



CAADP

CAADP Review

Renewing the commitment to
African Agriculture

Interim Report, November 2009
NEPAD secretariat

PARTNERSHIPS
IN SUPPORT
OF CAADP



AFRICAN UNION



NEPAD

A PROGRAMME OF THE AFRICAN UNION

List of Consultants for CAADP Review

- Chris Ackello-Ogutu (Kenyan), Associate Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Nairobi
- Mustapha Guellouz (Tunisian) Independent Consultant
- Simon Kisira (Ugandan), Independent Consultant
- Julius Mangisoni (Malawian), Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics, Bunda College of Agriculture, University of Malawi
- Egnonto Nicolas M. Koffi-Tessio (Togolese), Head of the Department of Rural Economics and Sociology, School of Agronomy, University of Lomé, Togo
- Stephen Tembo (Zambian) Independent Consultant
- Michael Wales (British), Independent Consultant
- Augustin Wambo (Cameroonian), Independent Consultant

For more information contact:

Dr. Maria Wanzala

Senior Specialist, Agriculture Marktes, CAADP Pillar 2

Email: MariaW@nepad.org

Contents

Abbreviations.....	iv
Foreword	vi
Preface	viii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	x
CAADP REVIEW	1
1. Introduction.....	1
African Agriculture Crisis and CAADP	1
Methodology	2
2. Milestones	3
3. Findings.....	3
Relevance	3
African ownership.....	3
Added value.....	4
Private sector.....	4
Strategies and policies.....	4
Pillar frameworks.....	5
Changing environment.....	5
Effectiveness.....	5
Framework.....	5
Ownership at country level	6
Implementation processes	7
Pillar frameworks.....	9
Capacity strengthening.....	10
Strategies and policies.....	11
Resource flows.....	11
Dialogue with private sector and civil society	12
Dialogue with development partners.....	13
Governance of CAADP	13
Reporting and communications	15
Capability	15
Sustainability	16
Vision	16
Institutions.....	16

Partnerships.....	16
Absorptive capacity	17
CAADP targets.....	17
Analytical support, M&E.....	17
Political support.....	18
Implementation Lessons	18
Planning process.....	18
Role of RECs.....	19
Pillar lead institutions.....	20
Partnerships.....	20
Development partner commitment	20
Congruence with AU.....	21
4. Regional Perspectives.....	21
North Africa (Working Paper 1).....	21
West Africa (Working Paper 2).....	22
East Africa (Working Paper 3).....	24
Southern Africa (Working Paper 4)	25
5. Recommendations: The Way Ahead	28
Concept.....	28
CAADP as a framework and service provider	28
Institutional Aspects.....	29
Governance structures	29
Political context	29
Management and administration.....	30
Communications.....	31
Implementation Processes	32
Stage I: Policy dialogue.....	32
Stage II: Investment programme design	34
Central support functions.....	36
Renewed Partnerships.....	38
6. Strategic Plan 2008-2013: Comments	39
7. Conclusions.....	40

Annexes

- 1. CAADP Review Terms of Reference**
- 2. The View of the Development Partners**

Working Papers

- 1. Regional Report: North Africa**
- 2. Regional Report: West Africa**
- 3. Regional Report: East Africa**
- 4. Regional Report: Southern Africa**

Abbreviations

AAA	Accra Agenda for Action
APF	Africa Partnership Forum
APRM	African Peer Review Mechanism
ASARECA	Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa
ASIP	Agriculture Sector Investment Programme
AU	African Union
AUC	African Union Commission
BRIC	Brazil, Russia, India, China – non-traditional donors
CGE	Computable General Equilibrium model
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CILSS	Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel
CORAF/WECARD	West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development
CMA/WCA	Conference of Ministers of Agriculture of West Central Africa
CSIF	Country Strategic Investment Framework
DFID	UK Department for International Development
DONATA	Dissemination of New Agricultural Technologies in Africa
DREA	Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture (of the AUC)
DWG	Donor Working Group (at country level, for agriculture)
DP	Development Partner
EC	European Commission
ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
ECCAS	Economic Community of Central African States
ECOWAP	Regional Agricultural Policy (for ECOWAS member states)
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
FANRPAN	Food Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FARA	Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa
FDI	Foreign direct investment
FIMA	Framework for the Improvement of Rural Infrastructure and Trade-Related Capacities for Market Access (Pillar 2)
FP	Focal Point
GDPRD	Global Donor Platform for Rural Development
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GPAFS	Global Partnership for Agriculture and Food Security
GTZ	German Technical Cooperation Agency
ICT	Information communication technology
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IITA	International Institute for Tropical Agriculture
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPTA	Innovation Platform for Technical Adoption
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
MAPP	Multi-Country Agricultural Productivity Programme
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MDTF	Multi-Donor Trust Fund

M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NARS	National Agricultural Research System
NASRO	North African Sub-Regional Research Organization
NMTIP	National Medium Term Investment Programme
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development
NPCA	NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Authority
ODA	Official development assistance
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PAEPARD	Platform for African-European Partnership in Agricultural Research for Development
PD	Paris Declaration (on Aid Effectiveness)
PER	Public expenditure review
PLI	Pillar Lead Institution
PP	(CAADP) Partnership Platform
RAILS	Regional Agricultural Information and Learning Systems
R&D	Research and development
REC	Regional Economic Community
ReSAKSS	Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System
RISP	Regional Indicative Strategic Plan (SADC)
RIU	Research into Use
ROPPA	Réseau des Organisations Paysannes et des Producteurs de l'Afrique de l'Ouest (West African Farmers Association)
SACAU	Southern African Confederation of Agricultural Unions
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SCARDA	Strengthening Capacity for Agricultural Research and Development in Africa
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SIP	Sector Investment Programme (for SLM under TerrAfrica)
SLM	Sustainable land management
SSA CP	Sub-Saharan Africa Challenge Programme
UKZN	University of KwaZulu Natal
UMA	L'Union du Maghreb Arabe
UMAGRI	Union Maghrébine des Agriculteurs
UNZA	University of Zambia
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WB	The World Bank

Foreword

By Dr Ibrahim Assane Mayaki, Chief Executive Officer of the Secretariat of NEPAD

When the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) was launched by the five initiating Heads of State (Algeria, Egypt, Nigeria, Senegal and South Africa) at the 37th Summit of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in July 2001, it was clear that addressing the challenges facing African agriculture would be central to achieving its goals. The eradication of poverty, achieving sustainable growth and development, integrating Africa fully and beneficially into the global economy and accelerating the empowerment of women cannot be achieved unless agriculture in Africa is transformed.

The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) is a genuinely Africa-owned and Africa-led framework through which the goal of transforming agriculture in Africa can be achieved. The Agriculture Unit of the NEPAD Secretariat has worked tirelessly with its partners at country level, the regional economic communities and development partners to accelerate the implementation of the CAADP agenda. This review of CAADP implementation has taken place after what have been five challenging years. The challenges have taken many different forms. The decades of neglect of agriculture by African governments and development partners is difficult to reverse but definite progress has been achieved as many governments seek to fulfil their commitment to devoting 10% of their budgets to agriculture and as development partners earmark additional development assistance to the sector. The global food, energy and financial crises have hit African economies hard but, assisted by the quick response by NEPAD in organising a broad stakeholder workshop on the high food price crisis, governments have generally responded well.

I would like to underline some of the findings of the review. The greatest achievement of CAADP to date has been to demonstrate its relevance to accelerating the growth of the agriculture sector in Africa and to bring African agriculture to the top of the development agenda. It has successfully garnered the support of all the major development partners both politically, through statements on the importance of supporting African agriculture at G-8 summits, and financially, through the creation of a US\$60 million Multi Donor Trust Fund dedicated to enhancing CAADP implementation. It has also shown itself to be flexible and responsive to emerging issues such as climate change, bio-energy and high food prices. CAADP's biggest disappointments have been its failure to secure greater understanding and ownership of CAADP at country level, and to not achieve more in terms of increased investment in the sector by governments and development partners.

Building upon its successes, CAADP must look ahead and strengthen its effectiveness in achieving the goals that have been set and take steps to redefine its responsibilities, streamline its procedures and secure more and reliable resources in order to guarantee the sustainability of its important work. The transformation of NEPAD into a Planning and Coordinating Authority (NPCA), fully integrated into the African Union and with clear definition of roles and responsibilities, will go a long way towards strengthening the effectiveness of CAADP.

The recommendations set out in the review address many of these questions and will, I believe, empower CAADP to play its part in enabling African agriculture to realise its true potential. One recommendation stands out. It is proposed that the time is right for CAADP to move beyond being simply a "process" to becoming a provider of services – what might be called "continental public goods" - in support of

accelerating growth in the agriculture sector. Such services would draw increasingly upon African institutions and African expertise and would be demand-driven. There are two practical manifestations of this idea. The first is to create an Investment Preparation Facility which would provide resources to deliver technical assistance to help stimulate greater investment in agriculture by governments, development partners and the private sector. The second is to build “centres of excellence” in the agricultural sciences that will attract human and financial resources into biosciences, networking regional centres with national research institutions, and strengthen the foundation for sustainable enhancement of African agricultural productivity.

I would like to commend the NEPAD Agriculture Unit for commissioning this review of CAADP implementation at this time and offer my full support for the recommendations that have been proposed.

Preface

The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) was launched in 2003. The programme started with broad consultations with governments and regional economic communities on the scope and purpose of the programme, attempting to identify priority investments and early actions. A coherent approach to accelerating implementation of the programme did not emerge until 2006 when the country level roundtable process was launched.

The idea of conducting a review was first mooted in 2008 when the CAADP implementation process had been in motion for just over two years. Even at this stage there were indications that implementation was not proceeding as quickly and smoothly as expected and for this reason the NEPAD Secretariat Agriculture Unit felt strongly that there was a need to systematically review progress. The purpose was to better understand the factors that had contributed to areas where there had been successes, as well as identifying factors that were hindering progress. The overall aim was not to lay blame on any actors or processes but to refine the framework and the tools that were employed so that implementation could be improved in the future. Consequently, the review adopted a forward-looking perspective, basing its recommendations for the future on the best available data and the views and experience of senior government personnel, the staff of the regional economic communities and development partners.

In order to optimise its impact on decision-making processes, the review set out to target its recommendations at the African Union Summit of Heads of State and Government in July 2009. Given the delays in securing approval and buy-in by all stakeholders, including the necessary financial resources, this meant that the review team had just two months in which to complete its work. The findings of the review are the product of broad consultation with an international technical committee drawn from a wide cross-section of stakeholders. Its recommendations are aimed at proposing changes in the scope and mandate of CAADP in light of the full integration of NEPAD into the African Union, as well as governance structures and financing that will equip CAADP to meet the growing challenges of the development of African agriculture over the next 5-10 years.

The CAADP Review was commissioned by the NEPAD Secretariat, Agriculture Unit and financed by the CAADP Multi-Donor Trust Fund. It was carried out by a team of consultants focused on the different regions: Chris Ackello-Ogutu and Simon Kisirwa (East Africa), Mustapha Guellouz (North Africa), Egnoto M. Koffi-Tessio (West Africa), Julius Mangisoni and Stephen Tembo (Southern Africa). The Technical Coordinator was Michael Wales (consultant), and the NEPAD Coordinator was Maria Wanzala.

