivoire's consultation, 2020). The Technical and Financial Partners coordination seems to be working relatively well. However, there is a low absorption of the funds mobilized. (NAIP2 Assessment, 2018-2019).</p>	<p>The setting-up of inter-ministerial Task Force comprising FAO enhances the coordination between various technical ministries for improved coordination of implementation or formulation through weekly monitoring consultations (ST-PNIA, 2017).</p>	<p>The recommendation of the recent review of the Côte d'Ivoire's NAIP to restructure the Permanent Secretariat taking into account elements that hinder its fluent implementation should be considered seriously in view of the ambitious expectations of the NAIP2.</p> <p>The innovative and commendable approach in the setting up of the consultation frameworks in the NAIP2 around strategic theme pertaining to the development orientations with organized multi-stakeholder groups instead of by categories of actors in the NAIP1 (Private sector, TFPs, IPOs and civil society) should be effective and reinforced..</p> <p>It is expected that the setting-up of inter-ministerial Task Force by the government of Côte d'Ivoire in the formulation and implementation of NAIPs enhances the coordination between various technical ministries.</p>
---------------------------------------	---	---	--

<p>The NAIP 2 integrates two main new provisions, in response to the needs identified during the NAIP I review and the workshops: (i) the extension and adaptation of this mechanism at the local level, and (ii) the establishment of mechanisms to promote innovation and agility in programming in the face of changes in the environment and the sector (NAIP2, 2018-2025).</p> <p>Pools of structures” were established to take into account the concerns of stakeholders in the formulation of rural sector policies and programs, by type of actors and based on the area of intervention.</p> <p>In contrast to NAIP I, the consultation frameworks were organized by type of stakeholder (Private sector, TFPs, IPOs and civil society), that of NAIP 2 will be organized by strategic theme pertaining to the development of the sector with organized multi-stakeholder groups (NAIP2, 2018-2025).</p>	<p>The lack of inter-sectorial collaboration between the public and private stakeholders, farmer’s organizations and technical and financial partners results in forgone opportunities for implementing the strategy and investment plans (PNIAII 2017 – 2025, Côte d’Ivoire).</p> <p>The coordination of the Côte d’Ivoire’s NAIP is carried out through: (i) technical secretariat of NAIP comprising representatives of concerned Ministries; (ii) three consultation frameworks (DPs, Private sector, Farmers’ organization and civil society); (iii) steering committee comprising technical ministries. The latter is not operational and impacts negatively the operation of the coordination system. This is coupled with the lack of operating budget. In addition the Technical and Financial Partners coordination faced low absorption of available financial resources (NAIP2 Assessment, 2018-2019; Côte d’Ivoire’s consultation, 2020).</p>	<p>There is a need to improve inter-sectorial collaboration between the public and private stakeholders, farmer’s organizations and technical and financial partners in agriculture sector in Côte d’Ivoire.</p> <p>Despite the merit of the coordination system, efforts should be made to restructure the steering committee and its mandate.</p> <p>In order to strengthen the consultation system of the NAIP through the National Steering Committee (NSC) and the Permanent Secretariat, it is urgent to provide them with (i) the dedicated staff to monitor and evaluate and to lead the PS-NAIP, (ii) the adequate budget to ensure the effective operation of the PS, namely a dedicated budget to monitoring-evaluation and (iii) the possibility for the different ministerial departments in charge of the NAIP to execute projects and programs outside of the NAIP.</p>
---	--	--

MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY	<p>The NAIP's monitoring and evaluation framework is inspired by the national systems put in place within the framework of development programmes/plans namely, the PRSP "Document de Stratégie de Réduction de la Pauvreté" (DRSP) and the "Plan Directeur de Développement Agricole" (PDDA). Each ministry involved had its own monitoring and evaluation system. Each year during the agricultural sector review, the information, activities and results were centralized and presented to all stakeholders in the sector.</p> <p>However, in practice, the system does not seem to be working as it should due to the followings :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The fact that the central services, as well as the decentralized services of the ministries involved in the implementation and monitoring-evaluation of the NAIP have not been able to adapt and adjust to the excess work required for an effective and efficient monitoring and evaluation system dedicated to the NAIP; ▶ the institutions in charge of the M&E did not benefit from additional means to properly fulfill their duties (RCSA, 2015). ▶ The establishment of SAKSS was not yet effective. <p>However, since 2019, with the support of IFAD, the Ministries of the agricultural sector have been able to develop a monitoring-evaluation document for the NAIP with defined indicators and validated in 2020 (Côte d'Ivoire's consultation, 2020) According to the proposed monitoring-evaluation framework, the strategic M&E of NAIP 2 corresponds to that of the programs, under the responsibility of the Permanent Secretariat. It will rely on the projects results monitoring (both data and evaluations) to assess the effectiveness of the programs and the impact of NAIP 2 as a whole.</p>	<p>Drawing lessons from the existing fragmented M&E system during the first implementation of the NAIP, the current trend is to build a robust, unified and harmonized M&E system during its second generation (Côte d'Ivoire's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>Côte d'Ivoire continues to make good progress in fostering peer review and Mutual Accountability during the two subsequent Biennial Reviews but failed to meet the overall commitment to Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results in 2019 due to Country capacity for evidence based planning, implementation and M&E and Biennial Agriculture Review Process (BR, 2017; BR, 2019).</p>	<p>Strengthen the capacities of central services, as well as the decentralized services of the ministries involved in the implementation and monitoring-evaluation system of the NAIP in order to build an effective and efficient M&E system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Support financially the M&E system and institutions in order to deliver. ▶ Develop collaboration with SAKSS nodes to better support national monitoring activity. <p>Encourage and support the setting-up of a robust, unified and harmonized M&E system, sustain the good progress in fostering peer review and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The current trend to build a robust, unified and harmonized M&E system during its second generation is commendable as it facilitates mutual accountability toward achieving expected results. <p>Sustain the good progress for delivering on Malabo commitments in fostering peer review and Mutual Accountability and take necessary steps to be on-track on the country capacity for evidence based planning, implementation and M&E and Biennial Agriculture Review Process.</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>The strategic M&E systems of NAIP 2 will be supported by the “Laboratoire d’Innovation et de Programmation Agile” and ReSAKSS agents (NIPA2, 2018-2025). It has two main objectives: (i) the operational monitoring and evaluation of projects launched during the period; and (ii) the strategic monitoring and evaluation of program implementation, i.e. the overall impact of NAIP (NAIP2 Assessment, 2018-2019).</p> <p>The logical framework for monitoring-evaluation of the implementation of NAIP 2 will include :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Common indicators to all CAADP signatory countries ▶ Specific indicators to Côte d’Ivoire’s NAIP 2, not included in this common portfolio of indicators. <p>The target levels of indicators specific to Côte d’Ivoire’s NAIP 2 are also derived from a model that allows Côte d’Ivoire to meet its CAADP commitments.</p> <p>These indicators are hinged on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDOs), the Malabo Declaration, the CAADP Results Framework and the Malabo Scorecard, the ECOWAP Results Framework, the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the National Agricultural Development Plan and the Results Framework of the National Policy and Investment Plan (NAIP2, 2018-2025).</p>		
--	--	--

GHANA

	PROCESS	LESSONS LEARNED	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	<p>The formulation and the design of the NAIP (Investing for Food and Jobs (IFJ): an Agenda for Transforming Ghana’s Agriculture (2018-2021) was participatory and comprised Academia, Private Sector, Representatives from Ministries and Departments from various sectors including trade and industry, environment, banking sector institutions, NGOs, development partners, farmers, civil society, researchers among others. The CAADP Round Table was inclusive and included the stakeholders mentioned above.</p> <p>The second generation of the NAIP (IFJ) is not as widely known and widely owned as the first generation of the NAIPs Medium Term Agricultural Sector Investment Plans (METASIP I, 2011– 2015) & II, 2014 – 2017). It is known within the circles of stakeholders actively involved during its development. It is viewed predominantly as the ministry’s document therefore, not widely owned as expected. A Stocktaking Exercise was undertaken as a basis for the NAIP and its findings have been translated into the NAIP and also discussions on instruments (including policy measures) took place during the stocktaking Exercise. Even-though the NAIP is sector-wide and seeks to enhance private sector investment in Agriculture sector, it is not private sector led. Its implementation is spearheaded by the public sector with private sector as implementing partners.</p> <p>In the process of alignment, the planning hierarchy of the IFJ is as follows:</p> <p>Coordinated Programme of Economic and Social Development Policies (CPESDP) 2017 - 2024)</p>	<p>The first generation of the NAIPs Medium Term Agricultural Sector Investment Plans (METASIP I, 2011– 2015) & II, 2014 – 2017) and the second generation National Agriculture Investment Plans (NAIPs) in Ghana. INVESTING FOR FOOD AND JOBS (IFJ): AN AGENDA FOR TRANSFORMING GHANA’S AGRICULTURE (2018-2021) designed to address the challenges identified during the implementation of the first generation of the NAIPs are not only well aligned to the country agricultural policy frameworks and medium term plans and development policies and visions, but also to the global (MDGs, SDGs), the continental, the New Partnership for Africa’s Development NEPAD’s Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (Maputo/Malabo Declarations and the regional ECOWAS Agriculture Policy and NEPAD’s Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (ECOWAP/CAADP). These alignment’s practices are anchored in the formulation process in Ghana (FASDEP II, 2007; METASIP I 2011– 2015, 2010; JSR, 2014; METASIP II 2014 – 2017, 2015; IFJ, 2018 Ghana).</p>	<p>The anchorage of planning and formulation process of the NAIP should be sustained and structured. However there is a cost associated with this good achievement. In this respect, there is a need for a continuous government financial support to the process.</p> <p>Efforts made by Ghana in the policy alignment is commendable and has to be encouraged and supported. This alignment to national, regional, continental and international policies and programmes need to be reinforced and sustained for the transformation of agriculture.</p>

<p>Food and Agriculture Sector Development (FASDEP II)</p> <p>Agenda for Jobs: Creating prosperity and equal opportunity for all (2018 – 2021)</p> <p>Investing for Food and Jobs (IFJ): AN AGENDA FOR TRANSFORMING GHANA'S AGRICULTURE (2018-2021) Other strategic and policy documents and programmes aimed at promoting sectoral developments in the agriculture sector were also considered.</p> <p>The implementation of the investment plan identifies key implementation arrangements to ensure effectiveness. Ghana's Parliament and other Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) are expected to play critical roles in ensuring smooth implementation of the IFJ.</p> <p>The Performance Measurement Framework (PMF) provides the complete list of performance indicators. The NAIP is part of the annual planning of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture. DPs are part of the Agricultural sector working group and contribute immensely to overall government work plans (Ghana's consultations).</p>	<p>Despite the alignment and consistency of the METASIPs and IFJ of Ghana with the principles and values of the Maputo and Malabo declarations, the ECOWAS Agriculture Policy and NEPAD's Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (ECOWAP & CAADP), the formulation and implementation of the NAIPs continues to face some challenges in terms of broad ownership of programmes from the onset and building-in mechanisms for regular consultations in its formulation, clarity on how program implementation is aligned with relevant agencies to ensure proper sequencing, dissemination to all stakeholders in its implementation, commitment at all levels of governance system, definition of roles and responsibilities of private sector and key partners, alignment of the NAIPs to National Development Plan, government spending to the NAIPs, budget lines and attractiveness to the private sector and limited resources and capacity to implement the NAIP (METASIP I 2011– 2015, 2010; ECOWAS, 2010; JSR, 2014; METASIP II 2014 – 2017, 2015; BR 2017; BR 2019; Ghana's consultation, 2020).</p>	<p>Encourage the Republic of Ghana to continue to maintain the alignment and consistency of its agricultural policy with the principles and values of the Maputo and Malabo declarations. There is an urgent need to reinforce ownership of development programmes and projects, programme implementation alignment with relevant agencies, involvement of all stakeholders, commitment at all levels of governance system, roles and responsibilities of private sector and key partners, and increase resources and capacity in the formulation and implementation of the NAIPs</p> <p>Sustain the good progress for delivering on Malabo commitments in Completing National CAADP Process and take necessary steps to be on track for CAADP based Cooperation, Partnership & Alliance and CAADP based Policy & Institutional Review/ Setting/ Support for the next biennial review.</p>
---	---	--

		<p>The Republic of Ghana continues to make good progress in Completing National CAADP Process during the two subsequent Biennial Reviews but failed to meet the overall Re-committing to CAADP Process, in 2019 due to CAADP based Co-operation, Partnership & Alliance and CAADP based Policy & Institutional Review/ Setting/ Support (BR 2017; BR 2019).</p>	
--	--	---	--

FINANCE & INVESTMENT	<p>Ghana uses the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) for budgeting for the entire country. This framework is also used by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture. The NAIP budget is made of public, private, donor funding and others.</p> <p>The National Budget is read in the last quarter of the year (from October to December). Its appropriation runs from the time it is approved by Parliament, normally at the end of the year. There is a Parliamentary Select Committee on Food, Agriculture and Cocoa Affairs. It plays a legislative oversight over the sector and is also responsible for validating and discussing agricultural related bills before recommending to the wider plenary for approval. Also there is discussion around the NAIP during the annual budget session.</p> <p>The budgeting process is inclusive as stakeholders are invited to provide inputs into the document.</p> <p>Despite the efforts made by Ghana in public expenditure the CAADP target of 10% has not been met. However, the share of agricultural sector expenditure in national expenditure has continuously increased from 6.5% in 2014 to 9.7% in 2019.</p> <p>A diversity of DPs support the agriculture sector (AfDB, AGRA, CIDA, USAID, FAO, GIZ-KfW, Canada, WorldBank, IFAD among others). The share of government and DP funding of the current NAIP (IFJ) is 60 % and 40% respectively (Ghana's Consultation)</p>	<p>Despite the design of the METASIPs and IFJ to stimulate private sector investment in the agricultural sector in Ghana, the expected responses were not met and the public sector is still dominant in the delivery of services in the agricultural sector. The implementation of NAIPs is strongly dependent on national budget and characterized by non-skewed programs towards the private sector, inadequate resources mobilization and lack of coordination affecting private investment (Ghana's consultation, 2020; BR 2019; IFJ, 2018 – 2021; 2018; BR 2017; FASDEP II, 2007, Ghana).</p> <p>The alignment of core indicators and targets under global (Sustainable Development Goals), regional (Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme CAADP-Malabo Declaration) and national (Agenda for Jobs: Creating Prosperity and Equal Opportunity for All) development frameworks results in a development of innovating mechanisms such as :</p>	<p>Ghana should continue to increase public expenditures to agriculture. Also there is an urgent need to involve the private sector at all levels of the process and enhance private innovative communication platforms in agriculture. Thus, the Public-Private Dialogue Forum (AP-PDF) established by MoFA and organized and hosted by Private Enterprise Federation (PEF) with Government as the Co-Chair should be operationalized for the benefit of the IFJ.</p> <p>There is a need to stimulate private sector investment (improving the environment and mechanism to attract private sector), mobilize adequate resources for the implementation of NAIPs and enhance private innovative communication platforms in agriculture.</p> <p>The alignment of Ghana's NAIP with CAADP-Malabo Declaration through the development of innovating mechanisms for attracting investors to provide technical and financial assistance to targeted beneficiaries is commendable and should be capitalized and replicated to other countries.</p> <p>Encourage Ghana to sustain the good progress for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process and take necessary steps to increase public expenditures to agriculture and enhance access to finance for agriculture development</p>
---------------------------------	---	---	---

<p>To create enabling environment for the private sector investment, the country has established the Ghana Incentive Base Agriculture Financing Scheme (risk guarantee instrument to push and encourage banks to loan more to agriculture). It has also launched and disseminated Government programmes with opportunities for private sector investment through Investment Promotion Agency, Tax holidays, Free Zone Area for agro-processing companies, Foreign Direct Investment codes and the development of the Agriculture Investment Guide (AIG) uploaded onto Ghana Commercial Agriculture Project (GCAP) and MoFA websites (https://gcap.org.gh and http://mofa.gov.gh). Also, an Investor Tracking System (a web-based platform to follow and facilitate activities of investors in all sectors – including the agricultural sector) was being developed for Ghana Investment Promotion Centre (GIPC) with support from GCAP.</p> <p>Additionally, agribusinesses in Ghana have been profiled and published to help attract investors to provide technical and financial assistance to targeted beneficiaries. Through this effort, Anyako Farms (producing fruits and vegetables) in the Volta Region, has attracted investors (AgroMoneta) and now supplies to high-end restaurants such as “Lord of the Wings” in Accra. (Ghana’s consultation; 2018 Agricultural sector annual progress report, 2018, Ghana).</p>	<p>Ghana Incentive Base Agriculture Financing Scheme, Agriculture Investment Guide (AIG), Investor Tracking System (a web-based platform to follow and facilitate activities of investors in agricultural sector) and agribusinesses’ profiling and publishing for attracting investors to provide technical and financial assistance to targeted beneficiaries(i.e Anyako Farms (producing fruits and vegetables) in the Volta Region and (Agro-Moneta)- (Agricultural sector annual progress report, 2018, Ghana)</p> <p>Despite the good progress made by the Republic of Ghana in Completing National CAADP Process during the two subsequent Biennial Reviews, the country continues to be underperformed in public expenditures to agriculture and in enhancing access to finance (BR 2017; IFJ, 2018 – 2021, Ghana; BR 2019).</p> <p>Though the Republic of Ghana has not met the public expenditure target as recommitted by Maputo / Malabo declarations, the share of agricultural sector expenditure in national expenditure has continuously increased from 6.5% in 2014 to 9.7% in 2019. (Ghana’s consultation 2020; 2018 Agricultural sector annual progress report, 2018; Agricultural sector progress report, 2017)</p>	
--	---	--

<p style="text-align: center;">COORDINATION & COOPERATION</p>	<p>All the investment plans are coordinated by the National Development Planning Commission under the Ministry of Planning through across-sectorial working groups. The NAIPs are coordinated by the MoFA partnered by a Steering Committee.</p> <p>The IFJ is clear on roles for both private and public sector. However not all the actors are aware of their roles, duties and rights. Thus, there is a need for effective coordination. The private sector is organized but not strong enough and will need further support to strengthen their capacity for their voices to be heard. Currently, there are very few farmer organizations which are organized, strong and vocal. These few groups are the ones making the difference in terms of advocacy and actively involved in the NAIP process. There is more orientation towards enabling private sector.</p> <p>The coordination across sectors that is relevant to agriculture is achieved through the cross-sectorial groups by the National Planning Commission, the Ministry of Planning and the Agriculture sector working Group under MoFA.</p> <p>The current Steering Committee that had oversight responsibility for implementation of METASIP I and II is being reviewed and restructured for IFJ (Ghana's consultation).</p> <p>Ghana has an inter-ministerial committee on agriculture at the national level. The coordination within the Ministry of Agriculture works through a directors meeting, the Agriculture Sector Working Group (ASWG) meetings and Joint sector review. DPs have a coordination group on their own and they are also part of the Agriculture Sector Working Group (ASWG).). If the JSR seems to be carried out adequately,</p>	<p>Despite the existence of a strong Agriculture Sector Working Group (ASWG) and a well-designed coordination mechanism of the NAIPs in Ghana, their implementation are not effective and the program is executed as independent projects and are faced with challenges in terms of limited funding, weak coordination across sectors and among stakeholders, lack organization of non-state actors, unclear definition of role of the private sector and development partners (Ghana's consultation, 2020; IFJ, 2018 – 2021; 2018, Ghana).</p>	<p>To enhance coordination, the Ghana's ASWG through an ad hoc committee is formulating a code of conduct or guideline based on the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). If this code of conduct is adopted by all stakeholders will be improved</p> <p>There is a need to strengthen the coordination across sectors and among stakeholders and clarify the role and the responsibilities of all stakeholders namely the private sector and development partners in Ghana. A code of conduct is inbuilt for improving coordination.</p> <p>There is an urgent need to increase availability and access of ICT and other communication's enhancing tools, communication among stakeholders in order to facilitate sharing of information in the process of planning and implementation.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>the ASWG is not operational as it should due to irregular meeting and non-active participation.</p> <p>MoFA has stakeholder platforms for engaging key stakeholders including; Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs), Development Partners, Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), and the private sector. These platforms are for deliberating on strategic issues of interest to the agricultural sector; and sharing of information to improve planning and implementation.</p>	<p>Despite the increased availability of ICT and other communication’s enhancing tools, communication among stakeholders in the agricultural sector at all levels (national, regional and district) has been limited resulting in low use of ICT to support agriculture. Nevertheless, existing stakeholder platforms (Agricultural Sector Working Group (ASWG) and Joint Sector Review (JSR)) for deliberating on strategic issues of interest to the agricultural sector in Ghana comprising; Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs), Development Partners, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and the private sector are commendable as it facilitates sharing of information to improve planning and implementation (METASIP II 2014–2017, 2015; Agricultural sector annual progress report, 2018, Ghana ; IFJ, 2018).</p>	
--	--	---	--

MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY	<p>The Ghana Statistical Service is responsible for collecting data but is usually constrained financially and technically. The MoFA has a Statistics Unit that collaborates with the National Statistics Office.</p> <p>(Ghana's consultation).</p> <p>There is a monitoring framework for the national development plan to which the technical ministry (MOFA) report. Ghana has a robust M&E system linked at three levels (district, Regional and National level). Each NAIP is developed with its M&E plan. The M&E is seen as a mandatory part of the NAIP. However, the robust M&E system established by Ghana needs to be improved in terms of capacity building and resources mobilization. A annual Joint Sector Review (JSR) is organized. The government is developing a web based M&E system (Ghana's consultation)..</p>	<p>Despite the continuous good progress made by the Republic of Ghana in Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results including fostering Peer Review and Mutual Accountability during the two subsequent Biennial Reviews, some challenges persist in terms of well-resourced communication and reporting systems (Ghana's consultation, 2020; BR, 2017; BR, 2019).</p> <p>The M&E system from Maputo to Malabo has been improved considerably in Ghana in the harmonization of programmes/Projects indicators with the national M&E Framework and creation of four task teams with defined terms of reference to follow up on: (1) Joint Sector Review Planning, (2) Value Chain development, (3) Monitoring and Evaluation and (4) GoG/DPs Budget Planning and Reporting but continues to face challenges as such: inadequate disease monitoring and surveillance system, lack of coordination, collaboration and capacity among stakeholders, quality of data collection and resources for the surveys .(Ghana's consultation 2020; IFJ, 2018; 2018 Agricultural sector annual progress report, 2018; Agricultural sector annual progress report, 2017; ReSAKSS CNA Report 5 2014).</p>	<p>Sustain the good progress for delivering on Malabo commitments in Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results including fostering Peer Review and Mutual Accountability and take necessary steps to be on-track on the well-resourced communication and reporting systems.</p> <p>Strong collaboration, coordination and capacity building are required among stakeholders for effective implementation and monitoring for results, strong feedback and reporting systems, regular resource for M&E and Agriculture Public Private Dialogue Platform (APPDF) to ensure continuous dialogue and monitoring mechanism.</p>
--	--	--	---

MALAWI

	PROCESS	LESSONS LEARNED	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	<p>Malawi signed the CAADP compact in 2010, setting the stage for joint sector reviews, budgetary and investment dialogue, and commitments to align, scale up and improve the quality of sector investment (Malawi's NAIP, 2017-2023).</p> <p>The NAIP has been developed through an extensive consultative and participatory process involving all key stakeholder groups. The consultations were organized with different constituent groups like technical departments of the Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development, other line Ministries, Private Sector as well as Civil Society (Malawi's NAIP, 2017-2023).</p> <p>All sector stakeholders, public, private, civil society, farmer organizations, development partners participated in the formulation and the design of the NAIP (Malawi's Consultations, 2020).</p> <p>The ministries responsible for implementation of the NAIP are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development (MoAIWD), as the lead ministry ▶ Ministry of Industry, Trade and Tourism (MoITT); ▶ Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development (MoLGRD); ▶ Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development (MoLHUD); ▶ Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Mining (MoNREM), ▶ Ministry of Health and Population (MoHP); ▶ Ministry of Transport and Public Works (MoTPW) ▶ Ministry of Gender, Children, Disability and Social Welfare (MoGCDSW), and 	<p>Compared to the agricultural policy making processes previously in place, the alignment of the Malawi's Agriculture Sector-Wide Approach Program (ASWAp) to key and strategic policy documents, including the MGDS II, the Maputo and the Malabo Declarations and to the requirements of the CAADP framework, the CAADP Compact, the Malawi Development Assistance Strategy, and Vision 2020 led to desired improvements in participation, ownership, use of evidence, and policy alignment. However, a number of presidential initiatives, donor-funded projects, and the budgeting process still are not aligned to ASWAp due to the non-well-defined timeline and poor account of diverse stakeholders 'views in the process of formulation and implementation of</p>	<p>The planning and policy process of the NAIP in Malawi is recommendable and should be replicated for the future NAIPs. However, there is a need to disseminate the NAIP to the general public.</p> <p>Encourage and support the Malawi government to sustain the improvements in participation, ownership, use of evidence, and policy alignment to CAADP framework process. Efforts should be made to address the non-well-defined timeline and poor account of diverse stakeholders 'views in the process of formulation and implementation of Malawi's future NAIPs.</p> <p>Sustain the good progress for delivering on Malabo commitments in Completing National CAADP Process and take necessary steps to be on track for CAADP based Policy & Institutional Review/Setting/Support for the next biennial review.</p> <p>There is a need to foster communication and ownership of the NAIP through active involvement of the targeted population in the process of formulation and implementation.</p>

<p>▶ Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development (MoFEP&D) (Malawi's Consultations, 2020).</p> <p>Other key stakeholders include the Reserve Bank of Malawi (RBM) and a number of parastatals, boards and trusts. In addition, NGOs (Civil Society Network), Farmers organizations (Farmers Union of Malawi (FUM), the National Smallholder Farmers Association of Malawi (NASFAM)), Private sector (Malawian Confederation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry (MCCCI), G8 new alliance).</p> <p>The formulation of the NAIP was inclusive as far as key stakeholders are concerned including the cross-cutting interests. It is also aligned to national, regional, continental, and international reference documents. The CAADP Round Table Discussion was held and the stocktaking on donor alignment (SDA) was prepared jointly by development partners (JSR, 2014).</p> <p>The Compact is a high-level agreement between the government, regional representatives, farmer organizations, the private sector, civil society organizations, researchers, and development partners. A high-level public private dialogue forum with broad participation from key ministries and private sector representatives were created to address issues involving several ministries (Malawi's NAIP, 2017-2023).</p> <p>The planning hierarchy of Malawi is from National Vision 2020 which is being replaced by a new national vision with a timeframe of up to 2063. Then comes the National Development Plan called Malawi Growth and development Strategy (MGDS III) (2017-2022). This is followed by the Agriculture Sector Wide Approach (ASWAp): Also, there is the Malawi National Agriculture Investment Plan (2017-2023) (Malawi's Consultations, 2020). The NAIP is widely owned and known to many stakeholders at national level, but its popularity to the general public is not obvious (Malawi's Consultations, 2020).</p>	<p>Malawi's NAIPs (JSR, 2014 Malawi; World Bank, 2013.JSR, 2014 Malawi; ITR-NEPAD, 2017 Malawi; MwAPA-TA Institute, August 2020; Malawi's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>Malawi has maintained a good progress for delivering on Malabo commitments in Completing National CAADP Process during the two subsequent Biennial Reviews but failed to meet the overall Re-commitment to CAADP Process in 2019 due to the CAADP based Policy & Institutional Review/Setting/Support (BR 2017; BR 2019).</p> <p>Though the NAIP is widely owned and known to many stakeholders at national level through their active involvement and participation, it is difficult to ascertain that it is widely owned and known by the large part of the population (Malawi's Consultation, 2020).</p>	
---	---	--

FINANCE & INVESTMENT	<p>The NAIP budget has been developed and contributions were received from various stakeholders including all MoAIWD Departments as well as other Ministries and Agencies (MoITT, MITC, MoLHUD,) (Malawi's NAIP, 2017-2023). The budget projections were based on the Medium-Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEFs). Malawi is continuously underperformed in terms of public expenditures to agriculture sector for meeting the Maputo target commitment of 10% (6.86% in 2019) with the agricultural growth rate of 4.3% in 2019 (Malawi's NAIP, 2017-2023; RESAKSS, 2020).</p> <p>Besides the off-budget support from DCAFS (Donor Committee in Agriculture and Food) donors, NGOs also mobilise significant funding from other sources including funds mobilised by their head offices, funds received from non-DCAFS donors, and from domestic sources. Thus, NGOs are regarded as an independent source of funding for NAIP (Malawi's NAIP, 2017-2023).</p> <p>For the envisaged continuation of the basket fund (Multi Donor Trust Fund), there is a Program Implementation Unit (PIU) needed for the management of that support, to be housed in the DAPS. As under the ASWAp, basket fund resources will be channeled not only through MoAIWD but also through other participating ministries and agencies. In view of the preferred funding modalities of many DPs (UN agencies, EU, USAID), there will still be a number of other PIUs to manage donor-funded projects and donor support. Consequently, the NAIP secretariat also provides overall coordination for all projects aligned to the NAIP (Malawi's Consultations, 2020).</p> <p>Funding research is a CAADP indicator and the area has been underfinanced in the past. The CGIAR funding for Research and Development investments comprise both DCAFS and non-DCAFS resources (Malawi's NAIP, 2017-2023).</p> <p>Non-traditional sources provide substantial funding for the agricultural sector. Some of these are from related sectors such as climate change,</p>	<p>Despite the alignment of Malawi Agriculture Sector-Wide Approach Program (ASWAp) to CAADP framework in terms of donors' financial support and existing NAP, the country still faces challenges such as funding mobilization due to bureaucracy and lack of political commitment, fiscal and internal financial management, multi-sectorial and private sector supports, monitoring and evaluation (World Bank, 2013; JSR, 2014 Malawi; MwAPATA Institute, August 2020; Malawi's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>Although Malawi has been meeting the CAADP Compact financial commitment, there has been a continuous significant discrepancy between the planned investment pattern outlined in ASWAp and the actual allocations largely in favor of the successful implementation of the Farm Input Subsidy Program (FISP) - (JSR, 2014 Malawi).</p>	<p>-The establishment of Donor Committee in Agriculture and Food Security (DCAFS) in the implementation of NAIP is commendable</p> <p>Sustain alignment of Malawi's ASWAp to CAADP framework and take necessary steps to mobilize adequate funding through removing bureaucracy and enhancing political commitment, improve fiscal and internal financial management and reinforce multi-sectorial and private sector supports.</p> <p>Efforts should be made by the Malawi government to harmonize the planned investment pattern outlined in ASWAp with the appropriate budget allocation of the implementation plan.</p> <p>Encourage Malawi to sustain the good progress for delivering on Malabo commitments in Completing National CAADP Process and take necessary steps to increase public expenditures to agriculture including spending on agricultural research and development (R&D).and enhance access to financial services by the farming population.</p>
---------------------------------	--	--	--

		<p>Despite its persistent good progress in Completing National CAADP Process, Malawi remains underperformed in public expenditures to agriculture (6.86% in 2019) including spending on agricultural research and development (R&D).and in enhancing access to financial services by the farming population (BR 2017; BR 2019; RESAKSS, 2020).</p>	
--	--	--	--

<p>COORDINATION & COOPERATION</p>	<p>The NAIPs in Malawi are coordinated through the Secretariat of the Ministry of Economic Planning and Public Sector Reforms through Sector Working Groups which bring together agriculture, trade, lands, environment .The Secretariat hosted in the Department of Planning assists with coordination in the Ministry between departments and within the structures at different levels. The heads of offices at different levels are designated as NAIP coordinators and they ensure that all activities are aligned to the NAIP.</p> <p>Existing coordination structures for the NAIP are articulated around Government and multi-stakeholder platforms. The government Platforms include the Office of the President and Cabinet (OPC), Executive Management Committee (EMC), Senior Management Team (SMT), Departmental Meetings; the Multi-Stakeholder Platforms comprises the High Level Forum (HLF), Public-Private Dialogue Forum (PPDF), Development Cooperation Group (DCG), Agricultural Sector Working Group (ASWG), Technical Working Groups (TWGs) Commodity Platforms (Malawi’s NAIP, 2017-2023).</p> <p>Effective implementation of the NAIP requires stronger coordination of all key players in the agriculture sector. These includes: Government and its subsidiaries (parastatals, boards and trusts); non-state actors (NSAs) such as Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs); the private sector (including farmers, farmers organizations and private sector companies); Research and Academia; and Development Partners (DPs). Other important ministries though not directly part of NAIP implementation include: Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Internal Corporation, Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs and Ministry of Labor, Youth, Sports and Manpower Development. Other key stakeholders include the Reserve Bank of Malawi (RBM) and several parastatals, boards and trusts (Malawi’s NAIP, 2017-2023).</p> <p>Malawi’s development partners have supported the ASWAp and are expected to continue their support for agriculture and rural development via the NAIP.</p>	<p>Despite the signing of CAADP Compact in 2010 that induced the 2012 Private-Public Partnership Bill, the formation of TWGs, and a number of inclusive reforms to facilitate the private sector involvement witnessing the government willingness to engage a broad range of sectors/ stakeholders including non-state actors, the establishment of the Executive Management Committee (EMC) to provide strategic direction for inter-ministerial coordination, oversee implementation, endorse work plans and monitor progress, the country still faces limited coordination between government ministries and departments, civil society Organizations (CSOs), academia, the private sector, and development partners hampering policy design, formulation, implementation and lack of internal coordination and across sectors, limited budget for coordination.</p> <p>Sector coordination is crucial for delivery of results, (JSR, 2014 Malawi; ITR-NEPAD, 2017; Agriculture Sector Performance Report, July 2016 - June 2017; Mwapata Institute, 2020).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The sharing role of the DCAFS, EMC and DPs in the NAIP coordination in Malawi was important for the success of the implementation of the NAIP. Thus, this practice should be pursued in the coming NAIPs. ▶ There is a need to improve the inter-departmental coordination and the coordination across sectors. <p>The government willingness to engage a broad range of sectors and to establish the Executive Management Committee (EMC) for strengthening coordination are commendable as sector coordination is crucial for delivery of results and there is a need to put in place a Trust Fund where partners can put financial resources to facilitate the coordination during the implementation of the NAIPs.</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>The DPs also play an important role in guiding and coordinating the sector. The agricultural sector stands out in terms of donor coordination. The Donor Committee in Agriculture and Food Security (DCAFS) aims to deepen dialogue, coordination and cooperation among development partners, and between these and the Government in relation to agriculture and food security. DCAFS established a secretariat which maintains a database of donor-supported programs and projects to enable improved coordination among Development Partners and between the DPs and the Government (Malawi's NAIP, 2017-2023).</p>		
<p>The Executive Management Committee (EMC) is the main instrument for inter-ministerial coordination. Chaired by the PS of MoAIWD, the EMC is composed of the PSs of all ministries and agencies participating in NAIP implementation. The EMC is the overall governing body for the NAIP and acts in the role of a Steering Committee at the level of GoM. It provides strategic direction and inter-ministerial coordination, oversee implementation of key policy decisions, endorse annual work plans and budget allocations as well as monitor progress on NAIP implementation (Malawi's NAIP, 2017-2023).</p>		
<p>The Agricultural Sector Working Group (ASWG) provides a similar function for all stakeholders, including DPs, CSOs and private sector. Intra-ministerial coordination is led by the NAIP Coordination Troika, composed of DAPS, CAETS and CAS (Malawi's NAIP, 2017-2023).</p>		
<p>There is a limited coordination between government ministries and departments and other stakeholders. There is also a lack of internal coordination and across sectors (MwAPATA Institute, 2020).</p>		
<p>The NAIP Secretariat which is the successor of the ASWAp secretariat has dedicated full-time staff to oversee the implementation of NAIP on a day-to-day basis. The secretariat is located within the DAPS but functionally report to TROIKA. The Secretariat shall concentrate full-time on NAIP management, coordination and be kept free from routine ministerial duties.</p>		

<p>Its responsibilities include consolidating work plans, liaison with DPs, convening meetings of the ASWG and TWGs, ensuring timely reporting, monitoring progress against the NAIP performance indicators, coordinating the annual progress review, and preparing proposals for the EMC's review and endorsement (Malawi's NAIP, 2017-2023).</p>		
--	--	--

MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY	<p>Recent evaluations of the first generation of ASWAp revealed serious gaps in monitoring and evaluation of agriculture interventions in Malawi which include: (i) the paper-based nature of data collection and transfer which leads to poor adherence to reporting timelines as well as poor quality and incomplete data; (ii) the multiplicity of projects and programmes with independent monitoring and evaluation systems which weakens, rather than strengthening, the capacity of the Ministry to effectively monitor results across projects and programmes; (iii) Weak data utilization at all levels of the system; and (iv) Weak governance of M&E across the sector. Therefore, to deal with these challenges, the second generation of ASWAP M&E plan proposed gradual and optimal computerization, specifically through operation of an Agriculture Management Information System (Malawi's NAIP, 2017-2023).</p> <p>The M&E guidelines are provided given by the National M&E master plan hosted at the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development and Public sector reforms. All the programmes' M&E are aligned to the master plan (Malawi's Consultations, 2020). The Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development (MoAIWD) is leading the development of a sector-wide National Agriculture Management Information System (NAMIS) to strengthen monitoring, evaluation, research and learning. Specifically, the NAMIS strengthens data collection by replacing the predominantly paper-based data collection tool with electronic data collection, reporting and analysis at all levels of the Agriculture Sector. Key initiatives in the NAMIS process include (1) Single data reporting system for all players in the agriculture sector; (2) development and operationalizing dashboards for each level of implementation and decision making; (3) integration of social accountability tools including community score card system at implementation level to both improve community participation and data quality; (4) Web-based data access; (5) intra-operability with relevant other Management Information Systems When fully operational;</p>	<p>Despite the alignment of the Malawi's Agriculture</p> <p>Sector-Wide Approach Program (ASWAp) to the requirements of the CAADP framework, the current M&E system is incomplete in terms of indicators, baselines and targets and faces a number of challenges namely poor information flows and lack of proper empirical data as the basis for decision-making (Phiri 2013; ITR-NEPAD, 2017; MwAPATA Institute, August 2020).</p> <p>Malawi has persistently achieved a good progress in terms of Fostering Peer Review and Mutual Accountability during the two subsequent Biennial Reviews but failed to meet the overall commitment of Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results in 2019 due to Biennial Agriculture Review Process (BR 2017; BR 2019).</p>	<p>► It is recommended that each new project or Program supporting the agricultural sector irrespective of the funding source (be it government or donor financed) earmarks a percentage (1-2%) of its budget towards strengthening the design and operation of a sector wide M&E system.</p> <p>The current M&E system should be significantly improved in terms of indicators, baselines, targets, information flows and proper empirical data as the basis for decision-making.</p>
--	--	---	--

<p>and (6) institutionalisation of key national level surveys (Malawi's NAIP, 2017-2023).</p> <p>The second generation of ASWAp M&E system comprises 35 outcome indicators (at the Program level) constitute the key indicators for the NAIP. They are monitorable on an annual basis and, if presented consistently at the JSR and other fora, provide a snapshot of sector performance. The Intervention Areas have corresponding intermediate outcomes but does not have related indicators, as this would prove too complex a reporting system. Rather, the achievement towards the intermediate outcomes will be measured through the sum of the outputs. Baseline and target figures for the outcome (35) and impact (9) indicators are presented to the extent that they are readily available. Some of these indicators may need to be revised and gaps concerning baselines and target values be filled (Malawi's NAIP, 2017-2023).</p> <p>According to the NAP, the DAPS in MoAIWD has primary responsibility for M&E and will collaborate with the National Statistical Office, MoITT, MoLHUD, among others (Malawi's NAIP, 2017-2023).</p> <p>The main challenge faced by the second generation ASWAp M&E system to a large extent relates to financing especially where surveys are concerned (Malawi's Consultations, 2020). In other words, one of the constraints is the lack of adequate funding for a sector-wide M&E system instead of the prevailing project-specific M&E (Malawi's NAIP, 2017-2023).</p>	<p>Despite its alignment with the National M&E master plan hosted at the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development and Public sector reforms and the establishment of the National Agriculture Management Information System (NAMIS), the Sector-wide M&E systems face issues regarding surveys for data collection due to the lack of adequate funding (Malawi's NAIP, 2017-2023; Malawi's Consultations, 2020).</p>	<p>Sustain good progress in terms of Fostering Peer Review and Mutual Accountability and take necessary steps to be on-track on Biennial Agriculture Review Process in order to achieve the overall commitment of Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results in the next Biennial Review.</p>
---	---	--