The team would like to express its thanks to the NEPAD Secretariat Agriculture Unit for all its support in carrying out the Review. It is also grateful to all the institutions and individuals who gave their time and contributed views and ideas to the Review.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) is a framework that reflects the recognition that in Africa agriculture is central to the alleviation of poverty and hunger. Hence, the successful development of agriculture is crucial to achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The African Union (AU) and New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) launched CAADP in 2003 in an effort to accelerate agricultural growth in the region. In the Maputo Declaration in 2003, Heads of State committed themselves to this goal by agreeing to allocate at least 10% of national budgets to agriculture. The aim is to achieve at least 6% annual rate of growth in the sector which is required in order to impact poverty and hunger. It is the most ambitious and comprehensive agricultural reform effort ever undertaken across Africa, addressing policy and capacity issues and improving effectiveness of development assistance.

It is now six years since CAADP was launched and there is a need to assess progress in order to understand the factors that have contributed to its successes, as well as those hindering progress, in order to refine the framework and the tools that are employed, with a view to improving implementation in the future. The review is also an opportunity to propose changes in mandate, governance and financing that will equip CAADP to meet the growing challenges of development over the next 5-10 years.

The Review was commissioned by the NEPAD Secretariat. It was undertaken by a team of consultants, who consulted with 15 countries and 5 Regional Economic Communities (RECs), the AU and UN Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), meeting with senior officials, as well as seeking the views of the African institutions that are taking the lead in advancing the four CAADP pillars. The views of representative regional farmers’ organizations and the private sector were sought. Development partners(DPs) were also consulted and invited to respond to questions about key aspects of CAADP.

The Review has tried to evaluate the overall vision and goals of CAADP and, within the limited time available, has attempted to assess its successes and challenges, and its relevance, effectiveness and sustainability. In view of the fact that the process of implementing CAADP through roundtables has only been running for less than three years, the Review did not attempt to assess CAADP’s impact in terms of achieving accelerated growth in the agriculture sector. However, considerable effort went into making a set of recommendations to AU/NEPAD that will help to shape CAADP over the next 5-10 years. These concern the CAADP concept, institutional set up, and implementation processes, and include suggestions as to how the partnerships that have brought CAADP to life, can be renewed.

Summary Evaluation

QUESTION	COMMENT
Relevance	Highly relevant to the goal of accelerating the growth of the agriculture sector in Africa
<i>Africa owned, led and funded?</i>	CAADP has reportedly gone further than any other part of NEPAD in articulating African leadership, embracing the adoption of CAADP principles from Heads of State down to line ministries. Ambitious 10% target set for country level funding has been

	achieved in several countries and many more have significantly increased resources.
<i>Added value?</i>	CAADP provides a valuable long term development framework against which other approaches can be set.
<i>Does the CAADP agenda address the needs of the private sector and civil society?</i>	The Pillar 2 framework sets the foundations for greatly enhanced participation of the private sector, including farmers, agribusiness and civil society, in the development of agriculture on the continent.
<i>Relevance to national agriculture sector strategies and policies?</i>	The CAADP framework and principles are relevant across Africa and have provided many governments with a background against which to assess their own strategies.
<i>Pillar frameworks provide useful guidance to countries?</i>	The frameworks provide useful information but, since only one (Pillar 4) was available before 2009, they have not yet been used when designing national programmes and projects.
<i>Responsive to the changing global environment</i>	CAADP has successfully responded to emerging issues impacting the agriculture sector such as climate change and high food prices.

Effectiveness	Limited effectiveness in achieving the goals that have been set
<i>Conveying its purpose as a framework?</i>	CAADP has been beset by the difficulty of conveying to governments its purpose as a framework, having been initially understood as being a programme, with expectations, so far unfulfilled, that investment funds would quickly follow. The issue remains whether CAADP is destined to remain a framework or to move ahead to become an active player in delivering services that could be described as “continental public goods”.
<i>Fostering understanding and ownership at country level?</i>	Launching CAADP through the respective RECs, has not been achieved equally well across the continent and has been generally deficient, in part because of the overly ambitious target of launching the roundtable process simultaneously in two-thirds of the continent.
<i>Implementation process?</i>	The implementation process has been slow and uneven, resulting in just one signed compact, in the COMESA region. The process is presently moving most effectively in ECOWAS.
<i>Have the pillar frameworks helped the implementation process?</i>	The frameworks provide useful approaches and strategies in each of the areas. Two pillars (Pillar 1 by TerrAfrica & Pillar 4 by FARA) have already made an impact on the work being carried out in their respective areas with investments supported by multi-donor trust funds.
<i>Will the draft Implementation Guide be more effective?</i>	The new approach is a significant step forward in refining the implementation process to make it more flexible and tailored to individual country situations, and is likely to be much more successful than the present model.
<i>Is the Compact useful?</i>	The Compact sets a high threshold of approval that cannot be realistically met. Failure to have compacts signed has meant that roundtable efforts are frustrated and progress towards implementing roundtable outcomes is blocked.
<i>Strengthening capacities at</i>	It is not clear whether CAADP has been able to significantly add to

<i>regional and country level?</i>	capacities in the sector. Skills do not appear to have been systematically transferred to African institutions. It cannot be verified whether ReSAKSS has been effective in delivering higher quality planning outputs and it operates in a limited number of countries.
<i>Influencing sector strategies and policies?</i>	There is little evidence that CAADP has had more than minimal influence on national strategies and policies. The econometric modelling part of the evidence-based planning is thought to have been of limited value because of the poor state of most countries' statistics.
<i>Enhancing flow of additional resources?</i>	Little or no additional external resources have come to the agriculture sector that can be directly attributed to CAADP. Only 7 countries have met the 10% budget target. There are potentially large resources flowing from "flagship" projects such as TerrAfrica.
<i>Involvement of the private sector?</i>	There has been little interaction between CAADP and the private sector at country level. Regional farmers' organisations in west and southern Africa have been increasingly engaged through the RECs.
<i>Improving dialogue with DPs?</i>	The main IFIs and donors have committed themselves to CAADP. The success of the CAADP Partnership Platform (PP) in bringing DPs, RECs and country representatives together, as well as the creation of the Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF), reflect this. The CAADP process has strengthened the capacity of governments to engage with DPs on sector issues.
<i>Governance structure?</i>	The governance structure of CAADP, including the AU Commission (AUC), NEPAD and the RECs, does not clearly define responsibilities, which are often overlapping, and do not reflect available capacities.
<i>Reporting back and communicating?</i>	The CAADP Secretariat has reportedly been more effective than any other NEPAD sector units but communication with stakeholders has been inadequate.
<i>Can the CAADP Secretariat fulfil its responsibilities?</i>	The CAADP Secretariat has not been provided with the human or financial resources or legal status to enable it to fulfil its mandate and role.

Sustainability	Without substantial re-defining of responsibilities, making processes more flexible, streamlining procedures and increased resources, CAADP has low probability of sustainability
<i>Does CAADP have a clear vision of how it should proceed?</i>	CAADP's long term vision of stimulating agricultural growth so as to achieve the reduction of poverty and hunger is clear. However, there is a surprising lack of vision of how its medium-term objectives will be met beyond implementing the roundtable process and the signing of compacts.
<i>Delivering its objectives?</i>	The Secretariat cannot fulfil its presently mandated responsibilities due to lack of resources, dependence upon RECs for country level activities, reliance upon an external body for all its administration, and having to consider national, regional and DP political interests. There is a widely held belief that the Secretariat does not operate with the level of professionalism required by an international organisation.
<i>Partnerships?</i>	The Secretariat has to work vigorously to maintain the partnerships

	that have already been forged with DPs through the CAADP PP and with the pillar lead institutions (PLIs).
<i>Can Africa absorb the extra resources?</i>	CAADP has not shown whether the level of investments that have been estimated as being needed to transform African agriculture could be absorbed. There is evidence of unspent resources and low efficiency of expenditure in the sector which reflects the general lack of institutional and human capacity.
<i>Are the Maputo commitment of 10% and the four pillars equally relevant in all African economies?</i>	The Maputo budget commitment and the standard pillar frameworks do not reflect Africa’s diversity or the reality of emerging economies. There is a danger that targeting total expenditure distracts attention from measures to enhance effectiveness.
<i>M&E and peer review?</i>	There is no evidence to show whether effective M&E and peer review have been adopted in countries in the roundtable process.
<i>Political support?</i>	At continental level, political support has been sustained. From the countries visited, actual political support varies greatly reflecting, rightly or wrongly, the perceived failure of CAADP to mobilise increased resources.

Conclusions

CAADP as a political concept has experienced a long and painful genesis in what is, in almost all African countries, a complex and highly sensitive area. CAADP’s task is to tackle the process of reform at country, regional and continental levels and address issues of food security, access to land and water, markets and knowledge. It was built upon a wave of political commitment to reducing desperate poverty and hunger through substantially increasing investment in the agriculture sector and achieving this based upon African ownership and leadership.

Although NEPAD successfully brought a coherent voice to Africa’s commitment to development and attracted strong support from development partners, the agriculture part – CAADP - was initially greeted with some scepticism. However, after five years, CAADP has gone further than any other part of the Partnership in articulating African leadership, embracing the adoption of CAADP principles from Heads of State down to line ministries. It has also secured strong commitment from all the main DPs.

The implementation of CAADP – the translation of the broad concept and principles into reality at regional and country level – has been in process for much less than five years and for this reason the Review considered it inappropriate to assess its impact on agricultural growth. The focus was rather on assessing the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the CAADP implementation process and on making recommendations about how this might be improved.

There is no doubt that CAADP is recognised as being highly relevant to the goal of accelerating the growth of the agriculture sector in Africa. The CAADP processes need to strengthen their relevance to the private sector and to providing technical support that can inform individual country’s strategy and policy formulation. However, the CAADP approach has proved itself relevant at country level and has been able to accommodate major new challenges that have emerged since its inception, such as high food prices, climate change and bio-energy.

The processes that have evolved to translate the CAADP principles into reality, through broad consultation and by trial and error, have had limited effectiveness. They have been constrained by sometimes confused objectives, overly ambitious targets, lack of human and financial resources, and governance and administrative structures that are not adapted to the scale of the task in hand. However, many different factors are coming together to promise a much more hopeful and effective future. At a technical level, sound frameworks have been put together for the four CAADP pillars that will better inform country level policy and strategy dialogue, and a new, more “user-friendly” set of guidelines have been prepared for implementing the roundtable process. The CAADP Secretariat is on the cusp of a new era as NEPAD is fully integrated into the AU, with a substantive NEPAD Chief Executive. It also finds itself well prepared with a credible, results-based five-year strategic plan. The promise of success over the next five years is underwritten by the availability of resources, in the form of the US\$60 million Multi-Donor Trust Fund that will empower the processes that are now ready to go.

The Review is in broad agreement with both the CAADP Secretariat’s Strategic Plan 2008 – 2013 and its draft Implementation Guide. Its recommendations should be seen in the context of these two documents, as being suggestions about how the Strategy and Guide could be further strengthened.

Summary Recommendations

The Review has concluded that CAADP stands at a critical point: it has successfully assembled the support of DPs behind CAADP and now has promising tools and the resources with which to implement the process at country level. However, so far there is little to show on the ground, and this could jeopardise future support. Detailed recommendations are set out in chapter 5.

CAADP Concept

CAADP is, by definition, intended to be comprehensive. The framework (in the basic CAADP document) needs to be revisited to include emerging issues such as climate change and bio-energy, as well as properly integrating livestock, fisheries and forestry. The links with resource mobilisation need to be specifically addressed including suggested mechanisms to make this effective, and the role of the private sector, civil society and farmers’ organisations fully integrated. This is also the moment for CAADP to move beyond being simply a “process”, driven by a vaguely-defined CAADP agenda and by roundtables, to become a provider of services – what might be called “continental public goods” - in support of accelerating growth in the agriculture sector. Such services would draw increasingly upon African institutions and African expertise and would be demand-driven. Specific recommendations include:

- *Revising the CAADP document*
- *Repositioning CAADP as a provider of services*
- *Engaging with the private sector*

Institutional Aspects

Governance: *The status and roles of the CAADP Secretariat must be clearly defined with respect to AU and the RECs, and it must be made accountable for delivering specific outputs. The ambiguities in the overall governance structure of CAADP must be resolved and the necessary resources and capacity building provided. Specific recommendations include:*

- *Preparing for NEPAD-AU integration*

- *Defining clear responsibilities for all stakeholders*
- *Strengthening the role of the CAADP PP*

Political context: *As an integral part of NEPAD which is itself a programme of the AU, CAADP should be unambiguously linked to AU structures, in particular the AUC. Achieving sustained external political support amongst DPs and at country level should be a top priority. Specific recommendations include:*

- *Renewing political support at country level*
- *Broadening and consolidating political support*
- *Reporting on progress regularly through a “scorecard”*

Management and administration: *The CAADP Secretariat should be empowered to fulfil its responsibilities as currently defined. This will entail substantially strengthening and reorganising the CAADP Secretariat and streamlining its procedures. The RECs also need to be strengthened in order to fulfil their roles in CAADP implementation properly. Specific recommendations include:*

- *Undertaking an institutional assessment*
- *Putting in place a result-based management (RBM) system including a log frame and an annual work plan and budget*
- *Ensuring effective management of the MDTF*
- *Strengthening the capacity of the RECs*

Communications: *A communication and knowledge management strategy should be prepared. The style, content and use of communications must be improved, especially targeting countries and DPs, and the link with knowledge management needs to be made stronger. Specific recommendations include:*

- *Developing a medium-term communications and knowledge management strategy*
- *Strengthening global advocacy*
- *Strengthening continental advocacy*

Implementation Processes

*The CAADP implementation process should become an iterative and seamless cycle of policy dialogue and investment programme design. It should proceed seamlessly with carefully diagnosed and empowered **policy dialogue** supported by analytical tools, leading to a “due diligence” report and peer review, followed by assistance in formulating a country-specific resource mobilisation strategy and strong technical support in detailed **investment programme and project design** in close collaboration with identified DPs, leading to the financing of a sector-wide approach (SWAp) or to projects under the umbrella of a programme-based approach (PBA). The role of signing a “Compact” by all stakeholders in the roundtable process should be made less onerous and perhaps be replaced by a memorandum of understanding (MoU) that will allow CAADP implementation to proceed. Specific recommendations include:*

- *Identifying a national CAADP partner institution at country level*
- *Establishing a CAADP Country Team*
- *Designing and supporting a customised implementation process*
- *Introducing a slower, phased approach to implementation*
- *Institutionalising the strategy, policy and investment design process*
- *Putting in place a peer review mechanism*

- *Formulating country-specific resource mobilisation strategies*
- *Formulating a medium-term capacity building programme*
- *Establishing an Investment Preparation Facility*
- *Establishing an effective M&E system*

Central support processes

There are important decisions to be made and agendas to be set in support of CAADP at the continental level which will support the process at country level. This includes the creation of CAADP Country Teams, based on existing national institutions, supported by a CAADP Resource Group, comprising the Secretariat, RECs and PLIs is proposed that would assist country level implementation and capacity development.

Specific recommendations include:

- *Identifying feasible “flagship” programmes*
- *Fostering links with non-traditional donors*
- *Supporting formulation of regional strategies for agriculture*
- *Expanding the ReSAKSS*
- *Focusing more on knowledge management*
- *Building “centres of excellence” in the agricultural sciences*
- *Establishing a set of feasible performance indicators*
- *Carrying out impact studies*

Renewed Partnerships

After five years, and with less than expected results, it is important for CAADP to put special effort in renewing its existing partnerships with countries, RECs, PLIs and DPs, as well as forging new ones with the private sector, civil society, emerging donors and foundations. Specific recommendations include:

- *Re-launching CAADP*
- *Seeking new partnerships*
- *Keeping African agriculture on the development agenda*
- *Consolidating existing partnerships*
- *Adopting new, more nuanced “headline” CAADP targets*

CAADP REVIEW

1. Introduction

The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) is a framework that reflects the recognition that in Africa agriculture is central to the alleviation of poverty and hunger. Hence, the successful development of agriculture is crucial to achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The African Union (AU) and New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) launched CAADP in 2003 in an effort to accelerate agricultural growth in the region. In the Maputo Declaration in 2003, Heads of State committed themselves to this goal by agreeing to allocate at least 10% of national budgets to agriculture. The aim is to achieve at least 6% annual rate of growth in the sector which is required in order to impact poverty and hunger. CAADP was gradually transformed from a "programme" into a "framework" during its initial 2-3 years. It is the most ambitious and comprehensive agricultural reform effort ever undertaken across Africa, addressing policy and capacity issues and improving effectiveness of development assistance.

It is now six years since CAADP was launched and there is a need to assess progress in order to understand the factors that have contributed to its successes, as well as those hindering progress, in order to refine the framework and the tools that are employed, with a view to improving implementation in the future. The review is also an opportunity to propose changes in mandate, governance and financing that will equip CAADP to meet the growing challenges of development over the next 5-10 years.

The framework for agricultural development in Africa is articulated by a CAADP network that consists of governments, RECs, the AU, pillar lead institutions (PLIs) and a range of development partners (DPs). As a network, there are only limited areas for which the CAADP Secretariat can be held accountable. It has limited resources and operates "at arm's length" when it comes to country level implementation.

The recent food and fuel price crises, followed by the financial crisis and the most severe world economic recession for 60 years, underline the need for Africa to consolidate its recent growth successes. It is likely that, as was the case in the economic downturn in Asia starting in 1997, the agriculture sector will prove to be the resilient core of Africa's economies. It will also be the place to which the unemployed and displaced will turn to stave off poverty. The challenge is to ensure that, faced with diminishing revenues, African governments continue to fund agriculture and that the development partners also meet their commitments.

African Agriculture Crisis and CAADP

When CAADP was conceived in 2003, African agriculture was seen to be in crisis. Even though most of its population are farmers, it is unable to feed itself and expends around US\$20 billion each year on food imports. The number of chronically undernourished people is rising and food insecurity is greatest in Sub-Saharan Africa. The situation remains unchanged and may even have deteriorated as a result of high food prices over the last 18 months, exacerbated initially by high oil prices and later by falling agricultural commodity prices.

The solution to the crisis was conceived as being to expand agricultural production in Africa itself. Agriculture contributes directly to economic growth through export earnings, providing industrial raw

materials, as well as giving employment to 70-80% of the population. It is the sector which offers the greatest opportunities to reduce poverty and hunger (MDG 1).

CAADP provided a vision for African agriculture that would achieve food security, improve productivity so as to reach an annual growth rate of 6%, create dynamic agricultural markets, integrate farmers into the market economy, achieve more equitable distribution of wealth, be a strategic player in science and technology development, and practice environmentally sound production methods.

The diagnosis of constraints in the sector pointed to the key fact that African agriculture has long been starved of investment. This led directly to the formulation of four “Pillars for priority investment” that are at the heart of CAADP. When assessing the levels of investment needed, it was shown that both ODA and private investment had fallen dramatically and that there was a need both for Africa itself to commit to funding agriculture as well as external partners to increase support. The total investment needed to 2015 was estimated at US\$251.3 billion. Of this, around US\$141 billion would be capital investment, almost US\$69 billion for operation and maintenance, and US\$42 billion for safety nets, food and emergency relief. It was anticipated that Africa would finance no less than 55% of the total (US\$104 billion) and that the private sector would provide US\$44 billion from domestic sources (US\$27 billion) and foreign direct investment (FDI) (US\$17 billion).

Methodology

The Review was commissioned by the NEPAD Secretariat. It was undertaken by a team of consultants who consulted with 15 countries and 5 RECs, the AU and UN Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), meeting with senior officials, as well as seeking the views of the African institutions that are taking the lead in advancing the four CAADP pillars. The views of representative regional farmers’ organizations and the private sector were sought. Development partners were also consulted and invited to respond to questions about key aspects of CAADP.

The Review has tried to evaluate the overall vision and goals of CAADP and has attempted to assess its successes and challenges, and its relevance, effectiveness and sustainability. However, within the limited time available, its findings are necessarily incomplete and impressionistic. In order to look ahead, the Review put considerable effort into making a set of recommendations to AU/NEPAD that should shape CAADP over the next 5-10 years. These concern the CAADP concept, institutional set up, and implementation processes. It also suggests how the partnerships that have brought CAADP to life can be renewed.

It is important to remember that the implementation of CAADP— the translation of the broad concept and principles into reality at regional and country level – has been in process for much less than five years. The lengthy process of setting up the CAADP support structures including the Agriculture Unit¹ of the NEPAD Secretariat, and the rounds of consultations with RECs and governments in order to establish the CAADP concept meant that implementation – essentially the roundtable process – was not launched until 2006. Furthermore, the lack of monitoring mechanisms at country level and the paucity and reliability of data make it difficult to assess agricultural growth. For these reasons, the Review team did not attempt to assess the impact of CAADP on agricultural growth. The focus is rather on assessing the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the CAADP implementation process and on making recommendations about how this might be improved.

¹ For convenience, the Agriculture Unit of the NEPAD Secretariat will be referred to as the “CAADP Secretariat” throughout this text

2. Milestones

Important milestones in the implementation of CAADP have been:

- **Maputo Declaration:** In July 2003 the Maputo Declaration marked the effective start of CAADP as a framework for accelerating agricultural development and food security. Heads of State committed to allocate at least 10% of national budget to agriculture by 2008.
- **Growth target set:** Models of the agriculture sector indicated that a target of at least 6% annual growth in the sector is needed to significantly impact poverty and hunger.
- **National Medium Term Investment Programmes (NMTIPs):** At the end of 2003, in an attempt to kick-start the CAADP process, FAO undertook a two-year exercise of assisting all African countries to prepare National Medium Term Investment Programmes (NMTIPs) which reflected the CAADP framework, identified priority investments including bankable investment project profiles (BIPPs) and estimated the financing gap in the agriculture sector to 2008.
- **Sirte Declaration:** In February 2004 at the Extraordinary AU Summit of the Assembly on Agriculture, Water and Energy, Heads of State welcomed CAADP and adopted a three pillar strategy for water development. It also committed to adopting an African Common Market and mandated the AUC to explore the feasibility of setting up an African Agricultural Development Fund
- **Roundtable process:** At the Maputo Africa Partnership Forum (APF) meeting in May 2006, a country level process of evidence-based planning was initiated in order to accelerate the implementation of CAADP. The process was to lead to a roundtable in each country between government and development partners, culminating in the signing of a compact.
- **Africa Fertilizer Summit:** In June 2006 in Abuja, a special summit of AU Heads of State and Government was called to launch an African Green Revolution. Fertilizer was declared a strategic commodity and steps were to be taken to increase fertilizer use, reduce costs and enhance farmers' access to it. Accelerated investment in infrastructure, targeted subsidies, national financing facilities and regional procurement and distribution facilities were to be put in place, and an African Fertilizer Development Financing mechanism set up.
- **Abuja Summit on Food Security in Africa:** In December 2006 Heads of State committed, *inter alia*, to promote and protect nine strategic agricultural commodities, promote investment in agriculture-related infrastructure through public-private partnerships, establish a technical assistance programme for agriculture and food security based on African resources and expertise, and to establish a funding mechanism for up-scaling agricultural successes.