RWANDA

	PROCESS	LESSONS LEARNED	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	<p>The planning process of investment programmes in Rwanda is a well-structured process across the sectors of the economy. The PSTA 4 was formulated within this framework with one (1) year sector strategy planning; one (1) year alignment of the NAIP objectives to the national, regional and international priorities. The investment plan is to be supported by a Results and costing framework. A well-structured and aligned M&E framework is prepared with direct linkages to the NST M&E system and other regional and international indicators. The PSTA 4 is not only consistent with the NST1 but also has identical timelines just like other sectors' programmes facilitating its implementation (Rwanda's consultations, 2020).</p> <p>The process leading towards the formulation of PSTA4 started in March 2017 with local consultations of key stakeholders (including: Farmers, Private sector, Government institutions, Development Partners, Knowledge seminar, ASWG) (ITR, 2017).</p> <p>The formulation and the design of the PSTA4 was inclusive involving the key stakeholders. The PSTA4 of the agriculture sector was designed in such a way that it is aligned with the various global, continental, and national processes, notably the SDGs, Malabo and the NST. Prior to this step, an agriculture sector stocktaking assessment was carried out and its findings served to finetune the targets and priorities of the PSTA4 (ITR, 2017).</p> <p>MINAGRI has two implementing agencies: the Rwanda Agriculture and Animal Resources Development Board (RAB) and the National Agricultural Export Board (NAEB). RAB's mission is to develop agriculture and animal resources through research, agricultural and extension services to increase productivity.</p>	<p>Contrary to the first Strategic Plan for Agricultural Transformation in Rwanda (PSTA I)- 2004-2008 and the Strategic Plan for the Transformation of Agriculture phase two PSTA-II (2009-2012) formulated in the framework of the implementation of the 2020 vision and the Poverty Reduction Strategic Plan in alignment with the country EDPRS and the MDGs specifically MDG 1, the third PSTA III (2013-2017) and the fourth PSTA IV (2018-2024) are ingrained in the Malabo declaration process under which African leaders have pledged to support the transformation of agriculture through the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) developed under the African Union New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). These investments plans are also aligned to the Agriculture and Rural Development Strategy for the East African Community, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) related to agriculture.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ There is a need to translate the PSTA4 document into Kinyarwanda and further disseminate it to the districts for their knowledge; ▶ In order to enhance the NAIP ownership, the government should not only communicate more on NAIP through advocacy and policy dialogue but also make the NAIP the reference working document in the agriculture sector; ▶ It would be very helpful that the MINAGRI initiates dialogue with all key players to ascertain common understanding of the role to be played by every constituency in following up on the planned content of the PSTA4 <p>Encourage and support Rwanda to reinforce and sustain its alignment with national, regional, continental and international policies and programmes for a sustainable transformation of its agriculture.</p> <p>Effort should be made by Rwanda to reinforce and sustain its alignment with CAADP values, principles and frameworks and to develop comprehensive NAIPs emphasizing gender, youth and social protection in its formulation.</p>

<p>NAEB focuses on the implementation of policies and strategies to facilitate the growth of business to diversify agriculture and livestock commodity export revenues. As of 2017, NAEB is a commercial public institution (PSTA4, 2017).</p> <p>Previous phases of PSTA have put in place several relevant steering mechanisms which become operational during PSTA 4 implementation (PSTA4, 2017).</p> <p>Although the formulation and the designing of the PSTA4 was successful with the high-level involvement of the state, its ownership by all the stakeholders is not obvious (ITR, 2017).</p>	<p>The Rwanda's PSTAs are aligned with CAADP values, principles and frameworks as a CAADP good performing country, the Rwanda existing policy and strategy documents for investment (PSTA4) are consistent with the National Strategy for Transformation (NST1) and comprehensive as gender, youth and social protection and incentives are mainstreamed in the formulation of NAIP (NST 1, 2017 – 2024, Rwanda).</p> <p>Meeting the CAADP commitments towards ensuring public financing and budgetary allocations and domesticating the CAADP/Malabo guidelines are as much as important as high level political engagement and representation (joint engagement of President, Prime minister's offices and technical ministries) to make the agriculture sector a key pillar of socio-economic transformation in Rwanda. NAIPs get implemented when they are part of the national planning architecture and budgeting cycle (PSTA4, 2017, Rwanda; GIZ Report, June 2020).</p>	<p>The accumulated experiences of Rwanda in policy and planning should be capitalized and scaled up to other countries. One of the important area to be highlighted is the synchronization of the country programmes across sectors with the NDP.</p> <p>Rwanda's high level political engagement and representation in the formulation and implementation of NAIPs is commendable and should be capitalized and replicated to other countries.</p> <p>Encourage the country to sustain the good progress for Re-commitment to CAADP Process including Completing National CAADP Process.</p> <p>Encourage the country to sustain the good progress for Re-commitment to CAADP Process including Completing National CAADP Process.</p>
---	--	---

		<p>Rwanda has persistently maintained a good progress for Re-commitment to CAADP Process including Completing National CAADP Process during the two subsequent Biennial Reviews (BR 2017; BR 2019).</p> <p>Despite the effective formulation and the designing of the PSTA4 with the high-level involvement of the state, its ownership by all the stakeholders is not obvious (ITR, 2017).</p>	
--	--	---	--

FINANCE & INVESTMENT	<p>Rwanda's public expenditure in agriculture sector 4.33% in 2019 is still less than 10% (CAADP recommendation). However, the agricultural growth recorded during the period was 5.03% due to the good governance, political will and accountability (Rwanda's consultation, 2020; RESAKSS, 2020). The Government of Rwanda has espoused its commitments to the CAADP vision towards ensuring that public financing and budgetary allocations are made towards making the agriculture sector a key pillar of socio-economic transformation (ITR, 2017). While the private sector is the real driver of growth in agriculture, the PSTA 4 investments have been estimated from a public-sector perspective. It is vital for resource mobilisation, planning and budgeting for the full implementation of the proposed plan (PSTA4, 2017).</p> <p>The budget projections were based on the Medium-Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEFs), ensuring linkages with existing (sub) sector plans and budgets, as well as other Ministerial (sub) sector plans. Under each priority area, the outputs and sub-outputs included in the results framework have been further disaggregated into clustered activities. As far as possible, each activity was characterized by a single measure of expenditure with a unit cost and gradually phased quantities over the implementation period. These annual quantities are linked to the annual targets over the 6-year period in the results framework. In some cases, detailed activities were defined. In other cases, cost estimates were consolidated into aggregated activities or low-level outputs. Both activities and low-level outputs are further grouped by sub-outputs, outputs, and outcomes under each Priority Area (PSTA4, 2017).</p> <p>Contributions from other relevant stakeholders were made including other Ministries and Agencies (this includes MININFRA, MoE and MINILAF). The set-up of Rwanda Development Board (RDB) has facilitated the mobilization of the overall private sector investments to the NAIP. RDB is an excellent example of public-private partnerships translating policy into action (Rwanda's consultations, 2020).</p>	<p>Despite the weak involvement of the private sector in the PSTAs, Rwanda continues to be a well-performed country in the agricultural sector (PSTA4, 2017, Rwanda).</p> <p>Despite its persistent good progress in Completing National CAADP Process, Rwanda remains underperformed in public expenditures to agriculture (4.33% in 2019) and in enhancing access to finance for men and women engaged in agriculture (BR 2017; BR 2019; RESAKSS, 2020).</p> <p>The set-up of Rwanda Development Board (RDB) has facilitated the mobilization of the overall private sector investments to the NAIP. RDB is an excellent example of public-private partnerships translating policy into action (Rwanda's consultations, 2020).</p>	<p>The Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) as a tool for budgeting is appropriate and should be pursued and reinforced as it improves efficiency of public expenditure, improves predictability of resource flows and improves efficiency, raises resource consciousness and promotion of output or outcome focused approaches, and improves accountability. In practice, at this stage, only the Rwanda budgeting system can be recommended for other countries for its merits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ There is a need to reinforce the private sector's contribution to the funding (which is vital for resource mobilization) of the NAIP for its successful implementation. ▶ The experience of the RDB is commendable and can inspire other countries. <p>Encourage Rwanda to sustain the good progress for delivering on Malabo commitments in Completing National CAADP Process and take necessary steps to increase public expenditures to agriculture and enhance access to finance for men and women engaged in agriculture.</p>
---------------------------------	--	--	---

COORDINATION & COOPERATION	<p>The existing internal coordination emphasized on the responsibilities of outcome leaders who operationalize results chains at different levels, build synergy among priority areas, support output implementation by the various actors, streamline synergies between RAB, NAEB, SPIU and MINAGRI through increased functional guidance, and inform annual planning by thorough feedback on implementation lessons learnt and best practices (PSTA4, 2017). The established platforms and mechanisms to facilitate and enhance coordination across sector are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ MINAGRI is responsible for providing an enabling environment to attract private sector investment and works closely with MINICOM to attract private sector investment in agriculture. ▶ RDB supports PPD (Public Private Dialogue) mechanisms and Value Chain platforms in collaboration with PSF to address key challenges in private sector development ▶ Districts are engaged in local level PPD and value chain platforms ▶ NAEB supports MINAGRI on PPDs and platforms for cash export value chains (PSTA4, 2017). <p>Institutional arrangements between the MINAGRI and DPs are suitable for an effective implementation of the PSTA4. An existing SWAP is responsible for setting the agenda of the ASWG, while the DPs' Nucleus offers a platform among partners to prepare for a strong engagement in support of the process (ITR, 2017).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Agricultural Sector Working Group (ASWG) is an essential forum for dialogue and coordination around key agricultural development issues. Members include development partners, NGOs, the private sector, civil society, farmer organizations, financial institutions and Government agencies. ▶ In addition, the Sector Wide Approach (SWAp) group brings together MINAGRI and key budget support development partners with its instrumental role of discussing issues related to budget support in the agriculture sector and coordinating financial support to the PSTA. 	<p>The various policy dialogue platforms established by the Ministry of Economy and Finance, the strong engagement of key CAADP constituencies and active involvement of stakeholders in the whole process of formulation and implementation facilitates and enhances the inter-sectorial collaboration required to ensure inclusive sustainability and resilience (PSTA 3, 2013; PSTA4, 2017, Rwanda).</p>	<p>The coordination mechanism put in place for the implementation of the PSTA4 is successful, replicable and should be capitalized by other countries and regions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ There is a need to reinforce the inter-sectorial collaboration through policy dialogue platforms and active engagement and participation of stakeholders. <p>The various coordination and participation initiatives established need to be sustained in order to reinforce the formulation and implementation process in Rwanda.</p>
---------------------------------------	---	---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Sub Sector Working Groups (SSWGs) of four permanent specialized clusters: crop development, livestock development, agribusiness, markets and export development, and planning & budgeting. SSWGs will seek to enhance stakeholders’ roles in the processes of planning, monitoring, advisory, coordination and financing for the sector. ▶ At the district level, the Joint Action Development Forum (JADF) made up of district government representations, (international) Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs), farmer and community organizations, and traditional and religious leaders, meets regularly to discuss sectoral issues. The implementation of the District Development Plan is overseen by the JADF (PSTA4, 2017). These established mechanisms and platforms facilitate and enhance the inter-sectorial collaboration required to ensure inclusive sustainability and resilience. 		
---	--	--

MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY	<p>A Clearly articulated M&E system and arrangements are included in the PSTA4 document. It is seen as a robust instrument given the ambitious plan and what is at stake. However, the M&E system in the document uses the conventional structures in reporting on progress being made on outputs and outcomes. It does not include partners like farmers, women and youth who are the real beneficiaries of a transformation program like this one (ITR, 2017).</p> <p>The monitoring and evaluation system of the NAIP was organized in 4 blocks namely strategic programs, M&E framework, results framework and costing plans (Rwanda's consultations, 2020).</p> <p>The PSTA 4 M&E framework proposes a two-tiered monitoring structure: (i) A Strategic Results Framework, focusing on the key outputs and indicators related to transformation; (ii) A linked Operational Framework, which includes the lower level (sub) outputs and indicators with targets and related activities and costs. The Strategic Results Framework with key transformational indicators is complemented by an Operational Framework to trace back to activities and inputs. The Strategic Framework furthermore reflects a strategic plan of the entire agriculture sector (not a project or programme). The (sub) outputs of the Operational Framework are clearly linked to the higher-level outputs ('results') and serve as a basis for programme/project monitoring (PSTA4, 2017). The PSTA 4 Strategic Results Framework has been built to incorporate key indicators reflecting commitments and ambitions of the agriculture sector towards various global, continental, and national processes, notably the SDGs, Malabo and the NST. The indicators and targets are directly linked to the activities costed in the PSTA 4 investment plan. For both, the Strategic and Operational Frameworks, indicator targets are cumulative unless indicated otherwise. (PSTA4, 2017).</p> <p>The government has also established an e-M&E system for accountability (Rwanda's Consultations, 2020).</p>	<p>Despite the improvement of M&E system, there is a lack of a dedicated platform for government to engage the beneficiaries (farmers, women and youth) on a regular basis (PSTA4, 2017, Rwanda).</p>	<p>There is a need to establish a dedicated platform for the government to engage the beneficiaries like farmers, women and youth on a regular basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Efforts should be made to optimize alignment and avoid proliferation of indicators to be reported on in the agriculture sector.- y.
--	---	---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ MINAGRI is responsible for monitoring and evaluation and management of information systems ▶ RAB and NAEB (for cash export crops) monitor performance and impact and coordinate data management with MINAGRI ▶ NISR (National Institute of Statistics Rwanda) undertakes household and farm surveys and MINAGRI increasingly collaborates with NISR and harmonizes data collection and methodologies ▶ Districts play a more active role in M&E and learning as well as information dissemination to the field (PSTA4, 2017). <p>The government of Rwanda has established the performance contract (Imihigo) which is a scheme for accountability signed by the government with the ministries. It has three levels which are:-Personal/individual, -Institutional, -Inter-ministerial. Also, the CPAF (Common Performance Assessment Framework) and DPAF (Development Performance Assessment Framework), the DPs assess the government on agreed indicators through these frameworks for accountability (Rwanda's consultations, 2020). The establishment of these tools has significantly reinforced the M&E in Rwanda.</p> <p>On nutrition, the last set of data validated by the government is 2 years old (ITR, 2017).</p> <p>The NAIP technical review is part of the overall CAADP implementation process, and is informed by other key CAADP-related reviews and analyses, including Agriculture Joint Sector Review (JSR) assessment and JSR reports (ITR, 2017).</p>	<p>Rwanda has persistently achieved a good performance in meeting the overall commitment of Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results but failed to meet the commitment of Biennial Agriculture Review Process during the two subsequent Biennial Reviews (BR 2017; BR 2019).</p> <p>Rwanda's success stories are dependent on the promotion of good governance and effective service delivery through the Rwanda Development Board (RDB). The initiatives (Rwanda Development Board (RDB) and Africa Improved Foods (AIFs)) are an excellent example of public-private partnerships translating policy into action (meeting report, CAADP-Malabo joint implementation planning and coordination retreat, 2017).</p> <p>The establishment of CPAF, DPAF and Rwanda performance contract, e-M&E system as M&E tools has significantly reinforced the M&E in Rwanda. Thus, these tools are commendable (Rwanda's consultations, 2020).</p>	<p>Sustain good performance in meeting the overall commitment of Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results and take necessary steps to be on-track on Biennial Agriculture Review Process in order to achieve the overall commitment of Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results in the next Biennial Review.</p> <p>The Rwanda's success stories should be ingrained and up-scaled in the country and on the continent.</p>
---	--	---

TOGO

	PROCESS	LESSONS LEARNED	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	<p>The conception, the formulation and the implementation, the composition of CAADP Round Table of NAIP-FS and NAIP-FNS comprised the related ministries, Farmers Associations, the civil society organizations, and Technical and Financial Partners, the African Union, the ECOWAS etc. For a better ownership of the process, emphasis is placed on the sensitization and the capacity building of various stakeholders and the information sharing. At the launching of the process, a kick-off workshop was organized, the participation in various methodological workshops in Dakar and the validation of identified orientations and actions were undertaken at the national consultation workshop with the various stakeholders supported by a large communication/dissemination programme.</p> <p>The NAIPs were largely communicated through the public medias but it is difficult to ascertain that the document is largely known and owned to be a credible reference working document used by all the stakeholders and CAADP partners.</p> <p>The formulation of the first and second generations of the NAIPs is preceded by an internal stocktaking assessment and its findings guided the orientations and the investment choices during the design stage. The formulation of the second generation of the NAIP benefited from past achievements, good practices and lessons learned from the first generation (RTEI, 2019). In fact the capitalization of the first generation of the Togo NAIP resumed in July 2016, following the launching formulation workshop organized by ECOWAS on the second generation of the NAIPs and RAIPs held in Abidjan from 30 May to 3 June 2016. This capitalization integrates the new challenges and emerging issues (gender, nutrition, social equity, environment, climate changes, sustainability and governance etc..) with the technical support of FAO, RAAF and the meetings with the Non-State Actors(NSA) and Farmers Organizations(MAEH).</p>	<p>The first generation of NAIP-FS is aligned to the agriculture component of the Priority Action Plan (PAP) of Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) and to the MDGs. The signed compact by all the stakeholders focus on six programmes articulated around the four CAADP pillars. Similarly, the second generation of Togo's NAIP built on the past achievements and good practices are elaborated based on a holistic approach and is well aligned to the National Development Plan (NAP) related to its interventions 2, to ECOWAP-CAADP which is itself aligned to CAADP-NEPAD and to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Contrary to the first generation, peculiar attention is given in NAIPFSN to key issues such as gender, private sector and youth as leverages of the successful implementation of the NAIPFSN (RTEI, 2019).</p> <p>Encourage and support Togo to reinforce and sustain inclusive and participative elaboration of the NAIP-FNS and take necessary steps to disseminate it largely.</p>	<p>In addition to the participative, inclusive and alignment process that characterized the formulation of the NAIPs in Togo, the instruments approach developed by Togo should be replicated in other countries or scaled up as it gives not only more precision and clarity in what one intends to achieve but also and most importantly how one implements it.</p> <p>Encourage and support the country to reinforce and sustain its alignment process to national, regional, continental and international policies and programmes for a sustainable transformation of agriculture. The holistic, adaptive approach and the capitalization of past achievement and good practices are commendable and should be pursued.</p> <p>The current trend of alignment and opening to the regional approaches are commendable and should be pursued</p> <p>Encourage and support Togo to reinforce and sustain inclusive and participative elaboration of the NAIP-FNS and take necessary steps to disseminate it largely.</p>

<p>The assessment is also based by the periodic sectorial reviews supported by ReSAKSS with the view to identify the vision and the policy orientation elaborated by the Ministry's technicians and Permanent Secretary's Office. External consultants were sometimes recruited on persisting issues. The NAIP of the second generation is validated in 2017 for the period 2017-2026 with an established timeline and budget.</p> <p>The NAIP-FNS followed similar harmonization hierarchy as in the case of the NAIP-FS: from the country SCAPE (2013-2017)/National Development Plan (NDP)-2018-2022 to National Agricultural Policy 2016-2030 and NAIP-FNS (2017-2023) with the declined programmes/projects. The NAIP-FNS falls within Axe 2 and 3 of the National Development Plan (NDP), The National Agricultural Policy and its Strategic Plan for Transformation of Agriculture towards 2030-PA-PSTAT 2030 predated the National Development Plan of which it is integrated with the well-defined roles between the NAIPs and other national agricultural through specific documents in order to avoid duplications. The policy and legal framework of the NAIP-FNS is enforced by the decree N°2016-186/PR approving the National Agricultural Policy for the period 2016-2030. An Agricultural Orientation Act is being elaborated to enforce its anchoring.</p> <p>An innovative and commendable approach that Togo has integrated in the NAIP-FNS (2017-2023) is the instruments approach. The latter has the merit of precision binding in the sense in what one intends to achieve but also and most importantly how one implements it. Ideally each instrument should be associated with its costs (RTEI, 219). These implementing instruments of the NAIP-FNS (2017-2023) are: the Direct State Investments and Donors Partners (DP); the Support Measures to stakeholders and Institutional and organizational reforms (PNIASAN, 2017-2020; Togo's consultation, 2020)).</p>	<p>Togo's adherence to the CAADP values and its opening to the regional approaches to implement the ECOWAS and WEAMU's agenda induced its awareness on political and legal reforms that are translated into a substantial budget allocation of 6% over the 10 years cycle (RTEI, 2019, TOGO).</p> <p>Despite the inclusive and participative elaboration of the NAIP-FNS (state actors and non-state actors, Farmers organizations, civil society and the TFPs) and also involved in the establishment of Incentive Mechanism of Agricultural Funding (MIFA) and the political commitment resulting in the vote of Land Act, the NAIP-FNS is not largely known as it is not disseminated following the various validation meetings and is more focused on indicators (Togo's Consultation, 2020).</p> <p>The operational anchoring of the Malabo Declaration through the NAIPFSN is translated into a decentralization at national, regional and local levels witnessing the achievement of the Target 2 result (agricultural transformation) (RTEI, 2019,TOGO).</p>	<p>Encourage and support the Togo government to reinforce and sustain the decentralization of the implementation of Malabo Declaration through the NAIPFSN at national, regional and local levels for its agriculture transformation.</p> <p>Sustain knowledge sharing and pooling by stakeholders in the process of formulation and implementation of the national investment plans in the agricultural sector in Togo.</p> <p>Togo's good practice in the formulation and implementation of NAIP-FNS through the development of a comprehensive presentation of main identified and featured policy instruments by strategic objective is commendable and should be capitalized.</p> <p>It is expected that the current implementation plan of the NAIPFSN includes a predicted disbursed planning tailored to expected results that enables better analysis of the appropriate budget allocation of the implementation plan</p> <p>Encourage Togo to sustain the good progress for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process and take necessary steps to be on-track on the CAADP based Policy & Institutional Review/ Setting/Support for the next Biennial Review</p>
---	---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Direct State Investments and Donors Partners(DP) through : the programmes and projects, Agricultural exchange, , the Incentives Mechanism of Agricultural finance(MIFA), the National Agency of Promotion and financing guarantee(ANPGF), the FAIEJ, the FNFI with its products AGRISEF, AJSEF et APSEF ; ▶ The enabling business environment through a series of reforms : land code and one-stop-shop for land, the investment code, the one-stop-shop for foreign trade, Agri-PME, the launching of YOLIM, a digital credit at zero interest rate in favor of Togolese farmers ▶ the Support Measures to stakeholders through detaxation, subsidies, risks management, technical assistance to family farms (EAF) and to agricultural enterprises and industrial enterprise (EAA) ; ▶ Institutional and organizational reforms through legal, regulatory, institutional frameworks. These are measures to attract among others private investments. <p>The planned mechanisms to ensure the operation of these instruments are : the establishment of a coordination system of monitoring and evaluation , communication and animation of consultation frameworks with the stakeholders</p> <p>The NAIP is parcel and part of the country annual planning process, In fact, the technical Ministry prepares the DPPD declined into Annual Working Plan and Budgets with PPM and PED. The described activities in the NAIP are based on the operation of the implementing instruments. En effet, le Ministère élabore les DPPD déclinés en plans de travail et budget annuel (PTBA) assortis de PPM et de PED. The PD contributes to the DPPD and to Annual Plan and Budgets to the government through the financing and the validation of activities contained in the general Working Plan and Budget</p>	<p>The setting-up of five (5) working groups around five major thematic areas for knowledge sharing and pooling by the majority of stakeholders in the process of formulation and implementation of the national investment plans ensures the national consensus building (inclusiveness) due to their active and full participation in Togo (RTEI, 2019).</p> <p>A good practice in the formulation and implementation of the Togo's NAIP-FNS is the comprehensive presentation of main identified and featured policy instruments by strategic objective, the four(4) interventions supported by grouped specific measures: (i) direct government investments; (ii) support measures to stakeholders(EAF and EAA) and (iii) institutional reforms(IR) (PNIASAN 2017-2026 ;RTEI, 2019, Togo).</p> <p>The weak initial stock-taking assessment based on findings supported by factual data as prescribed by the Malabo process led to inappropriate budget allocations which were not consistent with the strategic orientations and led to an imbalance between the allocated budget and expected results (RTEI, 2019; Togo's consultation, 2020).</p>	
---	---	--