3. Findings

Relevance

The overall conclusion is that CAADP is highly relevant to the goal of accelerating the growth of the agriculture sector in Africa

African ownership

To what extent is CAADP Africa owned, led and funded? More than any prior continent-wide initiative, NEPAD has been successful in bringing a coherent voice to Africa's commitment to development. The agriculture sector – CAADP – has gone further than any other part of the Partnership in articulating African

leadership, embracing the adoption of CAADP principles from Heads of State down to line ministries. The ambitious (and ambiguous) 10% target set for country level funding of the sector, has been achieved in several countries and many more have significantly increased the resources allocated to the sector over the last five years (see below). Whilst successfully securing DP commitment to the process, CAADP has retained a strong African character through being part of the AU political system. However, as with any initiative on this scale, there are inevitably cases where little ownership is felt and extra resources have not been forthcoming. A key part of CAADP's vision was the desire to overturn "business as usual" in an attempt to reverse the decline of the sector, its neglect by governments and the dramatic fall in ODA for the sector.

Added value

Does CAADP add value to an environment that is crowded with initiatives? As challenges to Africa's development are met with many new initiatives, CAADP provides a valuable long term development framework against which otherwise partial approaches can be set. At a time when it is predicted that economic growth in Africa could be halved², there is an important role to be played by a group committed to defending the rights of Africa's small producers and enabling them to play an enhanced role in Africa's recovery. The fact that new initiatives do not always consider CAADP is more a reflection of the limited awareness of the Programme than its intrinsic usefulness. For example, the proposals contained in the UN's Horn of Africa initiative were completely consistent with the CAADP framework even though they were not explicitly positioned in the context of the four pillars. The UN Secretary-General's High Level Task Force (HLTF) and the proposed Global Partnership for Agriculture and Food Security (GPAFS) initiative represent opportunities to employ the CAADP framework when addressing food security issues in Africa.

Private sector

Does the CAADP agenda address the needs of the private sector and civil society? With the formulation of the framework for Pillar 2³, CAADP has set the foundations for greatly enhanced participation of the private sector, including farmers, agribusiness and civil society, in the development of agriculture on the continent. The four strategic areas identified – raising competitiveness, investing in commercial and trade infrastructure, developing value chains and financial services, and strengthening the capacities of farmers' and trade associations – cover the entire gamut of private sector involvement in agriculture. However, it is not clear how this framework will be translated into action of the ground through partnerships with the private sector.

Strategies and policies

Is the CAADP framework relevant to agriculture sector strategies and policies across the continent? The CAADP framework and principles have provided many governments with a background against which to assess their own strategies. However, in some cases⁴, it has been suggested that existing, well-conceived strategies were merely re-worked to fit into the CAADP pillars. Indeed, the stocktaking exercise that has been undertaken in many countries aims to incorporate the best features of existing strategies into CAADP. There is no doubt that the CAADP pillars remain completely relevant to the challenges facing African agriculture. It provides all the essential elements that can inform policy debate and decisions about strategies and programmes.

² "Impact of the Global Financial Crisis on Sub-Saharan Africa", IMF, launched 9 March 2009

³ Finalised in February 2009

⁴ Report from Rwanda

Pillar frameworks

Do the Pillar frameworks provide useful guidance for countries? The Framework for African Agricultural Productivity (FAAP), the framework for Pillar 4 (agricultural research), led the way in showing the potential utility of having a consolidated set of approaches for the implementation of a CAADP pillar. By March 2009, the Pillar 1 framework (land and water management) was only in draft. The frameworks for Pillars 2 (market access) and 3 (food security) had not been completed until early 2009. Consequently, apart from Pillar 4, the countries that are already engaged in the roundtable implementation process could not benefit from the detailed guidance provided by the pillar frameworks. Now that the framework documents are almost ready, they provide an excellent set of tools for governments in formulating sound national strategies and programmes and offer a vehicle for the institutions that have led the framework process – the so-called lead pillar institutions – to support this process.

Changing environment

Has CAADP been responsive to the changing global environment? CAADP has successfully responded to emerging issues impacting the agriculture sector. Most notably, it organised a major event bringing together African policy makers and DPs in early 2008 when the food price crisis was at its peak. This event provided an opportunity to rekindle commitment to CAADP and to encourage countries to prepare action plans to address the continuing crisis as part of implementing longer term sector development goals in the context of CAADP. It has played a valuable role in helping to coordinate the actions of both governments and DPs in responding to the continuing crisis. CAADP has also played an active part in the aid effectiveness agenda in collaboration with the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development (GDPRD) at the Accra High Level Forum. Indeed, CAADP offers an ideal framework for enhancing aid effectiveness by helping to bring cohesion to DP support for agriculture and by putting national strategies and programmes at the centre of its approach. CAADP has also issued relevant and timely policy statements on the impact of climate change. The review process offers an opportunity for CAADP to consolidate its *ad hoc* responses to the changing global environment and reflect these in reformulating its priorities and modifying its implementation processes.

Effectiveness

The overall conclusion is that CAADP has had limited effectiveness in achieving the goals that had been set

Framework

Has CAADP been able to convey effectively its purpose as a framework? From the beginning, CAADP has been beset by the difficulty of conveying to governments its purpose as a framework as opposed to a programme. The transformation of CAADP into a framework took place over 2-3 years and its purpose is best described in the draft implementation guide: “CAADP is a framework (tool) designed to help and guide... agriculture development initiatives in analytical work, planning and programme formulation, implementation and impact assessment ...” For some time, there was evidently the misconception that, as a “Programme”, CAADP represented an investment fund that could be applied to accelerate the development of agriculture – somewhat like a “vertical fund” - in parallel with normal processes of securing grants and loans from DPs. This misperception was reinforced by the subsequent process, as part of FAO’s support for the formulation of NMTIPs and bankable investment project profiles (BIPPs), of requesting each government to formulate priority investment proposals. The roundtable process itself also served to

persuade governments that, by following a somewhat rigid process of evidence-based planning that would culminate in the signing of a “compact” between government and the DPs, extra resources would become available for the sector. To date, these expectations have been unfulfilled.

The Review also found similar confusion over the terms “CAADP implementation”, the “CAADP process”, and “CAADP agenda”, terms which have been used to focus attention on the operational aspects of CAADP. “CAADP implementation” is viewed as meaning both: achieving the broad goals of resource allocation (10%) and sector growth (6%); and more narrowly, as conducting the roundtable process and compact signing. Similarly, the “CAADP process” sometimes refers narrowly to the roundtable process, or generally, to ways of accelerating growth in the sector, which is synonymous with the “CAADP agenda”. In general, it must be said that CAADP is more often perceived as being a process, with milestones such as “launching” “roundtable” and “compact signing”, than as a conceptual framework. The issue remains whether CAADP is destined to remain a framework or to move ahead to become an active player in delivering services that could be described as “continental public goods” in support of accelerating growth in the agriculture sector. A continent-wide technical assistance programme would constitute the practical manifestation of efforts to bring coherence to the development of African agriculture embodied in the four pillar frameworks and to facilitate cross-country and cross-region sharing of experience for the benefit of national programmes.

CAADP has had limited success in bringing coherence to African institutions in the sector. Both the AUC and ECA, for example, have not adopted the CAADP framework as the centrepiece of their activities and often send messages that contradict CAADP. CAADP has also been perceived as being biased towards the Anglophone part of the continent, with many important documents not available simultaneously in French and English, and with major meetings impeded by the absence of interpretation services. This has seriously limited the realisation of potentially enormous opportunities for experience sharing across regions.

Ownership at country level

Has CAADP been able to foster understanding and ownership of its approach at country level? The process of launching CAADP at country level, through the respective RECs, has not been achieved equally well across the continent and has been generally deficient. The root of the problem has been the overly ambitious schedule in the beginning, of bringing countries into the roundtable process, which meant that the Secretariat and RECs were overloaded. The “chain of command” from CAADP Secretariat to RECs to countries has been too long and inadequately funded. ECOWAS has been an exception in this respect, having allocated substantial funds to each member country for undertaking the roundtable process. FARA has also fostered greater understanding of Pillar 4 issues through sub-regional meetings under the auspices of the RECs.

Although successful in generating ownership at the highest political levels through Heads of State, CAADP has not been able to translate this into such strong commitment on the part of technical staff in the sector at country level. In many countries CAADP is not well-known or understood and its added value remains unclear. At a technical level, planners are unconvinced of the purpose of a CAADP process which appears to attempt to run parallel to existing strategies and programmes.

There has been excessive dependence upon CAADP Focal Points who are often not well networked nationally, may be too junior, have no resources and receive little and infrequent support from the RECs, PLIs or Secretariat⁵. When the roundtable process was launched, the extremely ambitious target for

⁵ The weakness of links between the Secretariat and FPs was amply demonstrated during the review when it turned out that many FPs had changed, and contact information was wrong.

starting work more or less simultaneously in 33 countries meant that the country level launch of CAADP did not receive sufficient attention. This remains a serious obstacle to securing country ownership.

The greatest difficulty has been to communicate the precise meaning of CAADP as a “framework” as opposed to a “programme”, described above. When it was realised that there were no funds at the disposal of CAADP, enthusiasm and ownership waned. The Secretariat has faced a major challenge in communicating the value of the framework and the roundtable process and rekindling the early enthusiasm for CAADP, especially when the only country to have successfully completed the process, Rwanda, has not yet seen its efforts rewarded by increased external resource flows. However, the compact in Rwanda has yielded less tangible but valuable results in helping to bring DPs together behind a common agriculture agenda and a sector-wide approach (SWAp) for agriculture is in the process of being formulated by a group of donors. Furthermore, government has substantially increased domestic resource allocations to the sector⁶ since the compact was signed.

The apparent lack of broad consultation in the CAADP roundtable process outside the circle of planners is a serious omission and in at least one case has even resulted in the failure to sign a compact. The absence of strong national ownership is arguably the most important barrier to CAADP implementation.

The crucial role of the private sector in investing in the sector is being addressed in Pillar 2. However, the operational implications of this have not been recognised. In some instances, there appears to have been insufficient attention given to bringing the private sector and civil society actively into consultations. As a result, the sort of policy and design measures needed encourage private sector investment are often missing.

Implementation processes

How effective is the implementation process? In the absence of strong country ownership, and without a clearly-defined process that will yield extra resources, the implementation process has been slow and uneven. From 2005, successive attempts to launch “early actions” at regional level under the respective RECs, failed to materialise, although some promising actions have recently emerged under COMESA in early 2009. The implementation process has often been perceived as being a top-down, “blueprint” approach which undervalues or even undermines, existing programmes and processes. It is sometimes seen by governments and DPs alike, as a process which assumes that nothing of value has come before and that earlier programmes and projects were inadequately analysed and always poorly designed.

The main existing “process” in each country is the annual budget and, through the “development budget”, is the formal channel for accessing external assistance. The steps in this process are well known and line ministries have become adept at managing their relations with the ministry of finance (and planning) in order to secure external loans and grants and the necessary counterpart funding from the MoF. CAADP implementation appears to have no interface with this existing process and may indeed threaten tried-and-tested ways of “managing” donors for the benefit of particularly favoured (“pet”) programmes. DPs are also sometimes complicit in this regard, having special agreement with partner ministries. This lack of engagement with existing processes has meant that CAADP, through the analytical work it supports, has not been able to present the “voice of reason” in the face of politically-driven, short-term decisions affecting the sector.

⁶ Reportedly an increase of more than 250%

The RECs face the greatest challenges in leading the implementation process. Although the RECs vary with respect to their capacities, resources and the extent to which they are trusted by their member states, the scale of the task of launching and supporting CAADP implementation simultaneously in many countries is far beyond even the strongest of them. Efforts to strengthen the RECs are being undertaken in parallel with the implementation process but this has not alleviated the immediate capacity constraint.