		<p>Togo continues to make good progress for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process during the two subsequent Biennial Reviews but failed to meet the overall commitment to CAADP Process in 2019 due to CAADP based Policy & Institutional Review/ Setting/Support (BR, 2017; BR. 2019).</p>	
FINANCE & INVESTMENT	<p>The NAIP budget is elaborated annually involving all the stakeholders and is voted in the parliament after its adoption by the government and is published and made accessible to all through the ministry of finance website.</p> <p>There is a well-represented parliament committee on agriculture with updated information.</p> <p>The NAIP is discussed during the annual budgeting session through its implementing programmes and projects (Investment Budget) Regular reviews are undertaken and the results are integrated in the finance management (Togo's Consultation). The current NAIP budget is shared based on the implementing identified instruments as follows: The Direct State Investments (40.1%); the Support Measures to stakeholders (53%); Costs related to planned reforms (6.3%). Togo has not met the 10% budget target in compliance with Maputo Declaration. The average trend is 5.5% during the period 2003-2007, 7.4% for the period 2008-2009, 6,5% for the period 2010-2014, 2,9% in 2005, 10% in 2008, 6,4% in 2010, 5,3% in 2018.</p> <p>Within the framework of transition towards budgeting programme, each technical ministry prepares a pluri-annual programming document of expenses instead sectorial Medium Term Expenses Framework (MTEF).</p>	<p>Despite the increased overall public resources funding in the country and to the agricultural sector in Togo, the Maputo commitment of 10% was not met during the NAIP implementation due to the low effective consumption of the public resources to the sector. Moreover, the lack of formal and operational mechanism does not facilitate the engaged commitment of development partners and private sector which is weakly involved (PNIASAN 2017 – 2026; RTEI, 2019 Togo; Togo's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>Despite the good progress made by the Togo for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/ Malabo Process during the two subsequent Biennial Reviews, the country continues to be underperformed in public expenditures to agriculture and in attracting private investment (BR 2017; BR 2019).</p>	<p>The new option of "agropoles" enshrined in the new generation of NAIP is commendable but should be used as a real tool to open up and diversify opportunities for a real transformation of agriculture in Togo.</p> <p>Emphasis should also be placed on incentives policies to attract private investments to support agriculture</p> <p>Support the ongoing move to increase the overall public resources funding in the country and to the agricultural sector in Togo and to operationalize the formal mechanism in order to engage development partners and private sector.</p> <p>Encourage Togo to sustain the good progress for delivering on Malabo commitments in Completing National CAADP Process and take necessary steps to increase public expenditures to agriculture in public expenditures to agriculture and in attracting private investment</p>

<p>The NAIP is aligned to the global Medium Term Expenses Framework (MTEF) and the NAIP-FNS is declined every year into a budgeting programming or a rolling three-year budgeting programme (Togo's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>Within the framework of the implementation of aforementioned measures described in the NAIP-FNS, a high level meeting was organized under the leadership of the Presidency Office with participants from members of government, the Central Bank of West African States (BCEAO), Technical and Financial Partners, sub-regional development banks (BOAD, BIDC), commercial banks and local guarantee institutions in order to support the promotion of investment in the agricultural sector and to finance the small and medium enterprises (MAEH). The contributions of Development Partners (DP) to the agricultural sector and or to the NAIP1 were as follows: 45.52% for the State and 54.48% for the Development Partners (DP). The contributions of active non-state DP involved in the agricultural sector namely Urbis foundation, CRS, International Compassion, Solidarity Action Third World (ASTM) are not considered in the estimated budget (Togo's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>The private investment is attracted in the agricultural sector through the establishment of "agropôles" and of incentive measures. The extent of investment is regularly assessed by the technical ministry and the ministry of finance. Currently there is a weak involvement of the private sector.</p> <p>The country is engaged to mobilize 50% of the budget of the second generation of the NAIP from internal sources. The information on these investment trends is constantly reported in the strategic and programme planning. The dialogue public/private platforms are regularly held. The technical steering committee comprises all the stakeholders (state actors, professional associations, civil society, Technical and financial partners etc. (Togo's consultation, 2020).</p>		
--	--	--

<p>COORDINATION & COOPERATION</p>	<p>The state and non-state actors involved in the implementation of the NAIPs in Togo are the related key ministries and institutions, the Technical and Financial Partners. The NGOs, the private sector and civil society with clearly defined roles and responsibilities as indicated in the institutional arrangements of the NAIPs and the signed Compacts. However, the private sector (CN Patronat) and the Farmers Associations are not yet strong and active enough to assume their roles and responsibilities and to take over in the areas where the State disengaged. Nevertheless the NAIPs are more oriented towards the establishment of enabling environment of private sector. It concerns the investment in basic infrastructures and the incentives measures to enable the private sector to realize its potentials. Equally, the legal and business framework of agricultural investment are improved. The land and State Code, the Law of Agricultural Orientation are two ongoing commendable processes engaged by the government to the benefit of the sector. The Professional Associations through the CTOP are actively involved in these processes (Togo’s consultation, 2020). The place given to the agro-industry within the framework of the two NAIPs is translated through the support of value chain development with an emphasis on the processing and access to the markets.</p> <p>The inter-sectorial coordination is carried out through the Technical Steering committee chaired the Permanent Secretary. It is supported by the inter-ministerial strategic monitoring committee (CIPS), a framework of consultation between the stakeholders for the implementation of the NAIPs, the overall monitoring of the programme and the definition of the major orientations and strategic interventions of the agricultural sector. The CIPS comprises related technical ministries and institutions and representatives of the civil society, Technical and Financial Partners and the private sector. The Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation plays</p> <p>A leading role in the overall monitoring coordination of all investment programmes in the country including the NAIP-FNS.</p>	<p>The monitoring and coordination system, the policy dialogue and institutional arrangements established through various bodies: the inter-ministerial strategic steering committee (CIPS), the technical steering committee (CTP), the regional orientation and steering committee (CROP) is a positive achievement for the implementation of the NAIP in Togo despite the shortcomings identified in their operation (low level representation in CIPS meetings, lack of operating budget and low involvement of civil society, private sector in the monitoring & evaluation) (PNIASAN 2017 – 2026, Togo).</p> <p>The established multi-actor steering committee in Togo comprising of the representatives of the President and Prime Minister ‘office, various ministries, Farmers organizations, civil society, private sector, development partners for the formulation and implementation of the NAP and NAIP II through the ministerial decree of 10 April 2015 witnesses Togo’s compliance to the multi-sectorial principle and its alignment to Malabo Declaration (RTEI, 2019).</p> <p>The involvement of the private sector through public-private partnership is still weak despite the clearly expressed interests.</p>	<p>For a better participation of civil society in achieving the results of the PNIASAN, it is important to put in place a single reference framework for consultation (strengthening of the OP/CSO framework), which will be representative in the steering, decision-making and monitoring bodies of the implementation of the PNIASAN (mission to monitor projects of supervision).</p> <p>The accountability of the actors in the implementation process reinforces the ownership of the NAIPs and facilitates the contribution of all the actors towards the achievement of results</p> <p>The monitoring and coordination system, the policy dialogue and institutional arrangements established through various bodies are commendable but need to be improved in terms of representation, operating budget and involvement of civil society, private sector in the monitoring & evaluation.</p> <p>The established multi-actor steering committee in Togo comprising of the representatives of the President and Prime Minister ‘office, various ministries, Farmers organizations, civil society, private sector, development partners for the formulation and implementation of the NAP and NAIP II needs to be encouraged and supported.</p> <p>There is an urgent need to involve and attract the private sector through public-private partnership</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>Six thematic Working groups are organized around the NAIP-FNS and seven thematic groups within ReSAKSS are established of which recommendations are considered</p> <p>There exists the Working Group of Technical and Financial Partners for the implementation of the NAIP-FNS (GTPTFSA), the CIPS, CTP and the CROP. The development partners intervening in the agricultural sector have their own coordination mechanism through their country strategy document. The major Financial Partner in the agricultural sector in Togo is the World Bank and the government has always aligned the DP to their investment plans(alignment principle of Paris Declaration)</p>	<p>In fact, the role of the private sector in the governance structure namely in the steering and implementation committee of the NAIP-FSN is not clearly specified as set out in the co-ordination mechanisms and the private sector does not feel that it is being listened to (RTEI, 2019; Togo's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>Despite the consultation meetings with development partners organized by the Ministry in charge of agriculture to ensure their involvement and engagement, there is no clear evidence that the established TFPs group (GTPTFSA) is operational (RTEI, 2019).</p> <p>The current organizational dynamics of the agricultural sector around cooperatives, unions and confederations members of CTOP, a national agricultural platform of which views and interests are considered in the process of formulation of the Agriculture Orientation Act and the land code reinforces the ownership and implementation of NAIP and facilitates the achievement of expected results (Togo's consultation, 2020).</p>	<p>The established TFPs group (GTPTFSA) is to be operationalized in order to ensure their involvement in the planning and implementation process.</p> <p>The current organizational dynamics of the agricultural sector around cooperatives, unions and confederations, the ongoing formulation process of the agricultural should be supported as they reinforce the implementation of the NAIP and facilitate the achievement of expected results.</p>
---	--	--

		<p>The current organizational dynamics of the agricultural sector around cooperatives, unions and confederations members of CTOP, a national agricultural platform of which views and interests are considered in the process of formulation of the Agriculture Orientation Act and the land code reinforces the ownership and implementation of NAIP and facilitates the achievement of expected results (Togo's consultation, 2020).</p>	
--	--	--	--

MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY	<p>The Management Information Systems (MIS) and the M&E systems of the ministry of Agriculture exist but are not connected either between themselves, or with external systems and as the results of M&E are not utilized by the MIS. The Ministry collects the data and information from related ministries and centralize them for monitoring. The 139 SMART indicators of the NAIP-FS were defined from the objectives and expected results of the NAIP-FS which were aligned to the existing National Development Strategy (SCAPE). These are: 6 impact indicators, 34 effect indicators; 99 output indicators, which were used later for constructing the indicators of the current National Development Plan, 2018-2022. The Permanent Secretariat for the monitoring of Policies, Reforms and Programmes organize every year bi-annual and annual reviews of reform measures. There is a framework of performance in the agricultural sector namely the Inter-ministerial Strategic Steering Committee (CIPS), Technical Steering Committee (CTP) and Regional Orientation Steering Committee (CROP). To that one should add the farmers organized every year for the evaluation of agricultural campaign.</p> <p>The interventions supported by the DPs contribute to the achievement of the selected indicators at the national and sectorial levels. Based on one of the principles of the Paris Declaration, the DPs align themselves with indicators and monitoring systems at the national level where they exist. However, some partners have particular requirements and specific indicators that they follow through their monitoring system at their institution's level.</p> <p>The agricultural sector holds joint annual sector reviews with technical and financial partners. However, some of the recommendations from these reviews may not be implemented due to lack of financial resources or lack of expertise and relevance. In fact, these recommendations become sometimes obsolete in some contexts.</p> <p>The execution of the NAIP's budget is voted in parliament. The government is held accountable to the achievements of the NAIP by Parliament and stakeholders, including citizens. All reports on the execution of the</p>	<p>The lack of existing institutional mechanism for conducting the joint sector review does not ensure the successful implementation of the National Investment Plans in Togo. In addition the Management Information Systems (MIS) and the M&E systems of the ministry of Agriculture are not connected either between themselves, or with external systems and are not utilized by the MIS (RTEI, 2019; Togo's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>The NAIPFSN is aligned to the Result Framework of the CAADP at its expected impacts' level and at the component 2 of National Development Plan (NAP) through impacts' indicators of the agricultural policy related to Gross Agricultural Domestic Product and Poverty Reduction Strategy (Report RTEI, 2019).</p> <p>Despite the good progress made by Togo in fostering Peer Review and Mutual Accountability in 2017, the country failed to meet its benchmark target in 2019 (BR 2017; BR 2019)</p> <p>The NAIP-FNS makes arrangements for monitoring and evaluation of interventions within the framework of the agricultural policy.</p>	<p>The MIS and M&E systems in place are adequate but need to operationalize through the established linkages. Moreover, efforts should be made by the government to implement the recommendations from the Joint Sector Reviews</p> <p>Last but not least, all the interventions in the agricultural sector, even if they are not carried out by the Ministry, deserve to be monitored and capitalized on. Hence the need for a broader framework for monitoring interventions is urgently needed.</p> <p>There is a need to establish an institutional mechanism for conducting the Joint Sector Review to ensure the successful implementation of the National Investment Plans in Togo.</p> <p>The alignment dynamics displayed by the country should be pursued and sustained.</p> <p>Sustain the good progress in fostering Peer Review and Mutual Accountability and take necessary steps to meet its benchmark target in the next Biennial Review.</p> <p>Encourage the country to translate the arrangements for monitoring and evaluation within the framework of the agricultural policy through the provision of required indicators for elaborating the Biennial Review.</p>
--	--	---	--

<p>budget are published and available on the website of the Ministry of Economics and Finance.</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation results and performance reports are widely disseminated and accessible. However, not all actors/ stakeholders are aware of the dissemination of monitoring and evaluation results.</p> <p>The NAIP is disseminated at the region, district and village's levels where NAIP projects are implemented. However, generally the NAIP remains poorly known.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The annual organization of the National Forum of Togolese Peasants (FNPT) under the leadership of the Head of State witnesses the government's commitment to the transformation of agriculture in Togo. 	<p>Nevertheless, these arrangements are not translated in terms of required indicators for the elaboration of the Biennial Review (RTEI, 2019).</p> <p>There is no dedicated framework for monitoring all the interventions in the agricultural sector namely other actors' interventions. Moreover the monitoring and evaluation indicators are not published or disseminated. Last but not least, the monitoring and evaluation system lack motivated and qualified data collection and data processing/analysis's agents (Togo's consultation, 2020).</p>	<p>All the interventions in the agricultural sector even if they are not implemented by the technical ministry must be monitored and capitalized.</p> <p>Set up a single reference framework for consultation (strengthening of the OP / CSO framework), which will be representative in the steering, decision-making and monitoring bodies of the implementation of the PNIASAN (monitoring mission for supervision projects)</p>
--	--	---

3.2 Lessons and recommendations from RAIPs ECCAS

	PROCESS	LESSONS LEARNED	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	<p>The design and elaboration of the RAIP-ECCAS and the CAADP Roundtable were inclusive and involved several institutions such as the ECCAS Agriculture Department, the Chairs of the multi-sectoral country teams and CAADP Focal Points of ECCAS member countries, ECCAS Regional Organizations of the ECCAS agriculture, fisheries, forestry and livestock sector (CEBEVIRHA, COREP, COMIFAC, PRASAC...), the Agricultural Producers' Organizations of the Sub-region (PRO-PAC...): TFPs (World Bank, FAO, ADB, IFPRI, OIE, EU through CTA), CSOs (Rural Hub, APES); Government of the Member States of the Sub-Region (Ministry in charge of Trade, University...), NEPAD and the African Union.</p> <p>The WB's financing through a Multi-Donor Trust Fund has facilitated the participation of all stakeholders and enabled the region to have a focused vision on the region's priorities. A sensitization of stakeholders preceded the consultation meetings, the signing the regional pact declining the responsibilities and roles of the stakeholders and the signing of the compact at national levels.</p> <p>The process was launched with the official inception meeting of CAADP Chad on October 28, 2011 with the participation of PRASAC. The latter was already well sensitized on this continental program and was associated with the development of RAIP-ECCAS (ECCAS's consultation, 2020). The RAIP-ECCAS document was presented to stakeholders at various meetings in the Central African sub-region. Participants were sensitized during meetings including the one held in September 2017 in Chad.</p>	<p>Though the formulation of the ECCAS RAIP is inclusive, participative and aligned to the CAADP and Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and National Agricultural Investment Programme (NAIPs), its consistency with the regional Programmes namely the Regional Economic Programme and Seed Programme of the ECCAS is not yet effective. Moreover, the RAIP Results Framework and the NAIPs Results Framework are not consistent with the CAADP Results Framework. (ECCAS's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>The lack of synchronization in the process of formulating the RAIP and the NAIPs of the ECCAS does not facilitate complementary implementation of regional and national investment plans and the shared role and responsibility of countries as member States in the successful implementation of the RAIP (Revue post-pacte du PDDAA 2016, CEEAC).</p>	<p>The sensitization of stakeholders at various stages of the ECCAS RAIP formulation and implementation process and their involvement in the consultation meetings promoted participation and inclusiveness and enabled the identification for a focused vision on the region's priorities during the ECCAS-RAIP formulation and implementation process. However, it is necessary to strengthen the political and legislative framework for the implementation of ECCAS-RAIP through regional integration policies such as: common regulations on the approved pesticides in the CAEMU zone and to accelerate the convergence efforts between CEMAC and ECCAS.</p> <p>Accelerate the effective alignment of the ECCAS RAIP with the regional Programmes (Regional Economic Programme and Seed Programme) and the consistency between the RAIP Results Framework and the NAIPs Results Framework with the CAADP Results Framework.</p> <p>There is a need to synchronize the formulation process of the RAIP and the NAIP in order to facilitate complementary implementation of regional and national investment plans</p>