The model of the implementation process has assumed not only political commitment to CAADP, but also the availability at country level of spare human and financial resources to undertake the work involved. In most countries, planning units are severely stretched to fulfil their routine activities which include hosting and providing counterparts for several hundred DP missions each year, data gathering, formulating national strategies and policies, as well as preparing, defending and revising annual budget submissions. In ECOWAS, the process started to move ahead more quickly as a result of the REC allocating substantial resources (US\$450,000 per country) which could be used to recruit consultants to drive the roundtable process.

The schedule of CAADP implementation was, and remains, extraordinarily ambitious. When originally launched in 2006, it was projected that roundtables would be held in no less than 33 countries (14 in ECOWAS and 19 in COMESA) within 10 months, to be closely followed by the signing of compacts. Successive “re-launchings” of the process modified the schedule downwards, but targets were never achieved. The unfortunate consequence of this succession of missed goals has been to devalue the process itself in the eyes of countries and DPs.

Is the draft new approach to implementation likely to yield results? The draft “CAADP Implementation Guide”⁷ which was discussed at the CAADP Partnership Platform (PP) meetings in March 2009, proposes to make a number of important changes to the current implementation model. It is at pains to stress the flexibility of the new process, which will be customised to each country. It will focus on creating CAADP country teams that involve AU, RECs and PLIs as well as nurturing local capacity for analysis and knowledge generation. The new approach is a significant step forward in refining the implementation process and is likely to be much more successful than the present model. However, its success will still be dependent upon achieving more serious country ownership, providing a “menu” of options for implementation rather than a blueprint, and finding ways of overcoming potential political barriers to engaging in debate on sensitive issues. The approach is also likely to be costly and, if pursued thoroughly, will not be accomplished quickly.

Does the “compact” serve a useful role? The signing of a “compact” by the ministers of agriculture and finance, by the private sector and civil society and by DPs has been seen as the culmination of a country’s roundtable process. The compact is intended to mark high level political commitment, which is not legally binding, by all parties to the programmes and areas of investment defined by the roundtable. The signing of compacts has been taken as a proxy indicator of overall progress with CAADP implementation.

The lack of signed compacts could be taken as evidence either that there is no commitment to the CAADP process, or that the compact itself sets an unrealistically high threshold for approval. There may be as many as seven signatories of a compact including high level (ministerial) representatives of government, DPs, AU and civil society, and the process may well involve the tabling of memoranda to cabinet for approval. Such a process is not undertaken lightly and, without some accompanying legal commitment to funding, for example, may not be considered an appropriate instrument. The result is that roundtable efforts are

⁷ “Accelerating CAADP Implementation – A Guide building on initial experiences 2005-2007”, draft

frustrated and progress towards implementing roundtable outcomes is blocked. Indeed, there is an impression that the compact is the final step in CAADP implementation and there is no clear strategy for post-compact implementation support for countries.

Pillar frameworks

Have the pillar frameworks helped the implementation process? The CAADP roundtable implementation process was launched before pillar frameworks had been prepared, with the exception of the Pillar 4 (FAAP). The need to have an elaborated concept and strategy for each pillar was not fully appreciated until the roundtable process had started. However, at least two pillars have already made an impact on the work being carried out in their respective areas. The frameworks provide useful approaches and strategies in each of the areas but have not yet been consciously used when designing national programmes and projects. Apart from Pillars 1 and 4, the frameworks have fallen short of providing detailed guidance of how to operationalise each pillar. Pillar 4, thanks to a strong network of national (NROs) and sub-regional (SROs) research bodies, is well on the way to successfully bringing coherence to research programmes in the continent.

Pillar 1: The lead institutions for Pillar 1 are the University of Zambia (UNZA), Department of Soil Science, and the Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS). The land management aspects of Pillar 1 have been successfully translated into an operational framework through the TerrAfrica initiative (started by World Bank) which has focused on a Strategic Investment Programme (SIP) for sustainable land and water management (SLM and SLWM), supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) resources leveraged through programmes financed by World Bank, UNEP, UNDP, IFAD, AfDB and FAO. The analytical tools that have been formulated have been actively used for the design of SLM investment programmes. Some 38 projects in 28 countries have been prepared, with a total investment of over US\$1 billion. The SLM Country Programme for Ethiopia has been approved (end March 2009) and five others have been endorsed, including one Regional programme for east Africa. GEF resources are leveraged on a 1:4 ratio with IFIs and 1:2 ratio with UN agencies. Pillar 1 includes both soil and water management, but the water management aspects, in particular irrigation, have not yet been satisfactorily integrated into the Pillar.

Pillar 2: The lead institution for Pillar 2 is the Conference of Ministers of Agriculture for West and Central Africa (CMA/WCA). The Pillar 2 framework, released in February 2009, is entitled: *“Framework for the Improvement of Rural Infrastructure and Trade-Related Capacities for Market Access”* (FIMA). It provides thorough coverage, reflecting the latest thinking on the topics, under four strategic areas: (a) raising competitiveness in domestic, regional and international markets; (b) investing in commercial and trade infrastructure; (c) developing value chains and financial services; and (d) strengthening commercial and technical capacities of farmers’ organisations and trade associations. A number of “early actions” are proposed but it is not clear how these will be implemented.

Pillar 3: The lead institutions for Pillar 3 are the University of KwaZulu Natal (UKZN) and CILSS. The Pillar 3 framework, which is entitled: *“Framework for African Food Security”* (FAFS) provides a comprehensive approach to the subject. It covers: (a) risk management; (b) increasing food supply; (c) increasing the incomes of the most vulnerable; and (d) nutrition and diet quality. The framework was launched in draft form at the AU/NEPAD Workshop on *“Accelerating Investments in Response to High Food Prices and Food Insecurity”* in May 2008, but was not published until March 2009. It includes a guide and a template for use in country roundtables.

Pillar 4: The lead institution for Pillar 4 is the Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA). The “*Framework for African Agricultural Productivity*” (FAAP) is, in effect, the Pillar 4 framework. It builds upon established sub-regional research organisations (SROs) and links with their national agricultural research systems (NARS) and has gone further than the other pillars in terms of operationalising its mandate. With the RECs it has developed regional multi-country productivity programmes (MAPPs) with the respective SROs –CORAF/WECARD in west Africa, and ASARECA in east and central Africa. FARA has collaborated with ECOWAS and COMESA and their respective sub-regional research organisations, hosting Pillar 4 meetings aimed at informing national actors of the key principles of the FAAP. These meetings, which have included the DPs and the CGIAR, provide the opportunity to share experiences, discuss challenges and report on countries’ progress. Similar meetings are planned for the other sub-regions (ECCAS and in UMA with the newly created NASRO). FARA has established a Sub-Saharan Africa Challenge Programme (SSA CP) for demand-driven stakeholder research and, through its Dissemination of New Agricultural Technologies in Africa (DONATA), an innovation platform for technology adoption (IPTA) using a value chain approach, in 18 countries. The Regional Agricultural Information and Learning Systems (RAILS) approach provides ICT tools to 38 countries. FARA has strong links internationally for example, with the Platform for African-European Partnership in Agricultural Research for Development (PAEPARD), and with the Gates and Rockefeller Foundations. Its programme for Strengthening Capacity for Agricultural Research and Development in Africa (SCARDA) has forged a network with institutions across the continent. FARA has also established a multi-donor trust fund of over US\$150 million to support its work. The main gap in Pillar 4 is research on livestock, which reflects the weakness of the SROs in this respect.

Capacity strengthening

Has CAADP been able to contribute to strengthening capacities in the sector? It is not clear whether CAADP has been able to significantly add to capacities in the sector. None of the countries visited reported specific ways in which their capacity had been enhanced through CAADP. The main area in which CAADP could have been expected to contribute to capacity is in sector analysis and programme design and in the priority given to the sector by governments. It appears that most of the analytical capacity remains with IFPRI and short term consultants supporting the roundtable process and it is not possible to assess the extent to which some of this has been successfully transferred to national sector planning teams.

The management and sharing of knowledge in support of CAADP has been through a Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (ReSAKSS), set up by IFPRI in collaboration with three RECs (COMESA, ECOWAS and SADC) and three CGIAR centres (ILRI, IITA and IWMI). The system supports stocktaking and provides analytical support to the roundtable process. This work has been completed in only four countries, but is under way in an additional 8 countries. In each case, a team made up of staff from local institutions is formed for a 1-2 month exercise, led by IFPRI staff and consultants. Country level SAKSS nodes have been set up in six countries.

In the time available it was not possible to assess the quality of the analytical work itself or the extent to which this has been effective in delivering higher quality planning outputs since only one roundtable has been held to date from which the results could be tested. However, doubts have been expressed about the added value of such a low budget exercise⁸, and the feasibility of setting up and sustaining a regional system of this sort, as opposed to using resources to strengthen existing country level planning units.

⁸ The budget for providing stocktaking and analytical support per country is US\$20,000

Strategies and policies

Have national sector strategies and policies been influenced by CAADP? The increased attention given to formulating sound agriculture sector strategies and policies has mirrored the growing realisation that agriculture is the key to poverty reduction and, more recently in the pursuit of enhanced aid effectiveness, the commitment by DPs to align their assistance behind national strategies.

National strategies and policies, especially in the field of agriculture, are among the most politically sensitive areas. They touch upon issues such as access to land and water, and decisions to allocate resources, for example, to subsidies that will yield quick and high political returns. For this reason, it is difficult to determine the extent to which the CAADP framework has directly influenced national strategies and policies, but the overall impression is that, to date, it has had minimal influence. For example, several countries that are said to be close to signing compacts, allocate a large share of their sector resources to fertilizer subsidies, a measure which is unlikely to be consistent with recommendations for long term sustainable agricultural development.

Doubts have been expressed in some countries about the central role given to econometric modelling employed as part of the evidence-based planning. It is thought to have been of limited value in some places not least because of the extremely fragile state of most countries' statistics and data bases which means that best guesses for some parameters have to be used and consequently, results can be easily dismissed as irrelevant. The focus on crop production also limits the utility of the modelling. For the livestock sub-sector, where the data base is even weaker than for crops, the application of modelling is thought to be even less useful.

For those countries that are going through the roundtable process, the main issue is the extent to which CAADP principles are ultimately reflected in national strategies and policies and are not seen simply as a separate, parallel, CAADP exercise. For other countries and those at an early stage in the process, the influence of CAADP is almost always indirect, emerging from the fact that senior staff in ministries of agriculture have been exposed to the thinking behind the framework and have (sometimes) seen the individual pillar frameworks. The CAADP process is supposed to bring a far higher level of stakeholder consultation than previously into the formulation of national strategies and policies, but there is little evidence that this has occurred.

Resource flows

Has CAADP facilitated the flow of additional resources to the sector? The Maputo Declaration commitment of allocating 10% of national budget to agriculture by 2008 is one of the key founding principles and performance indicators of CAADP. It is a political commitment which remains useful because it can be monitored. However, it contains ambiguities which mean that it continues to be challenged even after more than five years.

Increasing the flow of resources to the sector from domestic and external sources has been an explicit objective of CAADP from the beginning. This was based on an analysis which clearly showed that, given its importance in reducing poverty and hunger, there had been massive under-investment in agriculture for decades. However, it has become increasingly clear that linking CAADP implementation directly to resource mobilisation is not a realistic goal. This is because, as yet, there is no systemic link between CAADP implementation processes and the procedures of IFIs and donors for channelling grants and loans to agriculture. With the implementation process completed in only one country, it is clear that little or no additional external resources have come to the agriculture sector that can be directly attributed to CAADP.

In addition, with various forms of direct budget support (DBS) becoming the favoured mechanism for resources transfers through aid, the decisions about sectoral resource allocation are increasingly in the hands of ministries of finance. Although implementation calls for the building of alliances for investment, the absence of an understanding of how CAADP processes interface with the normal processes of IFI and donors, and how the politics of national resource allocation works, is a weakness. The initial misunderstanding about CAADP as a source of funding need not have been critical were it not for the fact that no attempt was subsequently made to bring CAADP processes more into line with IFI and donor programming.

Resources are being mobilised for a number of “flagship”, continent-wide programmes and a number of these are on the point of being realised. The most substantial of these is through the Global Environment Facility (GEF) in collaboration with TerrAfrica. TerrAfrica evolved directly from CAADP Pillar 1 and has created a flexible and workable mechanism for mobilising resources for sustainable land management (SLM), where GEF funds leverage resources through “piggy-backing” upon investment operations, especially by WB. Some US\$900 million is likely to be mobilised for implementing SLM programmes, through formulating Country Strategic Investment Frameworks (CSIFs) in 28 countries for 38 projects. Other flagships include those initiated by FARA and the Research-into-Use (RIU) programme.

The poor achievement in terms of domestic resource mobilisation is more disappointing. A recent study published by ReSAKSS⁹ suggests that in 2005, on average, African governments allocated 6% of budgets to agriculture. This figure represents an increase from 4.5% in 2003, but only four countries have met the 10% goal and another three are in the 8-10% range. The Agriculture Expenditure Tracking System (AETS)¹⁰ survey of 2007 concludes that, of the 32 countries reporting, 17 (57%) still allocate less than 5% of the budget to agriculture. Eight (24%) allocate 5-10%, and 7 countries (22%), allocate over 10%. However, even these results are at best ambiguous; for example, Zimbabwe is counted as one of the best performers. The definition of “agriculture” under the COFOG¹¹ system includes crops, livestock, forestry and fisheries, but few countries in Africa have the COFOG system in place and consequently, the figures reported may either substantially under-estimate or over-estimate actual allocations. The study concludes that, although there is a “*general upward trend ... the response remains generally small...*”.

There are two main ambiguities regarding the 10% target. First, as the AETS study reports, it “*has not established the efficiency of utilisation of the rising capital expenditure.*” For example, some countries have met the goal by pouring budget resources into fertilizer subsidies. Second, the study takes note that in many African countries, actual disbursements are less than 50% of the annual budget allocation. For this reason, reporting on actual budget outcomes – expenditures – would have more meaning.

Unfortunately, CAADP has not examined the reasons why the Maputo commitment has not been met. This would require exploring how ministries of finance and planning decide on priorities, and on how effective the agriculture sector is in spending the resources at its disposal.

Dialogue with private sector and civil society

Has CAADP engaged the private sector and civil society? Although the private sector is central to successful implementation of Pillar 2, there appears to have been little interaction between CAADP and the

⁹ Fan and Saurkar, “*Tracking Agricultural Spending for Agricultural Growth and Poverty Reduction in Africa*”, ReSAKSS, 2008

¹⁰ AUC, Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture, 2007 Draft Survey Report, October 2008; 34 countries responded to the survey

¹¹ Classification of the Functions of Government (COFOG)

private sector, especially during the country level roundtable process. However, the main regional farmers' organisations in West (ROPPA) and southern Africa (SACAU) have become increasingly engaged in CAADP through their respective RECs. However, there is little evidence that this has trickled down to national level organisations. The lack of engagement with the private sector at country level, a common shortcoming of almost all international development bodies, appears to have resulted from problems of identifying which organisations are its legitimate representatives, and a traditional reluctance by governments to consult private actors. The same applies to civil society organisations.

Dialogue with development partners

Has the existence of CAADP strengthened dialogue with DPs? After an initial period of hesitation, all the main IFIs and donors have committed themselves to CAADP, and this can be considered a distinct success (see Annex 2). Political endorsement for NEPAD in 2001 triggered a wave of commitments to focus international development efforts on the problems of Africa, such as the UK's Commission for Africa (Blair Commission) and specific references to doubling development assistance at the Gleneagles Summit of the G-8. However, the endorsement of CAADP took much longer. Certainly the CAADP framework provides a convenient rallying point for donors who are interested both in Africa and agriculture. It has brought African agriculture into the development agenda more than ever before and has found a place in all the recent G-8 statements.

The CAADP Partnership Platform (PP), created in 2006 and facilitated by the GDPRD, is a manifestation of the impact CAADP has had in bringing donors together to harmonize their positions on support for the agriculture sector in Africa. The CAADP PP forms a substantial element of its work programme and GDPRD has employed an expert dedicated to CAADP issues, helped to raise awareness amongst the DPs, as well as providing conceptual and organisational support. Not least, a strong network of DPs around CAADP has been instrumental in moving the agenda forward, including the commitment of substantial resources (US\$60 million) by several donors to the Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) which is recognition of the trust and support for CAADP by the main DPs.

At country level, there is no evidence that CAADP has significantly changed the way DPs and governments interact. National consultative and donor coordination or working group (DWG) mechanisms operate in similar ways in many countries, focusing on "agriculture", "rural development" or "food security". At best, local donor representatives are aware of CAADP, but it does not shape the way they interact with government. However, to the extent that it has given coherence to a country's strategies and policies and has transferred skills to its planners, the CAADP process will have strengthened the capacity of governments to engage with DPs on sector issues.

Governance of CAADP

Is the present governance structure for CAADP effective and efficient? The governance structure of CAADP is dominated by the AUC, NEPAD and the RECs. Their respective responsibilities are not clearly defined, often overlapping, and do not reflect available capacities. The AUC is responsible for advocacy, coordination and linking NEPAD to the AU. NEPAD (CAADP Secretariat) is responsible for backstopping the RECs, monitoring the peer review mechanism and facilitating resource mobilisation and learning. The RECs coordinate support to processes in their member countries, "drive" the CAADP agenda, facilitate information and networking, and also mobilise resources.

It seems clear, as indicated above, that the RECs face the most challenges in the system. Proposed changes in overall AU governance will be put before the Heads of State at the Summit in July 2009. This will include

bringing NEPAD fully into the AUC structure, transforming NEPAD into a Planning and Coordination Authority of the AU. This potentially poses a major challenge to the status of NEPAD and with it, the operations of CAADP. It is unclear the extent to which roles and responsibilities will be changed and clarified and whether the objectives and programmes of the AUC will be brought more into line with CAADP. The Chief Executive of NEPAD reports to the **Heads of State and Government Implementation Committee** (HSGIC) on major issues, including recommendations considered by Ministers of Agriculture. Decisions taken by Heads of State provide the ultimate legitimacy for CAADP's operations.

Although the CAADP Secretariat reports regularly to the AUC (unlike many other parts of NEPAD), there is in reality weak **accountability** in the governance structure. It does not operate a results-based management system and its performance is only judged on the basis of successfully conducting programmed activities, such as roundtables and compacts, rather than delivering defined outputs.

The **CAADP PP** held four meetings, the most recent in Pretoria in March 2009. The PP has provided a convenient forum for the donors to "speak with one voice" and in this regard, marks a substantive contribution by CAADP to implementing the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (PD) and the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA). The PP has served to stimulate frank discussion of CAADP implementation issues, to report of progress and to enable the DPs to register their priorities for actions. A weakness of the PP, which is the fault of some DPs, is the lack of continuity of DP representation, and in some cases, the failure to advocate on behalf of CAADP with their respective agencies. Discussions conducted in the context of the CAADP PP, though not necessarily in PP meetings, play a major role in influencing the important interaction between CAADP and the G-8.

On the part of the DPs there is a **CAADP Task Team** comprising DFID, European Commission, FAO, French MFA, GTZ, IFPRI, Netherlands MFA, SIDA, USAID and World Bank. The members of this group keep in regular contact through teleconferences and side meetings at major events. Although an *ad hoc* group, it has been responsible for putting together the MDTF, organising the PP meetings, linking CAADP to other global initiatives and facilitating exchange of information on matters relevant to CAADP.

On the fringes of the overall structure are international organizations that deliver support to CAADP, directly and indirectly. **FAO** has been a strong supporter of CAADP and was centrally involved in the original formulation of the programme. In an attempt to kick-start CAADP implementation, it also supported from its own budget the process of formulating National Medium Term Investment Programmes (NMTIPs) in no less than 50 countries. **IFPRI**, with resources from USAID and DFID, has provided much of the technical analytical input to the roundtable process and has been the channel for USAID funding for some of the RECs.

The precise nature of the role that the **pillar lead institutions** (PLIs) are expected to play has been a matter for concern expressed at the CAADP PP. The PLIs were not selected in a transparent way and carry limited credibility at country level. The links between PLIs and the CAADP Secretariat, with countries and with each other are inadequately defined. In view of the critical role that the PLIs are expected to play in informing the content of CAADP implementation, this is a serious flaw. The main achievement of the PLIs has been the formulation of pillar frameworks.

The agriculture sector has only once been on the agenda of the **Africa Partnership Forum** (APF), the umbrella body monitoring NEPAD implementation. In May 2006 the CAADP Secretariat presented to the APF its vision of accelerating CAADP implementation. This was followed at the next APF meeting with a Progress Report on Agriculture, prepared by the APF Support Unit in OECD in collaboration with the NEPAD

Secretariat. The overall scorecard for CAADP was rated “red”, that is, “Little or no progress being made”. Four of the six scores for different elements of CAADP were also rated “red” and only two – Pillars 1 and 4 – were rated “amber” (“significant movement in the right direction”). The links between CAADP and the APF appear to be fragile. At the time, the APF report certainly served to focus attention on the issue of slow implementation, but there does not appear to have been any follow up by APF and it is not clear when agriculture is next scheduled to be on the agenda next.

Reporting and communications

Has the CAADP Secretariat been able to report back and communicate with stakeholders on progress?

The CAADP Secretariat has reportedly been more effective than any other sector units in NEPAD in reporting back to AU structures on progress with implementation. But it also has more staff and resources than other units. There is only one communications specialist for NEPAD and one recently-recruited for CAADP. However, communication with stakeholders is generally perceived to have been inadequate. The most glaring communication gap has been between the Secretariat and the RECs and with country Focal Points. Focal Points have been left ill-informed about CAADP processes and often uncertain about what is expected of them. Communications with DPs at HQ level has been a cause for concern but has improved over the last two years as a result of the CAADP Partnership Platform. However, communication with DPs at country level, through donor working groups (DWGs), has been negligible and the same can be said for links with the private sector and civil society.

At regional level, communications vary greatly. There is one communications specialist for CAADP in COMESA but no one with similar responsibilities in the other RECs. COMESA reports on a quarterly basis to the CAADP Secretariat and has also taken a number of information initiatives such as a CCADP news bulletin and establishing a network of journalists in the region.

The CAADP Secretariat has also proved unable to respond adequately and in a timely manner with clear messages for major world events. Communications on behalf of African agriculture, giving it a “voice” on the global development agenda, is a clear example of a “continental public good” that, in conjunction with the AUC, no other body could fulfil.

Capability

Can the CAADP Secretariat as presently constituted fulfil its responsibilities adequately? The CAADP Secretariat has not been provided with the **human** or **financial resources** to enable it to fulfil its mandate and role. Furthermore, there is a widely held belief on the part of many stakeholders including the DPs that, partly because of the great burden of work, the Secretariat does not operate with the level of professionalism required by an international organisation. In part, this results from highly qualified technical personnel being expected to also fulfil onerous administrative tasks. However, given its meagre resources, the Secretariat has performed surprisingly well.