<p>However, it is difficult to ascertain that the RAIP-ECCAS is widely known. The ownership of RAIP is not effective since the member states that were supposed to finance part of the resources have not done so. The Regional Council for Agriculture, Food and Nutrition (RAFN), the steering body for the RAIP is yet to be operational,(ECCAS's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>An assessment of the regional situation analysis was carried out within the framework of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and other strategic documents of some institutions. These results in the Common Agricultural Policy and to RAIP-FNS which takes up the strategic axes of the CAP and takes into account some priorities identified in national documents (ECCAS's consultation, 2020). However, the PRIASAN was developed while the drafting of national investment program documents and the analysis of strategic options were not yet completed.</p> <p>The planning hierarchy: from the vision of the region to the RAIP is as follows: Vision 2063 of the African Union is declined in phase in coherence with national visions such as Cameroon's Vision 2035.</p> <p>At the sectoral level, the Malabo Declaration of 2014 has been translated into a CAADP results framework for 2025.</p> <p>The development of RAIP-FNS is based on several documents that contribute to the operationalization of the CAP. These are mainly the Regional Program for Food and Nutritional Security, two strategic programs to boost the coffee and cotton sectors, the document on the agricultural financing mechanism, and above all the first eleven federating projects which are the result of a process prioritization and the expression of the willingness of the region's leaders to focus e in areas that are likely to produce expected results in the short term at the expectations of the CAADP stakeholders engaged in the CAADP process in Central Africa (PRIASAN ECCAS, 2017).</p>	<p>Despite the mobilization of all stakeholders and the integration of their priorities and commitments in the process of formulating the regional investment programme , the main regional stakeholders and partners of CCADP process are not explicitly mentioned and identified or quoted in the RAIPFNS of ECCAS (Revue post-pacte du PDDAA 2016, CEEAC).</p> <p>Despite the good progress made by the ECCAS for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/ Malabo Process in 2017, the region failed to meet its benchmark target in 2019.</p>	<p>There is a need to involve and engage all stakeholders in the process of formulation namely the main regional stakeholders and development partners in order to facilitate a fluent implementation of the regional investment plan. In this regards, the experiences of the ECOWAS-RAIP is appealing</p> <p>Sustain the good progress in delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process and take necessary steps to meet its benchmark target in the next Biennial Review.</p>
--	---	--

<p>The RAIP-FNS is in line with the continental (AU) CAADP Results Framework (2015-2025) and covers all areas that contribute to the agricultural transformation in the community (ECCAS, 2020).</p> <p>Documents such as the Regional Indicative Program (RIP) which is the framework for cooperation between the European Union and the Central Africa Economic and Monitoring Union (CAEMU member countries can be associated with the National Development Plan (ECCAS's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>The RAIP should be the sectorial (agricultural) component of the Regional Indicative Program (RIP), but the RIP is not related to the all ECCAS countries whereas the RAIP-FNS is common to them (ECCAS's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>The (CAEMU has a Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) (ECCAS's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>According to the principle of subsidiarity, the RAIP is rather a a framework of coherence than a common reference framework.</p> <p>However, the national NAIPAs are aligned with RAIP. The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) of ECCAS has been used as a reference document by the member States in relation to the formulation of the NAIPs and the RAIP. The axes and some actions declined in the RAIP are defined according to the priorities of these strategic documents (ECCAS's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>The policy and legislative framework is gradually improving in favor of the implementation of the RAIP. Several policies are developed at the sub-regional level (e.g. common regulation on the approved pesticides zone and the use of pesticides in the in the CAEEMU region). Efforts for converging .the two regional institutions (ECCAS and CAEMU) are real (ECCAS's consultation, 2020)</p> <p>The roles between the RAIP and the other regional agricultural programmes are not clearly defined but pragmatic convergence efforts are undertaken.</p>		
---	--	--

	<p>Nevertheless, the consistency of the RAIP with the regional programmes and projects is urging and necessary namely with the Regional Economic Programme (REP) and the CAEMU Seed Programme.</p>		
FINANCE & INVESTMENT	<p>The RAIP budget has been developed on the basis of the financial contribution of member states. The budget process is not done annually nor in a transparent and accountable manner,</p> <p>The CAADP's target of 10% of public spending on agriculture has not been met in the ECCAS region. Between 2014-2019, the average budget share is 1.95 for an average growth rate of 4.33%.</p> <p>The delayed organization of the business meeting (donors' round table) that occurred 2 years after the finalization of RAIP-FNS at the end of 2015 i.e. in December 2017 due to the delayed funding from the World Bank has led to re-contextualize the initial projects to meet the 2017 existing needs. Thus, with the FAO technical support, the initial projects were converted to 13 the selected projects with consideration of emerging issues such as youth through the PROJEC project. However, at the Donors Round Table, the Development Partners support to these new projects was impressive. At the end of the donors' round table, a roadmap was elaborated and a steering committee was set up to follow up on the commitments. The committee is currently led by the Gabonese Minister of Agriculture. It is composed of all stakeholders: Development Partners (ADB), Technical Partners (FAO) and Producers' Organizations (PROPAC). The aim is to translate the expressed intentions during the round table into concrete actions. Unfortunately, the lack of counterpart financial contribution by the member states to the Special Regional Fund for Agricultural Development (FSRDA) established in 2009 of which 1% of the RAIP-FNS budget represents the operation costs hindered the operation of this steering committee. The reasons are :</p>	<p>The allocation of budget to investment plans in the ECCAS is adequate, relevant and articulated despite the shortcomings noted in the design related to the financial analysis, mechanisms and information (Revue post-pacte du PDDAA 2016, CEEAC).</p> <p>Despite the delayed implementation of the ECCAS-RAIP and the expressed financial support DPs, the lack of counterpart financial contribution by the member states to the Special Regional Fund for Agricultural Development (FSRDA) established in 2009 hindered the operation of the steering committee and slowed the programme implementation</p> <p>Despite the good progress made by the ECCAS for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process in 2017, the region continues to be underperformed in public expenditures to agriculture and in attracting domestic private investment in 2019 (BR 2017; BR 2019).</p>	<p>Encourage ECCAS to implement its investment plans but efforts should be made to improve the design in terms of financial analysis, mechanisms and information</p> <p>The financial contribution of the member States is important to boost the dynamics of investment in the agricultural sector. To this end, the REC should further sensitize and inform member States on their complementary and coordinating role in the identification and implementation of regional projects for the benefit of States.</p> <p>Sustain the good progress made by the ECCAS for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process and take necessary steps to be on-track on public expenditures to agriculture and in attracting domestic private investment in the next Biennial Review.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ the failure in the approach developed for the formulation of regional projects through which the member States did not feel concerned with the regional projects due to the lack of communication and information between the RECs and their member States on the complementary and coordinating role of ECCAS in the process of the implementation of the regional projects ;. ▶ and the multiple memberships of countries in various RECs <p>The lack of private sector framework to secure and guarantee regional investments does not induce private investments. The newly created department, the Common Market, Economic, Financial and Monetary Affairs Department is the dedicated department to the private sector to replace the old one which failed to provide investment guarantee to the private sector in an agricultural sector often considered a high risk sector (ECCAS consultation's, 2020)</p>	<p>Despite the commitment and the consideration to integrate the regional private concerns in the CAADP development process in Central Africa, the ECCAS-RAIP does not describe the private sector and therefore does not provide information on regional private sector actors and their funding and investment capacity in its RAIP. Moreover, the lack of private sector framework to secure and guarantee regional investments does not induce private investments (Revue post-pacte du PDDAA 2016, CEEAC; ECCAS' consultation, 2020).</p> <p>Despite the active participation of the TFPs in the preparation process of ECCAS-RAIP and its funding of some operational programs currently being implemented at the regional level, the mechanism of collaboration between the various financial partners is not clarified in the ECCAS-RAIP. The role of the AfDB as the lead TFP in the RAIP is yet to be effective (Revue post-pacte du PDDAA 2016, CEEAC).</p>	<p>There is an urgent need to conduct a thorough mapping of SWOT analysis of institutional actors including private actors for their involvement in the implementation of the RAIP and to show the multiplier effects that ECCAS RAIP will bring to promote greater involvement of private investment , and the expansion of the private agricultural sector; and integrate into RAIP one or more activities or actions to strengthen public-private partnership and strengthen the private investment in the agricultural sector (Revue post-pacte du PDDAA 2016, CEEAC).</p> <p>In addition, the community should urgently put in place a dedicated framework for the private sector and to secure and guarantee regional private investments, for regional projects and programmes' funding</p> <p>The RTEI recommends that the results of the consultation between donors, initiated under the Permanent Secretariat (PS / ECCAS) and with funding from the European Union, to define the coordination mechanisms, distribute the roles and responsibilities of each donor funds in the implementation of PRIASAN, be integrated into the updated version of PRIASAN (Revue post-pacte du PDDAA 2016, CEEAC).</p>
--	--	--

<p>COORDINATION & COOPERATION</p>	<p>The contributing actors to the implementation of the ECCAS RAIP are state and non-state actors namely the Civil Society Organizations, in particular the Regional Platform of Producers' Organizations of Central Africa (PROPAC).</p> <p>The RAIP clearly defines the roles of the REC (ECCAS) and private actors at both regional and national levels. The actors are aware of their role in the process of implementation.</p> <p>The coordination of the process should have been ensured by the Regional Council on Agriculture, Food and Nutrition (CRAAN), the steering body in charge of the CAADP implementation process and of RAIP-FNS, established in Brazzaville. Unfortunately, the ECCAS failed to establish the coordination between the three bodies that comprises the Regional Council i.e. the political body which is the steering committee, the thematic group and the public body which is the technical monitoring committee in charge of coordination but was not set up due to the reform process initiated by at the ECCAS level. Hence, The RAIP-FNS is coordinated by the former Agriculture and Rural Development Department instead of an independent structure.</p> <p>The private sector is not organized, strong and dynamic in the region. So are the fishery, aquaculture, farmers and fish farmers organizations.</p> <p>There is a steering committee for monitoring the RAIP implementation road map in which the DPs are members. There is a rotating team leader for the coordination of DPs with their own coordination mechanism. The World Bank is the main donor in agriculture.</p>	<p>Despite the recognition of institutional collaboration between the EC-CAS and other Regional Economic Communities (REC) that are directly (CEMAC) or indirectly concerned with the implementation of the RAIPFNS (COMESA, CEPGL, SADC, etc.), the existence of coordination unit, the participation and funding of the RAIP-FNS, the established coordination and the collaboration mechanism through the operation of the Regional Council on Agriculture, Food and Nutrition (CRAAN), the independent steering body in charge of the CAADP implementation process of the ECCAS-RAIP are yet to be effective.</p> <p>Despite the tasks assigned to the unit in charge of the implementation of the RAIP of ECCAS in the permanent secretariat office of the CER/REC, namely that of contracting the technical institutions, the socio-professional organizations, the private sector for projects' implementation, these tasks are yet to be effective (Revue post-pacte du PDDAA 2016, CEEAC).</p>	<p>Reinforce the coordination process by establishing and ensuring the operation of the Regional Council on Agriculture, Food and Nutrition (CRAAN), the independent steering body in charge of the CAADP implementation process of the ECCAS-RAIP in view of establishing the coordination between the three bodies that comprises the Regional Council i.e. the political body which are the steering committee, the thematic group and the public body as the technical monitoring committee in charge of coordination.</p> <p>Ensure the organization of strong and dynamic regional private sector and professional associations (fishery, farming and aquaculture) frameworks or platforms to serve as exchange platforms for facilitating regional private investments and inter-sectorial dialogues.</p> <p>Strengthen the capacity of the secretariat to deliver results.</p> <p>There is a need to clarify the collaboration mechanism of the Community and different financial partners</p>
--	---	---	--

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY</p>	<p>There is no dedicated monitoring and evaluation unit or department for the RAIP-FNS at ECCAS, The Plan is monitored through the AUDA-NEPAD Mutual Accountability Framework, which provides information on the implementation of the CAADP process in Central Africa at the RAIP-FNS level. Hence, a CAADP expert was recruited to support the region in developing monitoring indicators.</p> <p>The planning, monitoring and evaluation systems of the Regional Agricultural Investment Plan will be largely guided by the SADC Policy for Strategic Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (SPME, 2012).</p> <p>In terms of the accountability of the REC (ECCAS), it should be noted that at the level of member States, the ECCAS interventions are almost unknown. There is almost no impact of the RECs on member States and the large part of the population is not knowledgeable of the roles that the RECs are supposed to play. They perceived them as independent institutions.</p>	<p>Despite the political will of the ECCAS for delivering on Malabo commitments, the lack of fully established inclusive institutionalized mechanisms and platforms for CAADP Mutual Accountability and peer review persists in the region (BR 2017; BR 2019).</p> <p>Despite a M&E system of the RAIPFNS based on three technical structures: (i) the regional System of Strategic Analysis and knowledge Management (ReSAKSS), (ii) the Regional Information System based on national information systems and (iii) the M&E unit established in the department of the ECCAS in charge of the M&E of the RAIP and its multi-actor consultation and dialogue mechanisms, the regional data collection and management system are lacking. (Revue post-pacte du PDDAA 2016, CEEAC).</p>	<p>Sustain the political will of the ECCAS for delivering on Malabo commitments and take necessary steps to be on-track on fully established inclusive institutionalized mechanisms and platforms for CAADP Mutual Accountability and peer review persists in the region.</p> <p>There is an urgent need to establish a dedicated monitoring and evaluation unit for the ECCAS-RAIP to ensure its fluent implementation.</p> <p>Reinforce the regional data collection and information management system for an effective M&E of the RAIP.</p>
---	--	---	--

EAC

	PROCESS	LESSONS LEARNED	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	<p>The formulation and the design of the RAIP were consultative and participatory. The CAADP Round Table was inclusive as it comprised representatives from Government, regional and sub-regional institutions, civil society, technical partners and development partners. The RAIP is widely known by top management level and the CAADP team but it is difficult to ascertain that it is widely known and owned.</p> <p>The stocktaking assessment was undertaken and its findings were translated into the RAIP formulation. Discussions on policy measures also took place and some of the proposed measures were incorporated in the RAIP.</p> <p>To achieve the EAC Vision 2050, the EAC develops medium term Regional Strategies as instruments for guiding the implementation of the necessary actions for attaining the Vision and the RAIP is one of these medium term instruments.</p> <p>The East African Community Agriculture and Rural Development Policy-2005-2030 (EAC – ARDP-2005-2030), a Regional Agriculture Policy, pre-dates the Regional Development Plan (RDP)</p> <p>The planning hierarchy runs from the EAC Food and Nutritional Security Strategy, the Second Food Security Action Plan to the RAIP. The EAC RAIP is the foundation for the agriculture sector interventions envisaged under the EAC RDP. Then RAIP is aligned to RDP. The EAC intends to transform agriculture through the RAIP by focusing on the 5 thematic areas namely: (i) regional agricultural production and food supply, (ii) food utilization, (iii) agri-business, value addition and agro-industry, (iv) building capacity for sustainable natural resource management, and (v) strengthening capacities for regional agricultural institutions.</p>	<p>Although the EAC RAIP formulation process is participatory and inclusive (Sub-Regional AR4D Organizations including ASARECA; Regional private sector institutions and other non-state actors including EABC, EAGC, CAADP Non-State Actors Coalition, and ReSAKSS; Development partners including USAID; Academia including the Inter-University Council for East Africa; Government Officials from the Ministries responsible for Agriculture and the Ministries of East African Community Affairs in the EAC member states), it is still not widely owned and widely known and its implementation process is not complemented by the NAIP implementation processes in the EAC partner states (EAC's consultation, 2020).</p> <p>Despite the alignment of the EAC member states agricultural policies to their RAIP and NAIPs enshrined in CAADP/Malabo process, the formulation and implementation of EAC's RAIP faces several challenges pertaining to the sequencing/timing of the regional compact, investment plan and policies at its formulation,</p>	<p>There is an urgent need to increase awareness on the RAIP through advocacy and policy dialogue and to mainstream it into member states national investment plans in the EAC. The Policy and legislative framework need improvement to ensure funding for implementation of the RAIP. More clarity on the roles and responsibilities of non-state actors is required for effective implementation of the RAIP.</p> <p>There is an urgent need to communicate and to engage all stakeholders at regional and national levels in order to facilitate complementary formulation and implementation of the RAIP.</p> <p>There is an urgent for the EAC to address the identified challenges in order to up-scale the alignment of EAC RAIP to the EAC member states agricultural policies to their RAIPs and NAIPs.</p> <p>The alignment process displayed by EAC should be reinforced and sustained.</p> <p>The clarity in the definition of roles and responsibilities of all relevant stakeholders involved in the formulation and implementation of the EAC RAIP is crucial to ensure convergent implementation of the regional investment plan.</p> <p>The current growth and transformation patterns displayed by the region should be encouraged and sustained.</p>

<p>There are several planning frameworks with different time frames. Other coexisting programmes are: Food Security Action Plan 2019-2023 and Food and Nutritional Security Strategy 2019 – 2023. However, different planning frameworks are aligned through harmonizing the interventions and timeframes.</p> <p>The EAC RAIP is implemented by the EAC Secretariat through the Sectorial Minister Councils.</p> <p>The capacity of the EAC to mobilize resources and to implement RAIP is a big challenge. Partner states tend not to prioritize implementation of regional agreements, policies and programs within their own budgets. An annual stakeholders' reflection meeting on progress, challenges and lessons learned in implementation of the RAIP and continuous monitoring and evaluation during implementation of the instruments is established. The EAC has an Agricultural Strategy but it is not clear that it is sector-wide and roles of non-state actors are not well articulated.</p>	<p>the effective implementation of these policies, the regional approach related to crop and trans-boundary live-stock diseases, limited national research and breeding capacities, knowledge sharing and establishment of databases, early warning and forecasting systems, the non-tariff barriers to free trade (failure to ratify the sanitary and phyto-sanitary (SPS) protocol) (EAC JSR, 2019, EAC).</p> <p>The EAC CAADP Compact, based on the EAC Agriculture and Rural Development Strategy (EAC-ARDS), the EAC Food Security Action Plan (EAC-FSAP), EAC Climate Change Policy, Master Plan and Strategy and the 4th EAC Development Strategy (2011/12-2015/16) and the instruments setting the EAC Integration agenda that call for 'food security and rational agriculture production', are aligned to the Malabo Declaration. (EAC CAADP COMPACT, 2017, EAC).</p> <p>Contrary to the 2012 Compact, the EAC's 2017 Compact clearly defined the role and responsibility of all relevant stakeholders (non-state actors- farmers' organizations, private sector representatives, etc) involved in the formulation and implementation of the EAC RAIP in order to ensure convergent views in the process of</p>	<p>Considerable efforts are to be made to consult non-state actors (NSA) in the process of developing policies and programmes formulation, implementation and review.</p> <p>There is a need to reverse the current negative trends in terms of food and nutrition security, resilience, sustainability through effective implementation of the EAC investment plan.</p> <p>Sustain the good progress for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process and necessary steps should be taken to be on-track on its benchmark target during the next Biennial Review.</p>
--	---	---

		<p>implementation (ECDPM, DP No. 128c, 2012; EAC Compact, 2017).</p> <p>Despite the domestication of the Malabo declarations, the East Africa Community has not persistently met 10% annual budget allocated to agriculture and at least 6% of annual growth as a Region. However, opportunities for growth of agribusiness are being created as consumers, both rural and urban, switch to processed foods. (EAC CAADP COMPACT, 2017 ; EAC, RAIP 2018, EAC)</p> <p>Although, considerable efforts are made to consult non-state actors including, among others, Eastern Africa Farmers Federation (EAFF), East Africa Businesses Council (EABC), Eastern Africa Grain Council (EAGC), East African Civil Society Organizations Forum (EACSOF) in the process of developing policies and programmes formulation, implementation and review, the consultations are not well structured for meaningful participation and engagement of the NSAs. This situation makes some of the NSAs to feel that their input maybe of no consequence and this in turn reduces their motivation to continue engaging with the EAC policy processes. (EAC JSR, 2019, EAC).</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Although the performance of the EAC region has indicated good progress in several areas (such as wealth creation, strengthening of mutual accountability and adoption of MALABO processes), there are however several challenges as the region still performs poorly in the following key result areas: Food and nutrition security, resilience, sustainability and difficulty in tracking on performance of some CAADP indicators (EAC JSR, 2019, EAC).</p> <p>Despite the good progress made by the EAC for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process in 2017, the region failed to meet its benchmark target in 2019 (BR 2017; BR 2019).</p>	
--	--	--	--