The Secretariat currently has seven professional posts, of which three are staff seconded from other agencies. It has been supported at times by consultants and junior level associate experts. Additional professional staff are being brought into the Secretariat but it is not clear what overall structure and staffing is sought. In the Strategic Plan 2008-2013, an organisational structure is presented in which operational responsibilities are highlighted rather than Pillar activities. However, this structure has not been properly implemented and individual staff still see their responsibilities primarily to the different Pillars. The result is a fragmented approach to the overall tasks of the Secretariat with an absence of team work. Whilst resources flow to some of the RECs to undertake their launch and implementation support

services, the CAADP Secretariat is unable to carry out its information, briefing and oversight functions. The draft Implementation Guide recognises this weakness and proposes a “task team” approach that would bring together the Secretariat, RECs and PLIs to focus on country level implementation.

Placed by its host government under the operating procedures of the Development Bank of South Africa (DBSA), the CAADP Secretariat (and presumably the whole of the NEPAD Secretariat) faces constant challenges in **administering** and managing its responsibilities. For this reason, it has great difficulty in recruiting consultants and mobilising teams and has had to rely upon DPs to define terms of reference, select consultants and manage their outputs.

Sustainability

The overall conclusion is that without substantial re-defining of responsibilities, making processes more flexible, streamlining procedures and increased resources, CAADP has low probability of sustainability

Vision

Does CAADP have a clear vision of how it should proceed? CAADP’s objectives are agricultural growth so as to achieve the reduction of poverty and hunger. Despite the clarity of this long-term vision, there is a surprising lack of vision of how its medium-term objectives will be met beyond implementing the roundtable process and the signing of compacts. The pieces of the vision are coming together slowly, for example, through the formulation of Pillar frameworks. However, even in this respect, there is no clear idea of how the Pillar frameworks will be used to influence carry forward the CAADP agenda at regional and country levels and what should happen after compacts have been signed.

Institutions

Can CAADP deliver its objectives with its present institutional set up? The CAADP Secretariat comprises seven full-time professional staff, supplemented for varying lengths of time by personnel seconded for specific tasks from international organizations (such as FAO) and DPs. Handicapped by lack of human and financial resources, dependent upon RECs for direct supervision of country level activities, reliant upon an external body for all its administration, and having to constantly balance national, regional and DP political interests, the Secretariat cannot fulfil its presently mandated responsibilities. Similarly, the RECs lack the resources – especially human resources - to provide the necessary support for launching and following through implementation at country level. At country level as well, the Focal Points lack the resources and, more importantly, the leverage to influence national agricultural development.

Partnerships

Can the network of partnerships be sustained? The CAADP Secretariat has to work vigorously to maintain the partnerships that have already been forged with DPs through the CAADP PP, and with the PLIs. It is also seeking to expand partnerships to bring in important new initiatives such as the HLTF and GPAFS, emerging donors (BRICs), and foundations such as AGRA, that are major new players in the sector. There is a serious risk that, because of its limited resources, there will be a perceived failure to perform adequately in reporting on CAADP and to address critical issues, and this will result in a downward spiral of expectations

and confidence. Such a signal has been raised by some of the DPs regarding the value of the CAADP PP in providing solid information and facilitating progress with CAADP implementation.

Absorptive capacity

Has CAADP shown how Africa can absorb the extra resources that are promised? Absorptive capacity is a perennial issue when discussing external support to African agriculture. The estimated investment needs for the sector over the period to 2015 is US\$251 billion. Although this looks small when compared with the sums allocated to rescuing banks and bankrupt industries in the west, it is not at all clear whether such a level of investments could be absorbed without seriously increasing “leakages” and jeopardising macro-economic stability. If such levels of investment were to be realised, it would almost certainly mean a reduction in resources going to key public sector services such as health and education. The scale of unspent resources for the sector from IFIs (for example, ADB) and donors indicate severe absorptive capacity constraints in the sector. This situation suggests that CAADP’s role in strengthening capacity in the sector – and not just in planning – is a top priority.

CAADP targets

Are the CAADP targets – for budget allocation and growth - equally relevant in all African economies?

The Maputo commitment targeting 10% of budget resources for agriculture does not reflect the fact that in some countries where economic transformation is moving ahead, it might make sense to allocate more funds for vocational education and infrastructure to support agro-industrial and service industry development, for example, rather than using scarce resources to sustain people in agricultural production. This has certainly been the case in many emerging economies in Asia, for example, and is true in South Africa. Even in economies where agriculture remains the leading sector, merely allocating 10% of budget in itself might not be a sufficient measure. But the most important factor is the effectiveness of expenditure in the sector and there is a danger that targeting total expenditure distracts attention from measures to enhance effectiveness. In addition, the actual measurement of budget allocation poses a major challenge in countries where standard definitions of budget categories do not exist and where many, agriculture-related, expenditures take place outside the ministry of agriculture.

Six per cent growth in the agriculture sector is a reasonable target to set. Man-made factors (such as conflict) and natural phenomena (such as rainfall) will obviously influence the outcome in the sector and these introduce a large amount of “noise” in any system of measurement. The achievement of such growth is, therefore, not solely related to public expenditure. This is already evident by the fact that some countries where budget allocation is substantially less than 10% have been able to achieve 6% or more growth. Measuring sectoral growth in the same way across the continent is also a challenge. From country consultations, it is not clear whether such calculations are carried out in the same way in each country and there have been some anomalous results in recent statistics.

The pillar frameworks which are intended to provide guidance to governments about how to most effectively spend scarce public resources in order to achieve 6% rate of growth in agriculture, are sufficiently broad and comprehensive to apply to almost all countries.

Analytical support, M&E

Can the mechanisms for M&E and peer review take root? The country level SAKSS nodes have only been set up in six countries and the project that has financed this work (from IFPRI and DFID) ceases before the end of 2009. There does not seem to be a plan in place for a second phase of this work that would continue

to support the CAADP process. In some countries, doubts have been expressed about the added value of the econometric (CGE) modelling aspects of the analytical support.

A monitoring and evaluation framework is being developed with IFPRI support through ReSAKSS but has not been operationalised. Peer review is one of the components of CAADP implementation process, but it does not appear to have been adopted in those countries that are moving through the roundtable process. Although the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) has gradually moved to acceptance, there has been no attempt to incorporate agriculture sector issues as part of this process.

In the global aid environment since the PD and AAA, in which mutual accountability and managing for development results are key features, CAADP cannot survive unless it is able to provide credible M&E results and some sort of “scorecard” that synthesises progress and that is accepted by DPs.

Political support

Is the political support for CAADP still strong? CAADP is essentially a political creation and it will live or die according to the political support that it receives. Its broad purpose is to foster reform in the agricultural sector throughout the continent and this inevitably involves a large political dimension. Notwithstanding the difficulties it has faced, political support at continental level has been sustained. Political support for CAADP at country level is difficult to judge because the only measure is the support for AU Summit resolutions. From the countries visited, actual political support varies greatly reflecting, rightly or wrongly, the perceived failure of CAADP to mobilise increased resources. It has taken most of its five years of existence for CAADP to find its identity – indeed, it could be said that it is still searching for an identity and a role. Its uneasy status has been the product of the political processes that link it to the AUC and the decision-making meetings of Agriculture Ministers and AU Summits, as well as its dependence upon the RECs for implementation.

Implementation Lessons

Planning process

Has the planning and implementation process been effective? It has to be admitted that, by its own targets and criteria, the CAADP planning and implementation process has been slow and ineffective. The schedule of roundtables and compacts has been frequently revised downwards and there is no evidence that the goal of increased resources for the sector has been achieved. The evidence-based planning process has not ostensibly been transformed into implementable programmes. The main lessons are:

- A clearer definition is needed of what is expected from the implementation of CAADP as a framework.
- Without active political support from the highest level, implementation will always stall.
- The implementation process must be carefully tailored to individual country circumstances, complementing and building upon existing planning structures and decision-making institutions.
- More realistic targets should be set for scheduling country level activities.
- The human and financial resources available to the RECs need to be substantially increased and their role complemented through support to country implementation from other institutions including the Secretariat and PLIs.
- There should be stronger involvement of PLIs in support of country level implementation.

- There should be greater engagement with DPs at country level – through DWGs - from the beginning.
- Greater time and more resources should be given to tailoring the evidence-based planning process to existing national resources and needs.
- The scope of analytical work should be widened so as to balance the CGE modelling exercise.
- The creation of an environment for agriculture sector policy dialogue should be given at least as much emphasis as resource mobilisation.
- Greater efforts should be made to work with planners and ministries to interpret the results of the planning exercise and translate them into feasible investment programmes and projects.

Role of RECs

Have the RECs played their part in the process effectively? From the beginning, the importance of strengthening regional collaboration has been central to the CAADP concept. The regional economic communities (RECs) have been given a pivotal role in the implementation of CAADP in order to ensure regional coherence in the planning and implementation of agriculture investments, and to enhance regional trade in agricultural goods.

All CAADP implementation action has taken place in just two RECs: COMESA and ECOWAS. ECCAS, UMA and SADC have been virtually absent from the roundtable process, although COMESA has launched the process in some countries that are also in SADC. Although varying considerably in their capacity and resources, the RECs have found it difficult to fulfil their responsibilities in supporting CAADP implementation except in a minimal bureaucratic sense. In ECOWAS countries, unlike COMESA, the process has begun with the formulation of a regional strategy (ECOWAP) before moving on to country level roundtables. Technical capacity focused on an initial group of seven countries and has then moved on to the remaining eight countries. COMESA is about to begin the process of formulating a “regional compact” to be carried out by FANRPAN¹².

In some cases, the RECs have also been handicapped by overlapping membership and the fact that member states do not necessarily acknowledge the mandate of the REC to engage in national level planning activities. In one instance, competing regional processes have diverted attention from CAADP. There has been almost no interaction between the RECs on CAADP implementation and so opportunities for learning and sharing knowledge have been lost. No progress has been made by the RECs in coordinating donors at the regional level. The main lessons are:

- In view of the ambitious scale of the country level support process, RECs should be further strengthened with human and financial resources but should also be relieved of sole responsibility for driving country level implementation. In the draft “Implementation Guide” they would be members of a CAADP Resource Group along with the Secretariat and PLIs.
- RECs should be encouraged to nurture genuine country level ownership of CAADP rather than simply achieving cosmetic goals of the number of meetings held.
- RECs should put more effort into diagnosing and addressing regional and cross-border issues that affect the agriculture sector and into preparing regional strategies.
- Partnerships with DPs at regional level should be actively pursued so as to better coordinate support for programmes in different member countries.

¹² Information note from FANRPAN, February 2009

Pillar lead institutions

Have the pillar lead institutions fulfilled their role in the process? The PLIs (with the exception of FARA) were identified and brought into the CAADP implementation process at a late stage. Their mandate was to develop frameworks for each of the four pillars. The PLIs have been successful in the formulation of pillar frameworks through a lengthy consultative process. However, the frameworks for Pillars 2 and 3 were only launched in early 2009 and Pillar 1 framework remains as a draft. Consequently, this work has not informed the implementation process in the 17 countries that have so far launched CAADP and are at various stages of completion. It is not clear to what extent the different PLIs have been able to provide technical expertise and backstopping to regional and national implementation processes. The exception is FARA, which has been able to provide support for Pillar 4 through the well-established network of national, sub-regional and regional research institutions and has set in motion a substantial programme of work. The absence of a similarly established set of national and regional partners for the other pillars has made the task of providing support more difficult.