FINANCE & INVESTMENT	<p>The RAIP budget is developed based on the resources that member States provide for investing in operating the relevant implementation of identified instruments. The partner states are responsible for policy implementation in the EAC. As a result, partner countries are expected to bear the larger share of the cost of implementing regional policies and programmes. Within partner states, national budgets are the key instruments of directly financing agriculture or indirectly attracting private sector investments in the sector. Without significant allocation of funds by the public sector and an enabling policy environment, agriculture is unlikely to be viewed as profitable business by the private sector which is the major source of finance to the agricultural sector anywhere in the world.</p> <p>The Public Expenditure Reviews (PER) are done annually and the findings inform the next year budgets. The EAC Region is not on track with meeting the CAADP target of 10% public expenditure to agriculture. The EAC has a Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) for the region as a whole and it is institution based. The RAIP informs the agriculture sector funding priorities in the MTEF.</p> <p>The EAC Parliamentary Committee on Agriculture comprises 18 members and the RAIP discussions take place during the annual budget session.</p> <p>The private sector investment is attracted through strengthening the policy, legal and institutional frameworks.. There are public-private dialogues organized by value chain. At the regional level, RAIP is targeted to coordinate investments at the member state level. At the Member States level, the Nationals design NAIPs which are Malabo Compliant to address the 7 commitments and within the NAIPs, targeted interventions include Investments by the private sector.</p> <p>USAID, AGRA, GIZ, IFPRI among others are DPs supporting the agricultural sector and the RAIP (EAC's consultation; JSR, 2019).</p>	<p>The weak contribution of the EAC Secretariat to its partner States' national CAADP process is attributed to the low level of staffing limiting the absorptive capacity of the department to fully utilize available resources from donors as well to harness the existing potential of regional organizations to support the agriculture and food security (AFS) agenda. The RAIP is very ambitious with a large budget outlay. However, funding and implementation capacity are big challenges (EAC's consultation, 2020; ECDPM, DP No. 128c, 2012, EAC; EAC JSR, 2019).</p> <p>There is often a mismatch between the planned budgets and available resources to implement the agriculture and food security (AFS) plans at EAC due to the low and inadequate financial resources allocated to agriculture and food security by the Member States for effective implementation of the RAIP (EAC JSR, 2019).</p> <p>Despite the establishment of a Partnership Fund in 2006 by EAC Secretariat to be a vehicle for coordinating and channeling contributions by DPs to projects and programmes towards regional integration and socio-economic development as well as facilitate harmonization and alignment of donor support to the EAC,</p>	<p>There is an urgent need to strengthen the EAC secretariat in terms of institutional and human capacity, funding for effective implementation of the RAIP.</p> <p>There is a need for member states to increase their financial resources allocation to the EAC in order to better plan and implement the agriculture and food security (AFS) plans.</p> <p>There is an urgent need to align the EAC Medium Term Expenditure Framework to projects/programmes and donor funding to the Community in order to reverse its decline.</p> <p>The current trends of mobilization of internal and external private investment are commendable and need to be supported and sustained. There is a need to establish a policy and institutional environment conducive to attracting the private sector.</p> <p>The increased willingness among development partners to allocate more funds for agricultural development for the EAC RAIP is commendable and need to be effective. Efforts should be made to provide incentives for the bank to finance agriculture in the member states.</p> <p>Sustain the good progress in delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process and take necessary steps to be on-track on public expenditures to agriculture and attracting domestic private investment in the next Biennial Review</p>
---------------------------------	--	--	---

		<p>donor funding to the Community has been on the decline in recent years, partially attributed to misalignment between the EAC Medium Term Expenditure Framework and activities/projects approved by the donors (EAC JSR, 2019).</p> <p>Despite the CAADP implementation in EAC, the largest private sector investment comes from the domestic sources with the farmer taking up the largest share. Other private sources include the Foreign Direct Investments (FDIs) from overseas countries. The private sector investment challenges are addressed through strengthening the policy, legal and institutional frameworks (EAC, RAIP 2018, EAC).</p> <p>Despite the increased willingness among development partners to allocate more funds for agricultural development for the EAC RAIP, there is a glaring funding imbalance from the bank to the member states. (EAC, RAIP 2018, EAC).</p> <p>Despite the good progress made by the EAC for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/ Malabo Process in 2017, the region continues to be underperformed in public expenditures to agriculture and in attracting domestic private investment in 2019</p>	
--	--	---	--

		(EAC's consultation, 2020; BR 2017; BR 2019; EAC JSR, 2019, EAC).	
COORDINATION & COOPERATION	<p>The overall implementation and coordination institution of the RAIP is the EAC Secretariat through the Sectoral Minister Councils. The relevant ones are: Agriculture and food security; Trade; Environment councils. The different Sectoral Minister Councils converge at the Level of the EAC Productive and Social sector Division of the secretariat and decisions that affect other sectoral councils are communicated across the sectoral minister councils. The coordination between public and private actors is done through engagement with the Non State Actors Forum. The Development Partners is engaged with the REC through the Development Partners Consultative Forum. The REC established the Projects Coordination Unit to ensure efficient management of DPs resources. They are coordinated through Joint Assistance Strategy. A relatively large number of regional stakeholders are involved in the EAC agriculture and food security agenda and the Community is acutely aware of the need to coordinate these stakeholders to achieve the development goals assigned to the sector. Several regional organizations representing private sector and farmers exist among others: East Africa Business Council, East African Farmers Federation. These are strong organizations that have capacity to influence the regional agenda but implementation of their recommendations is a challenge. Coordination within EAC institutions is well provided in the EAC Treaty, its protocols including the Common Market Protocol and the 5th Development Plan. The Treaty specifies the institutions for oversight, coordination and implementation of the regional agreements, policies and plans. This institutional framework cascades to the various sectors including Agriculture and Food security. Within the EAC Secretariat, DAFS is responsible for developing policies and plans, coordinating implementation by the various stakeholders and monitoring and evaluation.</p>	<p>Despite the existence of the Projects Coordination Unit through Joint Assistance Strategy to ensure efficient management of DPs resources, the lack of clear inter-departmental coordination structures within the EAC Secretariat including the Department of Agriculture and Food Security (DAFS) and of intra-institution mechanism of coordination with other relevant EAC institutions. There are strong organizations in EAC that have capacity to influence the regional agenda but implementation of their recommendations is a challenge (ECDPM, DP No. 128c, 2012; EAC JSR, 2019).</p> <p>The establishment of a Development Partners Consultative Forum convened in 2017 and in 2018 to enhance donor coordination and alignment of development partner support with EAC priorities, if sustained and operational is commendable, is likely to promote better coordination of DP support to the EAC and to foster synergies and leverage available resources while avoiding duplication of efforts in financing EAC programmers and projects. (EAC JSR, 2019).</p>	<p>Different coordination platforms are well established in East Africa Community. However, effort should be made to clarify the inter-departmental coordination structures within the EAC Secretariat in order to ensure efficient management of DPs resources and in the coordination of stakeholders through effectiveness of clarity and responsibility of each one of the actor in the EAC agricultural sector. Also in the improvement of taking into account the recommendations of regional organizations representing private sector and farmers to achieve the development goals assigned to the sector.</p> <p>The establishment of a Development Partners Consultative Forum to ensure coordination must be effective and sustained.</p> <p>There is an urgent need to improve traction, clarity and political mandate of regional investment plan in order to mobilize and coordinate DPs.</p>

<p>Industrial Development, and Tourism and Wildlife Management. The coordination between public and private actors is achieved through stakeholder planning and review meetings where both public and private actors are engaged. The coordination across sectors that are relevant to agriculture is achieved through an inter-ministerial coordination team and the current role of REC among others is to develop a monitoring and evaluation framework with indicators to track effectiveness of RAIP implementation. The Development Partners coordination is based specifically on Memorandum of Understanding and Regional Joint Sector Review mechanisms (EAC's consultation; JSR, 2019).</p>	<p>The establishment of a Development Partners Consultative Forum convened in 2017 and in 2018 to enhance donor coordination and alignment of development partner support with EAC priorities, if sustained and operational is commendable, is likely to promote better coordination of DP support to the EAC and to foster synergies and leverage available resources while avoiding duplication of efforts in financing EAC programmes and projects. (EAC JSR, 2019).</p> <p>There seems to be consensus that most DPs tend to support more national agriculture programmes than regional one in the region as there is usually more traction, clarity and political mandate at this level than at the regional level (ECDPM, DP No. 128c, 2012, EAC).</p>	
---	--	--

MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY	<p>The Directorate of Productive Sector plays the coordination role between DAFS and other productive sector departments such as Environment and Natural Resources, Energy, The EAC CAADP Compact adapted and adopted the CAADP Results Framework from which the RAIP M&E System emanates. The M&E is part and parcel of the RAIP and the budget execution is reported back through Audits, Public Expenditure Reviews (PER), Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) and presentation of budget statements to the East African Legislative Assembly (EALA). The indicators to be monitored for RAIP implementation are derived from the EAC CAADP Results Framework. The EAC has a Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) at all levels from the Secretary General's Level to the Technical Officers including the directorate of Productive Sector. The M&E findings are not widely disseminated and the RAIP is known but more sensitization is needed (EAC's consultation; JSR, 2019).</p> <p>In the RAIP's Implementation Plan, the EAC committed to develop a MEL Plan for the Regional Agricultural Investment Plan (2018-2022). The MEL plan would provide a mechanism for assessing performance of the Investment Plan in achieving objectives and results. (EAC's consultation).</p> <p>It is worthwhile pointing out that the EAC has an M&E policy which guides the EAC Common Market Protocol M&E system. To operationalize the policy the EAC has developed the East African Monitoring System (EAMS) which serves as the EAC's main monitoring tool. EAC uses this system to track implementation status of the EAC Common Market Protocol and decisions. All EAC decisions and directives which have been made since 2001 by EAC Summit, Council of Ministers, and Sectoral Councils are recorded and monitored through EAMS. The EAMS is implemented through an online database which is comprised of a regional EAMS Central database and EAMS Country databases at Partner State level. The central database is managed by the Secretariat,</p>	<p>Despite the existence of a unit responsible for Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) and the recognition that M&E system in mutual accountability processes, the EAC's Department of Agriculture and Food Security is deficient in terms of sectorial M&E specialists and procedure. This negatively impacted on the ability of Department of Agriculture and Food Security (DAFS) to effectively implement the CAADP M&E results framework and the mutual accountability mechanism for the agriculture and food security sector. Moreover, the M&E findings are not widely disseminated and there is no platform for sharing JSR experiences in other countries. (EAC, 2018; Food and Nutrition Security Strategy 2018–2022, February, 2018; EAC JSR, 2019).</p>	<p>A platform for sharing JSR experiences with other countries and RECs should be established at regional level and more fund is needed to keep operational the M&E system overall.</p> <p>Strengthen the capacity of the M&E unit through human and institutional capacity building.</p> <p>Reinforce the governance structures, organize adequate accountability forums, increase the participation of and communication among stakeholders.</p> <p>Sustain the good progress made by the EAC in establishing inclusive institutionalized mechanisms and platforms for CAADP Mutual Accountability and peer review and take necessary steps to meet its benchmark target in the next Biennial Review.</p> <p>There is an urgent need to develop the RAIP M&E framework in line with the NAIP.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>while the country databases are managed by the Ministries of EAC Affairs in the member states. Although the EAC region organizes a Joint Sector Review (JSR) annually, the implementation through at partner state level through national plans and budgets is not adequate. The regional issues tend to take a back burner in sector budgets. There is no platform for sharing JSR experiences with other countries and the lack of operating budget hindered participation of partner states and non-state representative experts to organized meetings. The REC is held accountable especially by the regional Members of Parliament (JSR, 2019).</p>	<p>Despite the good performance on mutual accountability displayed by the EAC, it is yet to be well developed to achieve the desired action and results in agricultural sector due mainly to weakness in governance structures, inadequate accountability forums, limited involvement of key stakeholders, poorly informed target group/ farmers, limited information channels, and weak M&E systems, inadequate training and capacity building to countries, ReSAKSS, Issue Note No.27, June 8, 2018; EAC, RAIP 2018, EAC).</p> <p>Despite the good progress made by the EAC in establishing inclusive institutionalized mechanisms and platforms for CAADP Mutual Accountability and peer review in 2017, the region failed to meet its benchmark target in 2019 (BR 2017; BR 2019).</p> <p>Despite the alignment of the NAIPs to the Malabo Declaration, the RAIP M&E framework is not developed concurrently with the NAIP neither included as part of the RAIP (EAC's consultation, 2020).</p>	
--	---	---	--

ECOWAS

	PROCESS	LESSONS LEARNED	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	<p>All the governments of the 15 ECOWAS member states, economic and technical institutions, organizations of non-state actors (POs, NGOs and civil society, private sector), TFPs and Experts of the Regional Support Program for Food Security and Nutritional (RAIP-FNS) of CILSS, research institutions participated in the development and design of the RAIP and the CAADP round table in 2015-2016. Prior to the the formulation of the RAIP document, a stocktaking assessment was made and the findings were translated in the formulation of the RAIP. Likewise, the findings of the national consultations served as a basis for the preparation of the RAIP. An annual evaluation of the RAIP is carried out and its findings used for its improvement. The RAIP takes into account both the public and the private sectors, in particular non-state actors. To ensure effectiveness and efficiency, Member States have received special training on FAO's sector and sub-sector approach. In terms of planning frameworks, the hierarchy runs from the Community Development Plan, the regional agricultural policy(ECOWAP), national agricultural policies and finally to national agricultural development plans. The RAIP-FNS is therefore a component of the Community Development Plan. The successive planning frameworks are aligned from top to bottom with the community strategic framework designed by all departments / directorates. The design goes from vision to priority areas from which all departments and directorates derive their specific priority areas aligned with the core areas. The programs and projects are designed and derived from this process. In the region, there is also another agricultural policy which is the Agricultural Policy of the West African Economic and Monetary Union (UEMOA) called PAU and at the level of CILSS, there is a Food Security Strategy Framework (FSSF).</p>	<p>As the agriculture component of the ECOWAS-Community Development Programme (CDP), the ECOWAS RAIP-FSN's formulation and implementation process is participatory, inclusive, owned, known and aligned to the Regional and Continental Policies and Programmes (ECOWAP-CAADP), the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) and to international Programmes such as Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the United Nations 2030 Agenda. Moreover, the alignment of the RAIP-FSN indicators to the regional and international Programmes anchors these practices. When continental and country-level link up, a major momentum can be created. However, the sustainability of these practices depends on their continuous budgeting allocation for regular consultations and meetings (GIZ Report, June 2020; ECOWAS Consultation, 2020).</p>	<p>-The anchorage of the planning and formulation process through the adaptation of the CAADP process (Aide-memoire) is relevant and should be pursued for a region with existing planning and formulation processes. The need for synchronization of this regional planning and formulation process with that of national processes remains a challenge. The ECOWAS is often confronted with budgetary arbitration issues in the face of regional and country priorities. The current reliance or dependency on DPs funding at the expenses of internal mobilization is a path to be reversed to ensure ownership and sustainability.</p> <p>Last not least, there is an urgent need to operationalize all the implementing instruments of the RAIP for the agricultural transformation to take place in the region. Further efforts should be made to improve on the institutional arrangements of implementation of RAIPs currently shared between the different sub-regional institutions(RAAF, CORAF, AFRICA RICE, CILLS, UEMOA etc) under the leadership of the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Water resources with limited capacity</p>

<p>The PAU and the FSSF recognize are aligned to the ECOWAS agricultural policy and all contribute to the formulation of the RAIP. The operationalization of ECOWAP is done through the RAIP. There are several thematic strategies (rice, milk, youth employment, regional food security reserve, etc.). The roles between the RAIP and other regional agricultural programs are well defined. Synergy and complementarity efforts are underway to enable the different programs to be implemented fluently. Consultation frameworks as well as high-level dialogues exist for this purpose. The instruments for implementing the regional agricultural policy are not all operational. Often, there are budgetary arbitration issues in the face of regional and country priorities. In addition, the region experiences many recurring climatic (drought, flood), security, etc. crises which hamper or destroy the efforts to implement the RAIP. The RAIP has technical, regulatory, financial and organizational Implementation instruments: (i) Technical implementation instrument (The Regional Agency for Agriculture & Food - RAAF, which is the Executive implementation mechanism); (ii) Regulatory Implementation mechanism - There are various regulations and policies; (iii) Financial Implementation instrument is the ECOWAS Agriculture Development Fund (ECOWADF); (iv) Organizational Implementation instruments include Consultative Committee on Agriculture & Food (CCAF) as well as the Interdepartmental Committee on Agriculture. The instruments for implementing the RAIP are regional programs, TEC, regulations on seeds, fertilizers and pesticides, regional funds, regional agency for project implementation. Beyond ECOWAP, there is the overall monitoring and evaluation system of the ECOWAS community based on its vision declared in the community strategic framework 2011, 2015, 2016, 2020 aligned with the AU agenda 2063. Quarterly reports are produced and consolidated at Abuja level.</p>	<p>Contrary to the formulation of the first generation of ECOWAS RAIP (2010-2015) in which strong emphasis has been placed on agricultural production, inputs and productivity at the expenses of nutrition, food consumption issues, private sector's incentives, social protection for the majority of small scale farmers/family farmers with limited access to agricultural resources, credit and markets in West Africa and other emerging issues, the ECOWAS RAIP-FSN (2016-2020) is more comprehensive and more tuned to regulation and investment instruments to support member States, professional organizations and the private sector. These supports are also extended to nutrition, social protection, gender, climate change due to a thorough stocktaking assessment conducted resulting in a wide coverage of programmes being implemented by ECOWAS and technical institutions (FAO, 2016; ECOWAP 2017; DAERE, 2019; FAO, 2020)</p>	<p>The alignment dynamics displayed by the region in the process of formulating and implementing are commendable and these practices should be sustained through adequate internal mobilization of financial resources for regular consultations and meetings.</p> <p>The capitalization of accumulated lessons and emerging issues, the thorough stocktaking assessment, the adaptive approach built in the formulation of ECOWAS RAIP are commendable and should be sustained. Other regions may learn from these practices,</p>
--	---	--

<p>On the technical side, CILSS is rolling out a complete system composed of the Harmonized Framework for the analysis of vulnerable areas and populations, monitoring of the agricultural season, markets, PREGEC and RPCA. To assess the implementation of these instruments and their effectiveness several standards are set to determine their effective implementation depending on the instruments: (i) Existence of the regulations; (ii) Operationalized tools; (iii) Head quarter agreement; (iv) Account number. The political and legislative framework is favorable to the implementation of the RAIP, except for customs duties on rice and milk powder. However, efforts remain to be made to further improve the institutional environment. The RAIP is part of the annual planning process at the regional department of agriculture (RAAF) level through regional projects. In addition, ECOWAS often organizes mid-term reviews of its ECOWAP implementation strategy where regional and national actors come to present their contributions to the implementation of the RAIP. The RAIP dictates the annual work plan of the Directorate of Agriculture & Rural Development of the ECOWAS Commission. From the RAIP, programs and projects are proposed, which in turn are linked to the ECOWAS Vision as well as priorities. It should be noted the contribution of Development Partners (DP) in support to the RAIP are through the regional projects/programmes such as PRAPS, P2RS, PREDIP, PEPISAO etc.</p>	<p>The new generation of ECOWAS RAIPs is built on past lessons learned and accumulated past achievements and challenges faced by the region in the formulation and implementation of investment plans (livestock and pastoralism, gender mainstreaming... etc) (ECOWAS and NEPAD, 2017)</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>Despite the good progress made by the ECOWAS for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process in 2017 facilitated by several region wide engagements ECOWAS has had with the countries, regional and country stakeholders as well as technical support provided by the ECOWAS Commission and its technical partners to its Member States, the region failed to meet its benchmark target in 2019 (BR 2017; BR 2019).</p>	<p>Sustain the good progress in delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process facilitated by several region wide engagements ECOWAS and necessary steps should be taken to be on-track on its benchmark target in the next Biennial Review.</p>
--	--	--	---

FINANCE & INVESTMENT	<p>The planned funding is mainly mobilized from the Member States, the DPs and the private sector. The region's budgeting cycle is twofold: (i) At the ECOWAS level, the budget cycle is annual (January to December); (ii) Each operational programme has a steering committee that meets annually to define the programmes, plans and budgets and most of these programmes have different budget cycles depending on organization's strategy and these range from 1 year to 5 years. The budget process is very transparent for both schemes. For the ECOWAS interventions, the Council of Administration and Finance is held twice in a year and their outcome goes to the council of Ministers for adoption. The same process is followed at the country level. For programmes and projects funded by development partners, a steering committee follows an open process. The CAADP target of 10% of public expenditure to agriculture has not been met by the region (4.21% between 2014 2019) even though a few countries have made tremendous progress and only 6 countries have met the Maputo target. The Region has a Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) involving all sectors related to Agriculture. Besides, there is a regional Parliamentary Committee on Agriculture with specific sessions dedicated to agriculture. The Committee has a chair and clerk assigned to take care of all agriculture issues. To facilitate the Public Expenditure Reviews (PER), the budget structure of the commission is made by theme. Allocation is given to the sector and by sub-sector. Agriculture's budget is not merged. This makes it possible for review, comparison Percentage by the directorate, among others. The RAIP budget mainly comes from the Member States. Several DPs are supporting the RAIP financially but mainly operational are USAID, AECID, DDC, WB, FAO, JICA, GIZ, EU, AfDB, Swiss Cooperation, Spanish cooperation, among others. The ECOWAS Regional policy funding mechanism depends largely on community levy, where the Member States commit and contribute funds to a common basket, which is in turn allocated based on the existing needs and priorities.</p>	<p>Contrary to the prevailed inadequate alignment of Technical and Financial Partners with the priorities of ECOWAP during the first and second generation of NAIPs and RAIPs, the establishment of ECOWAP Donors Group with rotating leadership (World Bank, African Development Bank, USAID, EU, AFD, Swiss Cooperation, Spanish Cooperation, GIZ, etc) ensures this alignment and facilitates the funding of regional initiatives such as the West Africa Initiative for Climate Smart Agriculture (WAICSA), PRAPS, P2RS, PREDIP, PEPISAO and future regional initiatives in line with the second commitment of Malabo declaration (Enhanced investment finance in agriculture) (ECOWAS 2017 and 2019).</p>	<p>The current trends of mobilization of development partners' funding to the ECOWAS investment plan due to the establishment of ECOWAP Donors Group with a view to align their priorities with that of the region should be sustained.</p> <p>Despite the support of current positive trends of mobilization of external financial resources to ECOWAS investment plan, there is an urgent need to mobilize the internal financial resources of the Community to support the implementation of the regional plan in order to ensure its sustainability</p> <p>Sustain the good progress made by the ECOWAS in delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process and take necessary steps to be on-track on public expenditures to agriculture and on attracting domestic private investment in the next Biennial Review</p>
---------------------------------	---	--	--

<p>The sectorial approach is used for regular public-private dialogue and platforms.</p>	<p>Contrary to the pre-vailed heterogeneity in terms of visions as well as involvement of DPs in 2015, the outcome of available matrix of ECOWAP regional projects pertaining to thematic and regional programme for the period 2015-2019 reveals a large distribution of funding (36% of loans and 64% of donation) and a wide diversity of institutional and operational modalities in term of implementation (26% of projects managed by ECOWAS i.e. about 10% of total contribution of TFPs, against 74% managed by other institutions). Nevertheless, the contribution of TFPs to ECOWAP (AFD /ECOWAP Donors Group) indicates some of the following limits: the lack of response of some ECOWAP Donors Group, the lack of information about some major programmes and difficulties to communicate on future financial commitments. The strong dependency on external funding i.e. on TFPs for formulating and implementation regional programmes is source fragility of the regional food sovereignty (DAERE, 2015; DAERE, 2019).</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>Despite the good progress made by the ECOWAS for delivering on Malabo commitments in completing CAADP/Malabo Process in 2017, the region continues to be underperformed in public expenditures to agriculture and in attracting domestic private investment in 2019. CAADP has recognized the need to engage the private sector but has been unable to do so in a systematic and sustainable manner (BR 2017; BR 2019; GIZ Report, June 2020). .</p>	
--	--	---	--

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">COORDINATION & COOPERATION</p>	<p>All six ECOWAP stakeholder groups (private sector, professional organizations, research institutions, government, civil society organizations, technical & financial partners) contribute to RAIP implementation. The Private Sector is organized, strong and vocal. Federation of West African Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FEWACCI) that brings together National Associations has its Executive Secretary domiciled within the ECOWAS Commission to serve as liaison. Like FEWACCI, farmers associations are well organized with clear leadership and management. From the beginning of the process of formulating the RAIP, the role and importance of the private sector were demonstrated. The roles and responsibilities of the public and the private have been defined. Perhaps in the implementation, the private sector was not able to benefit from all the necessary support, also considering the overall business environment in the countries and at the regional level. Agribusiness and the development of agro-food chains are the main components of the RAIP. There is a medium-term Regional Development Plan of 5 years. The Directorate of Agriculture & Rural Development is the coordinator while all stakeholders have their clear roles and responsibilities. For coordination of its implementation, the RDP is translated into specific strategies, actions, or initiatives mainly by value chain or themes e.g. rice strategy, youth employment strategy, local dairy value chain, Yam value chain Fisheries & aquaculture strategies. In terms of coordination across sectors, the Directorate of Agriculture & Rural development does the coordination with RAAF as the lead technical/administrative manager. However, the Directorate finds itself in the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Water resources, coordinated by the Commissioner. Also, there are an inter-departmental committee on Agriculture and the ECOWAS parliament with a committee on agriculture. In the implementation of the RAIP, the current roles of REC are to provide funding for the implementation of the RAIP, to help, guide, design and implement plans as well as to ensure reporting.</p>	<p>The ECOWAS RAIPs are coordinated by the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Water Resources (DAEWR) under the leadership of the Commissioner. The regional agricultural investment plans are formulated and implemented through the advisory support of the Consultative Committee on Agriculture and Food (CCAF). The CCAF is supported, technically, by different ad hoc thematic Task Forces. The formulation and implementation of the RAIPs involves well-structured state and non-state actors. There is a framework of dialogue and consultation due to important investments in terms of capacity building to increase the capacity of organizations</p> <p>The Regional Agency for Agriculture and Food (ARAA/RAAF) is the implementing agency under the control of DAEWR. It ensured the coordination and the management of 14 regional programmes in 2019 against 3 in 2015 and is increasingly recognized as a credible institution of donors and TFPs (DAERE, 2019; RAIP-FSN 2016-2020).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ There is a need to reinforce the coordinating of DPs' actions at regional and country level for a successful implementation of the RAIP. ▶ Effort should be made to address the financial constraints that hinder the wiliness of action of the Department of Agriculture in terms of coordination of the RAIP. <p>The institutional setting for the formulation and implementation is operational and effective and should be supported. The coordination and management capacity of the regional programmes by the RAAF should be strengthened in the light of continuous increasing programmes.</p> <p>The current alignment trend of development donors to the ECOWAS policies and priorities should be supported and sustained.</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>The coordination within the Department of Agriculture works very well: (i) at the ECOWAS level; (ii) at National level; and (iii) at regional and national levels combined with other RECs. However, there are financial constraints that hinder the wiliness of action of the Department of Agriculture. The Directorate of Agriculture & Rural Development is the host/Coordinator of the RAIP. There are also Technical Working Groups as part of the RAIP coordination mechanisms. The FEWACCI is deeply involved on a day to day basis in the RAIP coordination mechanisms. There exists the ECOWAP Donor Group which is coordinated by the Directorate of Agriculture & Rural Development. This was a regulation passed with a compact signed and being implemented. The ECOWAP Donor Group does not have its coordination mechanisms, it was designed specifically to help in the governance of the ECOWAP/RAP/NAIPs. Since the establishment of this presidency, the lead donor in Agriculture was first taken by the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation for Development (AECID) from 2010 to 2015 and then by the US Agency for International Development (USAID) from 2016 to December 2018. Currently, the lead donor is Agence Francaise Developpement (Afd). DPs coordination is REC driven. RECs coordinate the agenda of DPs instead of allowing DPs simply push their agenda. However, there is a problem of coordinating DPs actions at regional and country level. Neither the REC, nor the countries manage to ensure real coordination of the action of the DPs. Even between DPs, there is a coordination problem.</p>	<p>Contrary to the prevailed situation in the past, the current interventions of TFPs and socio-professional institutions are increasingly aligned to the ECOWAP policies and priorities and the ECOWAS leadership in terms of coordination/monitoring of interventions of various stakeholders is enhanced (DAERE, 2015 ; CEDEAO, 2019).</p>	
--	---	--

MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY	<p>Both Top-down and bottom-up approaches are used in the M&E system. At the continental level, the CAADP develops a CAADP Results Framework and this framework forms the basis for the ECOWAP M&E Results Framework (RF). It is aligned with the CAADP framework. At the regional level, the 15 ECOWAS countries were involved in the development process. While a regional M&E system exists, each country's M&E system is closely linked with the regional and vice versa. Also, each regional stakeholder has its M&E system, which they use to contribute to the ECOWAP M&E RF while there exists a Regional M&E working group that comprises M&E experts of all Regional stakeholders as well as Ministries of Agriculture of the countries. There exists a Regional Statistics Office which collects and does analysis depending on the request of the commission. This M&E system is geared towards managing regional integration. Within ECOWAS, there is the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Water Resources to which the Directorate of Agriculture belongs. REC has a database system called ECOAGRIS. It operates as a platform whose objective is to strengthen information systems at different local, national and regional scales to meet information needs for monitoring the food and nutritional situation, for vulnerability analysis, for decision support. Other Departments contribute to the implementation/outcome of the RAIP. For proper and effective results, the monitoring of the RAIP is mainstreamed in their M&E systems. Typically, the Regional Agency for Agriculture & Food (RAAF) based in Lomé has its M&E system taking the RAIP into account. The monitoring of the implementation of the RAIP is integrated into the M&E of the partner departments. ECOWAS has the ECOWAS Agriculture Information System in place. This system has been in place and considers systems decentralized at country level, linked to the regional level ECOAGRIS system. This is specifically for the Agriculture sector. Each sector has its own specific M&E system, and a mechanism is developed to merge all inputs as and when required.</p>	<p>Despite the recognition of the value of M&E as a key component of Mutual Accountability for Action and Results and the existence of M&E regional framework, data centralization, and analysis and reporting system with accountability components for monitoring and implementation of the regional policy, the sustainability of the system hinges on its continuous funding that currently depends largely on development partners (BR 2017; BR 2019; FAO, 2020).</p>	<p>Efforts should be made to avoid the fragmentation of small projects and therefore, manage to design a large program in which several small projects could be integrated according to their common objectives, for a common planning and monitoring.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ It is expected that ECOWAS adopt a management fees policy in order to take part of the funds allocated by the donors to finance impact evaluations and the designing of new projects. ▶ There is a need to have a monitoring-evaluation focal point, who intervene at all levels of the monitoring-evaluation chain, on each project to better value the results in the framework of results-based reporting and to strengthen his/her capacities. ▶ There is a need to mobilize internal funding for the M&E and the ECOAGRIS systems. <p>Efforts should be made to strengthen data centralization and analysis, reporting system with accountability components for monitoring and implementation of the regional policy and to mobilize internal financial resources for the sustainability of the M&E system.</p>
--	---	--	--

<p>The RAIP implementation indicators are 14 in number. The indicators were defined by all the actors who are members of the regional monitoring and evaluation task force. ECOWAS through its central ECOWAS M&E unit under the office of the ECOWAS Vice President has a regional Community Strategic Framework that guides design, implementation, and reporting. The Agriculture sector also has the ECOWAP Results Framework coupled with a list of indicators, technical guidelines defining such indicators and data collection tools. The Agriculture sector conducts Regional Joint Sector Reviews which are carried out annually and the recommendations are being translated into actions to catch up with subsequent ones. The Department of Agriculture, Environment and Water Resources oversees the implementation and monitoring of the RAIP. The RAIP is known at continental, regional and country levels. Even partners at global level know and value it. There is a Regional Compact signed, which makes it everyone's business to ensure it is implemented. The institutional reform of ECOWAS has fostered consistency between planning and monitoring-evaluation with the creation in the agencies of strategic planning and monitoring-evaluation positions by involving monitoring-evaluation from the planning stage. The M&E and the ECOAGRIS systems rely on external funding at the expenses of internal resources.</p>	<p>Despite the merit of ECOAGRIS system as a regional information instrument hinged on national information systems, the sustainability of the system depends on continuous funding, national capacity to provide the regional mechanism with regular, reliable and independent database on harmonized methodologies (RAIP-FNS 2016-20, ECOWAS).</p>	
---	--	--

3.3 General conclusions and recommendations

NAIPs

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	
<p>-The CAADP planning, formulation and implementation processes through “the “Country CAADP Implementation Guidelines under the Malabo” are being adopted and adapted by all the countries and RECs as a tool for formulating and implementing the NAIPs and RAIPs with non-identical path and patterns of adoption, adaptation and capacity.</p> <p>-In all the countries under investigation, the planning and formulation process of the NAIPs is being structured (Côte d’Ivoire, Ghana, Malawi, Rwanda and Togo) in terms of alignment with the national, regional continental and international reference documents, inclusiveness, CAADP Round Table organization, stocktaking assessment, and high-level political representation. However, the process is more embedded and structured in the country planning and formulation process in Rwanda than other countries. This good performance cannot be achieved without the government and DPs’ financial support to the process.</p> <p>- The NAIPs are widely owned and known to key stakeholders at national levels, but its knowledge and ownership by the general public and beneficiaries cannot be evidenced.</p> <p>-In terms of implemented instruments, all the countries are not at the same level. Some countries are well advanced as related to the implementation of these instruments (Ghana, Rwanda) than others (Côte d’Ivoire, Malawi and Togo).</p> <p>-The CAADP planning and formulation processes have some impact on improvements in the enabling environment with more inclusive policy dialogue providing platform for all stakeholders. This created a growing concurrence on the important role that the agriculture sector plays in economic growth, poverty reduction and transformation. This can be attributed to the impact of the CAADP planning structures and processes</p>	<p>-The anchorage of planning and formulation process of the NAIP observed in all countries should be sustained. However there is a cost associated with this good achievement. In this respect, there is a need for a continuous government financial support to the process. The accumulated experiences should be capitalized and scaled up to other countries on the continent</p> <p>-There is a need to translate the NAIPs document into local languages for large dissemination.</p> <p>In order to enhance the NAIP ownership the government should not only communicate more on NAIP through advocacy and policy dialogue but also make the NAIP the reference working document in the agricultural sector.</p> <p>-It is also important that some countries that are lagging behind in terms of instruments’ implementation for agricultural transformation to learn from well-performed countries. However, the instruments approach developed by Togo in the formulation process is commendable and should be replicated in other countries or scaled up as it gives not only more precision and clarity in what one intends to achieve but also and most importantly how one implements it.</p>

FINANCE & INVESTMENT

-The budgeting processes of the NAIPs are guided by the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) for the country. The Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) used as the tool for the NAIP budgeting process in all countries under investigation is relevant and appropriate but needs to be anchored in budgeting process of the country except in Rwanda where the budgeting system is more structured

- ▶ The contribution to NAIP's budget comes from the public, private sector and DPs. For the past decade, all the countries under investigation are underperformed in terms of public expenditures to agriculture sector for meeting the Malabo target commitment of 10%. There is a significant setback compared to the previous biennial review of 2017. During the past decades, the trends of public expenditures and agricultural growth performance for countries under investigation are summarized in the following table.

NAIPs

PAYS	2019	2014-2019		
	Public expenditures in agriculture (%)	GDP (%)	Public expenditures in agriculture (%)	GDP (%)
Cote d'Ivoire	3.2	3.62	3.68	4.53
Ghana	9.7	4.65	0.77 (2013-2018)	3.61
Malawi	6.86	4.3	13.81	1.94
Rwanda	4.33	5.3	7.06	5.24
Togo	4.47	3.32	6.42	4.35

Source: ReSAKSS. 2020. Tracking indicators and Monitoring progress. <https://www.resakss.org/>

These downward trends expose the countries to be highly dependent on external funding with a loss of ownership, sustainability and sovereignty of the NAIPs

The Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) as a tool for budgeting is appropriate and should be pursued and reinforced as it improves efficiency of public expenditure, improves predictability of resource flows and improves efficiency, raises resource consciousness and promotion of output or outcome focused approaches, and improves accountability. In practice, at this stage, only the Rwanda budgeting system can be recommended for other countries for its merits.

- ▶ There is need to increase public expenditures to agriculture.. Efforts should be made to reverse the current trends of increasing DPs support at the expenses of public expenditures in compliance with the Malabo Declaration
- ▶ It is necessary to attract private investments in agriculture through:
 - ▶ reating enabling business environment through legislative and fiscal policies,
 - ▶ developing skills in deals and negotiations with private investors,
 - ▶ developing a culture of transparency and accountability,

Implementing key reforms instruments for attracting private investment as in the case of Ghana and Rwanda,

- ▶ the experiences of RDB (Rwanda Development Board) are appealing and can be replicated in other countries. RDB is responsible for overall private sector investments in market linkages. It supports public private dialogue (PPD) mechanisms and value chain (VC) platforms in collaboration with PSF to address key challenges in private sector development. RDB supports private sector investment and advise other institutions and ministries in public private partnership (PPP). RDB is an excellent example of public-private partnerships translating policy into action (Rwanda's consultations, 2020)

- ▶ In all the countries, a diversity of incentives policy and legislative reforms have been put in place to attract the private sector's investment with limited impact on agriculture (Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Malawi) and no impact (Togo). For the second generation of the NAIPs, some countries like Côte d'Ivoire and Togo opt for "agro-poles" in the process of transformation of their agriculture. This option" seduced the private sector. Unfortunately, the lack of clarity in the process and the delayed implementation of key reforms do not attract private sector's investments.

The case of Rwanda in terms of institutional arrangements and reforms (Rwanda Development Board) and approach (investment in infrastructures) is relevant and attractive as they prepare and secure private investments. The setup of the RDB (Rwanda Development Board) to support public and private investment has facilitated the mobilization of private investment in the country. RDB is an excellent example of public-private partnerships translating policy into action (Rwanda's consultations, 2020). Other countries may learn from the Rwanda experiences.

To create enabling environment for the private sector investment, the country has established the Ghana Incentive Base Agriculture Financing Scheme (risk guarantee instrument to push and encourage banks to loan more to agriculture).

In all the countries, a diversity of incentives policy and legislative reforms have been put in place to attract the private sector's investment with limited impact on agriculture (Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Malawi) and no impact (Togo). The case of Rwanda in terms of institutional arrangements and reforms (Rwanda Development Board) and approach (investment in infrastructures) is relevant and attractive as they prepare and secure private investments. Other countries may learn from the Rwanda experiences

In Ghana, the established Incentive Base Agriculture Financing Scheme (risk guarantee instrument to push and encourage banks to loan more to agriculture) is commendable and can inspire other countries.

COORDINATION & COOPERATION

All the countries under investigation has a coordination set up or mechanism integrating various stakeholders with well-defined roles and responsibilities. However, in the implementation phase, the coordination is not effective due to internal shortcomings especially the lack of operating budget .for its functioning

There is a need to reinforce the inter-sectorial collaboration through policy dialogue platforms and active engagement and participation of stakeholders in Rwanda and Malawi.

it is important to put in place a single reference framework for consultation (strengthening of the OP/CSO framework) which will be representative in the steering, decision-making in Togo

There is a need to improve the inter-departmental coordination, the coordination across sectors and clarify the role and the responsibilities of all stakeholders in Ghana and Malawi.

The establishment of an inter-ministerial Task Force led by a TFP as in the case of Côte d'Ivoire accelerates communication between the different ministries and to better coordinate the process.

The steering mechanisms and platforms put in place in Rwanda viz. the Agricultural Sector Working Group (ASWG), the Sector Wide Approach (SWAp) group, the Sub Sector Working Groups (SS-WGs) and Joint Action Development Forum (JADF) have enhanced the internal agricultural sector coordination for an effective implementation of the PSTA4. This is an excellent example of well-established coordination system that can be reproduced in other countries.

MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY

The NAIP's monitoring and evaluation framework is inspired by the national systems. The M&E is seen as a mandatory part of the NAIP. However, in practice, the system does not seem to be working as it should due to some bottlenecks. The lack of funding for data collection and the weak coordination are the main challenges faced by the countries. The establishment of CPAF (Common Performance Assessment Framework) and DPAF (Development Performance Assessment Framework) and Performance contract has reinforced the M&E system in Rwanda.

It is urgent to:

- ▶ strengthen the capacities of central services, as well as the decentralized services of the ministries involved in the implementation and monitoring-evaluation system of the NAIPs in order to build an effective and efficient M&E system in Côte d'Ivoire
- ▶ Support financially the M&E system and institutions for achieving the expected results in Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Malawi.
- ▶ The benefits provided by CPAF (Common Performance Assessment Framework) and DPAF (Development Performance Assessment Framework) and Performance contract (Imihigo) in implementation of PSTA4 in Rwanda are significant. Other countries should use these tools for accountability.

RAIPs

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
POLICY & PLANNING	
<p>The planning and formulation process of the RAIPs in all the RECs under investigation were aligned with the regional, continental and international reference documents, inclusive. The CAADP Round Table was also organized and stocktaking assessment was undertaken with different methodologies sometimes away from the CAADP principles of independent stocktaking assessment. The RAIPs have also benefited from a high-level political representation. The RAIPs are widely owned and known by key stakeholders at national and regional level, but their reaching out and ownership to the general public is not evidenced.</p> <p>In terms of implemented instruments, all the RECs are not at the same level. Some RECs are doing better (EAC, ECOWAS), than others (ECCAS) where the policy and legislative frameworks are gradually improving. The RAIPs implementation process faces challenges such as such as climatic and security crises, unclearly defined roles and responsibility and lack of synchronization in the process of formulating of the RAIP and the NAIPs.</p>	<p>It is urgent to synchronize the process of formulation of the RAIP and the NAIPs to ensure complementarity between the RAIP and the NAIPs and to strengthen the political and legislative framework for the implementation of the RAIP</p> <p>It is timely that an independent stocktaking assessment be carried out for the third generation of the ECOWAS RAIPs under preparation and that AUDA-NEPAD conduct an independent assessment of the ECOWAS RAIPs as in the cases of ECCAS and EAC</p> <p>More clarity on the roles and responsibilities of non-state actors is required for effective implementation of the RAIP i.</p> <p>All the RECS are faced with budgetary arbitration issues in the face of regional and country priorities and dwindling contribution by member States. The current reliance and dependency on DPs funding at the expenses of internal mobilization is a path to be reversed to ensure ownership and sustainability.</p> <p>Last not least, there is an urgent need to operationalize all the implementing instruments of the RAIP for the effective agricultural transformation to take place in the region. Further efforts should be made to improve on the institutional arrangements of implementation of RAIPs currently shared between the different sub-regional institutions (RAAF, CORAF, AFRICARICE, CILLS, UEMOA etc) under the leadership of the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Water resources) with limited capacity</p>

FINANCE & INVESTMENT

The EAC and ECOWAS's budgeting cycle is annual. But the budget process in ECCAS is not done annually and not in a transparent and accountable manner. ECOWAS has a steering committee that meets annually to prepare the budget of each operational programme. In the planning and formulation of the RAIPs, the budget contributions are supposed to come mainly from the member states complemented by DPs and private sector resources. However, in practice, the member states failed to contribute as they should.. The CAADP target of 10% of public expenditure to agriculture has not been met by the RECs, a serious setback compared to the 2017 Biennial Review

RAIPs

RECs	2019	2014-2019		
	Public expenditures in agriculture (%)	GDP (%)	Public expenditures in agriculture (%)	GDP (%)
ECCAS	2.46	4.19	1.95	4.33
EAC	4.07	4.07	3.52	4.35
ECOWAS	4.14	2.86	4.21	3.75

Source: ReSAKSS. 2020. Tracking indicators and Monitoring progress. <https://www.resakss.org/>

These poor regional financial contributions expose the region to external funding with the risk of loss of ownership, sustainability and sovereignty.

Between 2013 and 2019, the RAAF/ECOWAS managed a total of 18 projects/ programmes amounting to 197 million USD. Only 17% of the budget of these projects/programmes funded by ECOWAS and the remaining 83% are funded by DPs.

Moreover, the private sector mobilization in all regions is not effective due to weak policy, legal and institutional frameworks. Many RECs recognize the importance of the private sector investment but the big challenge remains how" to attract the private sector at regional level"

There is a need to put in place a dedicated framework for the private sector and to secure and guarantee regional private investments, for regional projects and programmes' funding.

Efforts have to be made by the Member States to increase their public expenditure to agriculture in order to meet the CAADP target of 10%. The current downward trends of public expenditures to agriculture should urgently be reversed to enable the RECs to regain their credibility and sovereignty.

The ECOWAS twofold budgeting cycle structure (i) at the ECOWAS level, the budget cycle is annual (January to December); (ii) Each operational programme has a steering committee that meets annually to define the programmes, plans and budgets, is an excellent example of budgeting process. This is commendable and can inspire other RECs.

- ▶ Moreover, the private sector mobilization in all regions should be main concerns in all regions. In spite of political and institutional frameworks. that needs to be strengthened, the big challenge remains how" to attract the private sector at regional level. It is timely that the AUDA-NEPAD organize a forum of learning experiences on the issue

COORDINATION & COOPERATION

All the RECs under investigation have a coordination mechanism involving various stakeholders for planning and formulating their RAIPs. However, the implementation of these mechanisms is only effective in EAC and ECOWAS. The establishment and the operationalization of Federation of West African Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FEWACCI) that brings together National Associations has reinforced the RAIP coordination mechanism (structured around the Directorate of Agriculture & Rural Development, the Regional Agency for Agriculture and Food (ARAA/RAAF) and the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Water Resources (DAEWR)) in ECOWAS

. In ECCAS, the public body which is the technical monitoring committee in charge of coordination were not put in place due to the reform process initiated at the ECCAS level.

In all the cases, most of the RAIPs are faced with a lack of operating budget for their coordination mechanisms. The regional private investment mobilization is a big challenge. Most of the RECs recognize the importance of the regional private sector role in the implementation of the RAIPs but the “how to attract the private sector” is a big challenge in all the RECs.

Reinforce the coordination process by establishing and ensuring the operation of the Regional Council on Agriculture, Food and Nutrition (CRAAN), in ECCAS.

There is a need to take into account the recommendations of regional organizations representing private sector and farmers to achieve the development goals assigned to the sector.

Efforts should be made to mobilize the operating budget for the coordination of the RAIPs

The establishment and the operationalization of Federation of West African Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FEWACCI)—that brings together National Associations and has its Executive Secretary at the ECOWAS Commission serves as a liaison office is a good step that needs to be operationalized to produce tangible results for the region. This is commendable and need to be reinforced. It can be replicated in other RECs..

MONITORING & ACCOUNTABILITY

ECOWAS and EAC have their own M&E systems of which indicators to be monitored for RAIP implementation are derived from the CAADP Results Framework. However, ECCAS’s M&E system is based on the AUDA-NEPAD Mutual Accountability Framework.

The existence of ECOAGRIS database system has strengthened the M&E system and the findings are produced mainly in annual reports, factsheets and books and are widely disseminated and accessible including on websites in ECOWAS. In contrary, the M&E findings are not widely disseminated in other regions. As part of the M&E system, a Joint Sector Review (JSR) is organized annually in each region. There is no platform for sharing JSR experiences with other countries within EAC and ECCAS contrary to ECOWAS. The lack of operating budget hindered participation of partner states and non-state representative experts to organized meetings in all regions.

There is an urgent need to establish a dedicated monitoring and evaluation unit for the ECCAS-RAIP to ensure its fluent implementation

A platform for sharing JSR experiences with other countries and RECs should be established at regional level and more fund is needed to keep operational the M&E system overall.

Efforts should be made to avoid the fragmentation of small projects and therefore, manage to design a large program in which several small projects could be integrated according to their common objectives, for a common planning and monitoring.

There is a need to have a monitoring-evaluation focal point, who intervene at all levels of the monitoring-evaluation chain, on each project to better value the results in the framework of results-based reporting and to strengthen his/her capacities.

There is a need to mobilize internal funding for the M&E system.

	<p>The existence of ECOAGRIS database system has strengthened the M&E system in ECOWAS. It operates as a platform whose objective is to strengthen information systems at different local, national and regional scales to meet information needs for monitoring the food and nutritional situation, for vulnerability analysis, for decision support. ECOAGRIS is an excellent example of monitoring platform which is commendable and can be replicated in other RECs.</p>
--	--

IV. ANNEXES

ANNEX A: List of relevant documents consulted

12 Years of German Support to CAADP Lessons Learnt and Sustainability. SNRD PPARD Webinar | GIZ, 30 June 2020

Accelerating CAADP Country Implementation A Guide for Implementors

Agriculture sector investment plan 2009 -2012, Rwanda.

Programme National d'Investissement Agricole de deuxième génération

(2018 –2025). Rapport sur le bilan d'exécution sur la période 2018- 2019

CAADP at 10: Progress Toward Agricultural Prosperity. African Growth Initiative at BROOKINGS.

CAADP Country Implementation under the Malabo Declaration (April 2016)

CAADP Implementation Strategy and Roadmap (2015)

Capacity Strengthening Strategy through Capacity Needs Assessment for Country Level Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (SAKSS) ReSAKSS CNA Report #5 | August 2014, GHANA.

ECOWAP/CAADP process 2025. Regional agriculture investment plan - food and nutrition security (RAIP-FNS 2016-2020)

Guidelines for Non State Actor participation in CAADP processes (2011)

Guidelines for Non State Actor participation in CAADP processes Prepared for the working group by Ian Randall of Wasafiri Consulting. January 2011. CAADP Working Group on Non State Actor participation (2011).

Implementation strategy and roadmap to achieve the 2025 vision on CAADP (2014)

Inaugural Biennial Review Report of the African Union Commission on the Implementation of the Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared prosperity and Improved Livelihoods. Assembly Decision (Assembly/AU/2(XXIII)) of June 2014

The 2017 progress report to the Assembly Highlights on Intra-African trade for agriculture commodities and services: Risks and Opportunities

Investing for Food and Jobs (IFJ): an agenda for transforming Ghana's agriculture (2018-2021)

Medium term agricultural sector investment plan (METASIP) ii, 2014 – 2017, Ghana.

Medium term agriculture sector investment plan (METASIP) 2011 - 2015, Ghana.

National Agricultural Investment Plan (NAIP). Prioritised and coordinated agricultural transformation plan for MALAWI: FY 2017/18-2022/23

Policy Paper Report of the Malabo Policy Learning Event on the Biennial Review Report & Process 23rd and 24th April 2018 Libreville, Gabon

Programme National d'investissement Agricole (PNIA 2010 – 2015), COTE D'IVOIRE.

Programme National d'Investissement Agricole de deuxième génération (2017 – 2025). Rapport final. Novembre 2017, COTE D'IVOIRE.

Programme National d'Investissement Agricole et de Sécurité Alimentaire (PNIASA -2010 – 2015), TOGO.

Programme National d'Investissement Agricole et de Sécurité Alimentaire et Nutritionnelle. 2ème génération du PNIA (PNIASAN- 2017 – 2026), TOGO.

Programme Régional d'Investissement Agricole, de Sécurité Alimentaire et Nutritionnelle en Afrique Centrale, Décembre 2017, CEEAC.

Regional Workshop on Accelerated Domestication of Malabo Declaration by Members States and Regional Economic Communities. 27 Feb to 2nd March, 2018 Protea Hotel by Marriot Lusaka, Zambia

Revue post-pacte du PDDAA de la CEEAC. Rapport de la RTEI du PRIASAN, 18 Juillet 2016

Second Biennial Review Report of the African Union Commission on the Implementation of the Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods

The 2019 Progress Report to the Assembly Highlights on “Resilience and Livelihoods

The CAADP Results Framework 2015-2025 “Going for results and impacts” “Sustaining CAADP momentum (April 2015)

The NEPAD biennial review guidelines (2016)

The Programme of Work “Operationalizing the Malabo Declaration on African Agriculture and CAADP Implementation Strategy and Roadmap” (2015)

The Programme of Work: operationalizing the Malabo Declaration on African Agriculture and the CAADP. Revue technique externe indépendante du plan national d’investissement agricole, et de sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle (PNIASAN) 2017-2026 Togo rapport final de la revue johannesburg, south africa septembre 2019

Secretariat technique du pnia. Rapport general sur le processus de formulation du pnia de deuxieme generation de la cote d’ivoire, novembre 2017

ATELIER DE VALIDATION DU BILAN DU PNIA DE PREMIERE GENERATION ET D’IDENTIFICATION DES AXES STRATEGIQUES DU PNIA DE DEUXIEME GENERATION, GRAND-BASSAM, du 31 mai au 02 juin 2017. RAPPORT GENERAL

Revue post-pacte du PDDAA de la CEEAC. Rapport de la RTEI du PRIASAN, NEPAD 18 Juillet 2016

Ceeac, programme regional d’investissement agricole, securite alimentaire et nutritionnelle en afrique-centrale, decembre 2017

Fao. 2020. Cluster evaluation of “establishing a hunger-free initiative for west africa” and “mainstreaming nutrition in caadp and agriculture policies and programmes in sub-saharan africa”. Project evaluation series, 04/2020. Rome.

Département Agriculture, Environnement et Ressources en Eau. Processus ECOWAP/PDDAA Horizon 2025 Rapport des travaux des Experts sur le bilan et les perspectives de l’ecowap 2025

(Conakry, Guinée, 2-4 Décembre 2019)

Département Agriculture, Environnement et Ressources en Eau, Processus ECOWAP/PDDAA. Conférence Internationale sur l’Agriculture en Afrique de l’Ouest. Forum global « Bilan ECOWAP+10 et Perspectives pour 2025 »

Caadp. Revue technique externe indépendante du plan national d’investissement agricole, et de sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle (pniasan) 2017-2026 togo rapport final de la revue johannesburg, south africa septembre 2019

Mofa (2017), DRAFT WORKSHOP REPORT Social Safety Nets in the Context of Agriculture & Incorporating the SSN Concept in to the 2nd Generation NAIP (METASIP III) 25th & 26th April, 2017

Mofa, (2018) 2018 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT, 2018
ISBN: 978 - 9964 - 975 - 74 - 0

Ministry of Food and Agriculture (2007) Food and Agriculture Sector Development Policy (FASDEP II), August 2007

Ministry of Food and Agriculture, (2013) Mid-term Review of the Medium Term Agriculture Sector Investment Plan (METASIP), September 2013

Resakss CNA Report #5, (2014) Capacity Strengthening Strategy through Capacity Needs Assessment for Country Level Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (SAKSS) August 2014

Mofa, AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PROGRESS REPORT, 2017

ReSAKSS. 2020. Tracking indicators and Monitoring progress. <https://www.resakss.org/>

ANNEX B

4.1. Methodology

Through a participative process involving all the stakeholders (state actors and non-state actors) at country and REC's levels, the methodological approach is as follows:

- Inception meeting
- Desk review
- Data collection phase and report drafting

The detailed presentation of the methodological approach is presented in Annex B

4.1.1. Inception meeting

Through a videoconference, the consultant interacted with the AUDA-NEPAD team composed of the Procurement Officer, the Principal Programme Officer-CAADP and his assistant at the headquarters in Midrand, South Africa. The inception meeting held on 26 August 2020 was preceded by the negotiation meeting held on 9 July 2020. Only technical issues discussed are presented in this report.

The technical discussions focus on the common understanding of the terms of reference of the assignment namely the objectives, the scope, methodology and deliverables. Other issues discussed involved the: focal points in selected countries and RECs; the introduction letters, the required documentation and the sampled countries and RECs. On the latter, after discussion with NEPAD-CAADP, an agreement was reached on five countries (namely, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Malawi, Rwanda and Togo) and three Regional economic Communities (RECs) (namely, ECOWAS, ECCAS and EAC

4.1.2. Desk review

Various documents are being consulted ranging from CAADP policy documents at national and regional levels, national development plans, existing agriculture policies and programs, NAIPs or RAIPs, mid-term reviews and technical reports on NAIPs and RAIPs. Factual and relevant secondary data and evidences are being collected using the following template (table 2).

Table 2: Desk review template

-Questions raised in the NAIP Appraisal ToolKit - Questions raised in the specific objectives (ToRs).	LESSONS FROM NAIPs/ sources	LESSONS FROM RAIPs / sources
1. Policy & Planning		
2 Finance & Investment		
3. Coordination & Cooperation		
4 Monitoring & Accountability		

Overall, the ongoing desk review is enabling the consultant to examine existing documentation on planning, formulation and implementation processes in order to take stock of preliminary lessons learned presented in Part III. A list of the documents consulted is presented in annex A.

4.1.3. Data collection phase and report drafting

► Identification of selected NAIPs and RAIPs

Based on an agreement reached between the Consultant and NEPAD-CAADP, the study covers five countries (namely, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Malawi, Rwanda and Togo) and three Regional economic Communities (RECs) (namely, ECOWAS, ECCAS and EAC).

Table 3: Selected countries and RECs for NAIP and RAIP

Selected countries and RECs for NAIP and RAIP	
COUNTRIES	
Côte d'Ivoire	NAIP
Ghana	NAIP
Malawi	NAIP
Rwanda	NAIP
Togo	NAIP
RECs	
ECOWAS Headquarters (Nigeria)	RAIP
ECCAS Headquarters (Gabon)	RAIP
EAC Headquarters (Tanzania)	RAIP

► Briefing meeting with the focal points of selected countries and RECs

A briefing meeting will be held with each selected country and REC. In order to structure the discussions, each selected country and REC is requested to provide relevant documentation on its NAIP or RAIP. The purpose of this meeting is to ensure that there is a common understanding of the assignment and to seek advice about the best possible ways to organize and undertake the fields' intervention.

► Identification of target constituencies/stakeholders

Each selected country and REC is requested to provide the list of constituencies/stakeholders involved in the planning and implementation of the NAIPs and RAIPs. At this stage, only the ECCAS has provided a list of the **target constituencies/stakeholders for its RAIP**.

The identification of constituencies/stakeholders in each selected country and REC facilitated their mapping at national and regional levels and field's interventions and organization of the consultants' team.

- **At country's level**, the group of stakeholders comprises public institutions, private sector institutions, civil society, financial institutions, donors etc. If the number is large, the group will be sampled based on its stratification. It is only this selected sample that will be considered for interview.

- **At REC's level**, not only the member States but also the regional support institutions, donors and experts will be considered for interview. However, if the number is large, given time and budget constraints, the member States will be sampled.
- The proposed sample of countries for ECOWAS with fifteen (15) member States is five (5) countries selected on the basis of the three accepted languages (French, English, and Portuguese). These countries are:
 - French speaking countries: Côte d'Ivoire, Togo
 - English speaking countries: Ghana
 - Portuguese speaking countries: Cabo Verde, Guinea-Bissau,
- For ECCAS comprising of nine (9) countries, 5 countries are selected as follows:
 - French speaking countries: Gabon, Democratic Republic of Congo
 - English speaking countries: Cameroon
 - Portuguese speaking countries: Equatorial Guinea, Angola
- Finally for EAC comprising 12 countries, 5 countries are also selected:
 - French speaking countries: Burundi
 - English speaking countries: Rwanda, Kenya, Tanzania, Ethiopia

These sampled countries will be complemented by the regional support institutions, donors and experts. Obviously, if the group of the regional support institutions and experts is large, it will be also sampled based on the type of institutions (public, private, civil society, financial institutions etc).

The target constituencies/stakeholders identified and their locations in the selected countries and RECs are summarized in the following table 4:

Table 4: Target constituencies/stakeholders for NAIP and RAIP

Target constituencies/stakeholders for NAIP and RAIP		
COUNTRIES		
Côte d'Ivoire		
Ghana		
Malawi		
Rwanda		
Togo		
RECs		
Institutions	Member States	Sample of selected member States
ECOWAS Headquarters (Nigeria)	Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Cote d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo.	Côte d'Ivoire, Togo, Ghana, Cabo Verde, Guinea-Bissau
ECCAS Headquarters (Gabon)	Angola, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Sao Tome and Principe.	Gabon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Cameroon, Equatorial Guinea, Angola
EAC Headquarters (Tanzania)	Burundi, Comoros, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, South Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda.	Burundi, Rwanda, Kenya, Tanzania, Ethiopia

► Elaboration of data collection tools /instruments

Primary and complementary data will be collected using elaborated interview guides. Triangulation techniques will be mobilized for data collecting. The data collection tool is elaborated on the basis of key questions raised in the specific objectives of the ToRs and in the NAIP Appraisal ToolKit. The following table summarizes the structure of the interview guide:

Table 5: Structure of the interview guide

Questions raised in the NAIP Appraisal ToolKit	Questions raised in Specific objectives
1. Policy & Planning	1. What are the RECs and countries with unique and successful experiences, as well as challenges, in planning and implementing their RAIPs and NAIPs?
2 Finance & Investment	2. What are the linkages exist between a REC's RAIP and the NAIPs of their Member States?
3 Coordination & Cooperation	3. What are the roles and responsibilities played by various stakeholders in RAIP and NAIP formulation and implementation?
4 Monitoring & Accountability	4. What are the relevant practices and lessons learned in the formulation, implementation of their RAIPs and NAIPs by the selected RECs and countries that will add value to the process in future? 5. What are the key success factors in rolling out a RAIP and a NAIP in the selected countries and RECs? 6. What are the recommendations on mitigating the identified challenges, scaling up successes and domesticating these practices by other countries and RECs?

4.1.3.1. Data collection

Preliminary phase

1. Briefing of CAADP constituencies' /stakeholders/ focal points/ interviewers by country and REC

At this stage, communication has been established between the focal points and the consultant. All the countries have responded except Malawi. All the RECs have also responded. However, required documentation is still awaited from Malawi, Côte d'Ivoire, ECOWAS and EAC.

2. Planning and organization of data collection by country and REC

Planning is underway to organize the fields' interventions.

Data collection and analysis phase

3. Physical or online interview with stakeholders (respondent, interviewer and consultant)

Given the peculiar context of COVID-19, the interview guides are administered through local interviewers in the sampled countries and RECs: five (5) countries (namely, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Malawi, Rwanda and Togo) and three Regional economic Communities (RECs) (namely, ECOWAS, ECCAS and EAC).

4. Consultation of key informants

About 30 informants from DPs, FARA and SROs, AGRA, AUC and Technical NetworksNet works were consulted

2.4.3.2. Report drafting

5. Data processing and drafting of preliminary report on lessons learned by country and REC
6. Country/ REC validation of lessons learned.
7. Drafting a consolidated report to be submitted to AUDA-NEPAD.
8. Presentation and discussion of the draft report by stakeholders at a virtual technical validation meeting organized by AUDA-NEPAD.
9. A Power-Point presentation on the major findings and recommendations to be submitted to AUDA-NEPAD.
10. Submission of the final report



Contact Information



230 15th Road, Randjespark
Midrand, 1685



+ 27(0) 11 256 3600



info@nepad.org



AUDA-NEPAD
AFRICAN UNION DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

CAADP