Beyond their role in formulating pillar frameworks, the role of the PLIs has not been clearly defined. There have been some effort to create networks of institutions and experts but, for example, the work of Pillar 2 is limited to ECOWAS. There has been limited interaction between the four pillars and the PLIs concerned, giving rise to a rather fragmented approach, which contradicts the “comprehensive” spirit of the programme. In particular, FARA has moved ahead faster than the other PLIs in developing its own stand-alone programme under CAADP. The attempt to link the different pillars with other initiatives, such as TerrAfrica (with Pillar 1), has not been easy but has potential to mobilise large amounts of funds for programme implementation. The main lessons are:

- Having completed the formulation of pillar frameworks, PLIs need to have a more clearly-defined role in the future which will enable them to network more extensively with relevant institutions across the continent with the ultimate aim of creating “centres of excellence” that will provide technical support to CAADP in each region.
- Involvement of African institutions in each of the pillars should be broadened to include universities, expert groups, think tanks and individual consultants, with the aim of having partners in the network in every country to support CAADP.
- The present PLIs should become the drivers and organisers of these networks and have clear performance criteria to meet.
- More resources are needed to guarantee that PLIs engage in each country in the roundtable process as well as to support capacity development.

Partnerships

Development partner commitment

Have DPs committed to the process? There was initial scepticism on the part of DPs with regard to CAADP although NEPAD itself benefited from high levels of political support. There were doubts about the way the programme was formulated and fears that CAADP might aspire to become yet another institution in the continent and detract from regular programming by IFIs and bilateral donors. The turning point was in October 2005 at the retreat in Pretoria on the *Post Accra Action Plan to Advance Implementation at Regional and Country Level*. The idea of instituting a process of CAADP planning as a collaborative venture

between DPs and governments, facilitated by the CAADP Secretariat and RECs, was launched and a number of key DPs committed to what became known as the “roundtable” process.

The DPs as a whole are unanimous in seeing that the major success of CAADP has been in bringing a unified voice to Africa around the African agricultural agenda (see Annex 2). They also believe CAADP has been uniquely successful in garnering global political support from the development community. This has been most recently reflected in the successful creation of the Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF), launched in January 2009, to which US\$60 million has been committed. Further resources are likely to be provided to the TF, broadening the DP partnership behind CAADP. Even beyond the core group, a wider circle of donors have provided increased financial and political support to CAADP through the GDRD and the CAADP Partnership Platform (PP). However, DP commitment in the MDTF could be matched by African governments making a contribution to the Fund.

CAADP has also been successful in enhancing the aid effectiveness agenda in agriculture, helping DPs to harmonise their approaches to providing support to the sector in Africa. However, the full potential for CAADP to bring coherence to aid programmes in the sector at country level has yet to be realised. Despite commitments by donors to the PD principles and the AAA, at country level there is often less willingness by donors to join together behind national strategies and programmes. CAADP, by strengthening the credibility of national strategies and policies in the agriculture sector, should be an obvious starting point for coherent DP assistance. However, in some cases it is seen rather as a distraction from established planning and programming processes.

Although development assistance to the sector in Africa has increased over the last five years, this is from historically low levels in the late 1990s. Total grants and loans to the sector are nowhere near the level that CAADP believes is necessary to achieve the target rate of growth. CAADP’s estimate of investment needs over the period to 2015 is US\$251 billion. Increased commitment of resources to agriculture by DPs has been triggered by the realisation that any serious effort to reduce poverty and achieve MDG 1 necessarily means investing in agriculture and this is a message that CAADP has been instrumental in conveying.

Congruence with AU

Is CAADP fully congruent with AU priorities? The relationship between NEPAD and AU is mirrored in the uneasy history of CAADP and the AU Commission Department for Rural Economy and Agriculture (DREA). The dilemma is reflected in the fact that it was necessary, in 2006, to formulate an “*Integrated Implementation Plan for CAADP and the Sirte Declaration*”. CAADP’s pillars were linked to management of trans-boundary waters (Pillar 1), establishing an African common market for agricultural products (Pillar 2), production of strategic agricultural commodities (Pillar 3), strengthening centres of excellence (Pillar 4), and support for livestock and fisheries.

4. Regional Perspectives

The Review team visited each of the main regions and RECs in Africa with the exception of Central Africa. The separate regional reports are contained in Working Papers 1 – 4. A short summary of the findings from the different regions is presented below.

North Africa (Working Paper 1)

The consultant working in North Africa visited Algeria, Egypt, Morocco and Tunisia as well as the headquarters of L’Union du Maghreb Arabe (UMA).

Despite the fact that two of the governments that were instrumental in founding NEPAD are in North Africa – Algeria and Egypt – the region is notable by its absence from the CAADP implementation process. The North African REC, UMA, engaged with CAADP initially but has not taken part in the roundtable process. The views expressed at UMA indicated the perception that CAADP was not suited to the countries in the region because their level of development was ahead of the rest of Africa. The roundtable process was seen to be top-down and not responsive to the region’s needs and CAADP itself excessively tied to processes rather than action.

Although North Africa is committed to NEPAD and food security is a priority area, there is a general lack of understanding in the region of the CAADP process. There is a feeling of exclusion since none of the region’s institutions have been selected to lead pillar processes and there has been almost no contact with the region’s farmers’ unions. The countries in the region have reportedly surpassed the Maputo commitment on budget allocations, even though agriculture is less important to their economies than in the rest of Africa, generally accounting for 10-19% of GDP. The most important sector issues in North Africa are how to access European and international markets, how to apply international grades and standards, the challenges of climate change adaptation and the general shortage of water, issues which are not at the top of the CAADP agenda.

If there is to be a future role for North Africa in CAADP, there will be a need for serious “fence-mending”. The region could become a source of technical expertise and good practices for the rest of Africa.

West Africa (Working Paper 2)

The consultant working in West Africa visited Liberia and Togo, as well as the headquarters of ECOWAS (Nigeria), the Conference of Ministers of Agriculture or West and Central Africa (CMA/WCA) in Senegal, and Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS) in Burkina Faso.

Liberia and Togo represent countries in two quite different situations: one emerging from conflict, and the other emerging from political crisis. A summary of the main conclusions and recommendations is presented below:

ECOWAS

The pragmatic and realistic approach adopted by ECOWAS in the region for implementing the roundtable process has delayed its implementation, but should ensure its effectiveness and sustainability due the high level of ownership of the process. Although ECOWAS’s performance is commendable on the process for implementation of CAADP in West Africa, no country has yet signed a compact. The first group of countries is planned to sign their compacts by April 2009 whereas the second group is scheduled by June 2009.

Institutional arrangements: The formal collaboration between NEPAD and ECOWAS is very weak: there is only an aide-memoire concluded between NEPAD and ECOWAS aimed at strengthening cooperation on and support to the CAADP roundtable process. There is no memorandum of understanding between the two institutions. What is needed is a real institutional arrangement through which roles and responsibilities are clearly defined. These institutional relationships must be based on the subsidiarity principle. This principle is intended to ensure that decisions are taken as close as possible to the base (the lowest level) and that degrees of decision-making power, accountability/transparency and efficiency are maximized at the appropriate organizational level (from the field to the national, sub-regional and regional levels). This principle should ensure efficient programme implementation, client ownership, and for reason that the involvement of the sub-regional and regional institutions is limited to what is necessary to most efficiently

achieve the objectives, given their respective mandates. Despite this, there is a weakness in the string of relationships between NEPAD and ECOWAS, on the one hand, and between the NEPAD, ECOWAS and the pillar institutions such as FARA, CMA/WCA and the CILSS, on the other hand.

Weak delivery capacities: Despite its strong engagement, ECOWAS lacks adequate human capacity to meet the increased demands expressed by the countries for the roundtable process and to support the early actions. This has been recognized by the RECs and some of the coordination and technical functions are delegated to the pillars institutions which operate with their own rules and procedures without clear accountability to the RECs. ECOWAS has reached agreement with development partners on support to strengthen their capacities to implement regional programmes and coordinate the country level process. The agreed support includes resources to recruit long term consultants as well as short term expertise, to prepare, implement, and coordinate programme implementation and review processes, including the establishment of regional knowledge support system to facilitate progress monitoring and evaluation as well as peer review and mutual learning. In response to these needs, about 11 additional staff were recruited by ECOWAS to support the process.

Liberia

The following ***lessons*** emerged:

1. The strong political commitment of the government of Liberia is a driving force for pushing the CAADP agenda and for accelerating the implementation of the Maputo declaration.
2. Although the budget allocation remains low and steady at a level of about 2% between 2006 and 2009, the positive and increasing growth rate displayed by the sector (an average of 3.5% far below the target rate of 6%) is significant for Liberia which had a zero or negative growth rate at end of the war in 2003. If these trends are sustained, Liberia is likely to record an annual growth performance of more than 6% with less than 10% of budget allotment to agriculture in the years ahead.
3. Though CAADP is at its early stage of implementation in Liberia, the country's agricultural policy design and process are aligned with some CAADP framework and process.
4. The recognition of building a strong knowledge base for the agricultural sector as a prerequisite for sound agricultural and rural development strategies and focused interventions, is a realistic option which will nurture and accelerate the country roundtable process.

The main ***recommendations*** are:

1. Liberia as a post conflict country, confronted by the complex equation of investing in wealth creation sectors such as agriculture and investing in social services such as health and education with long term implications, must be encouraged to increase its budget allocation to agriculture in view of its link to economic growth and poverty reduction.
2. Although the CAADP process is at its initial stage, the country's agricultural policy design and process are currently aligned with the CAADP framework and some process. This dynamic needs to be sustained during the implementation of the CAADP process that was recently launched in the country.
3. The building of a strong knowledge base for the agricultural sector in Liberia is a significant asset that must be capitalized for fluent implementation of the roundtable process.

Togo

The following *lessons* emerged:

1. Information about the CAADP roundtable process has not been equally shared among different stakeholders, consultants and technicians at the inception and during the process.
2. Information on financial support to the CAADP process by NEPAD and ECOWAS in Togo was not equally shared among stakeholders. The poor performance of most of the task forces set up is due to lack of incentives and budget to support the stocktaking exercise.
3. The poor existing knowledge and data base on the sector to support the modelling and simulation exercises has not facilitated the identification of investment programmes.
4. The lack of a clear work plan supported by a budget has hindered the production of the technical reports by the thematic groups which are supposed to be fed into the process.
5. The poor delivery of thematic groups has not facilitated the identification of investment programmes by the consultants.

The main **recommendations** are:

1. It is imperative that a performance assessment of the process be conducted and necessary adjustments be made to arrive at more credible investment programmes and a high quality Compact.
2. The point of convergence of the National Programme of Agricultural Investment (PNIA) and CAADP must now be clearly spelt out by the government to avoid ending with two parallel programmes competing for limited funding. The ideal solution would be to consider the PNIA as a cross-cutting programme implemented through technical ministries but led by the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries.
3. There is an urgent need to scale up the dissemination of the roundtable process information using the media to enhance participation and ownership of the process by a larger pool of stakeholders including the international private sector, farmers' organizations etc.
4. Looking to the future, invest in the production of agricultural data with a view to facilitating monitoring and benchmarking and peer review.
5. Capacity building remains a critical issue to implement any programme in the country as many retirees were not replaced in the technical Ministries. Togo will certainly have a Compact but will lack quality human resources to implement it.

East Africa (Working Paper 3)

The team working in East Africa visited Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda as well as the East African Community (EAC). Contacts were also made with the recently-recruited PLI for Pillar 3, Sokoine University in Tanzania, and with FARA (Pillar 4) during a meeting held in Kenya. Discussions were also held with the AU Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture (DREA) and UN-ECA in Addis Ababa.

A summary of the main conclusions and recommendations of the team is presented below:

Relevance of CAADP

The relevance of CAADP was assessed from various perspectives namely: relevance to Africa's overall agriculture-led growth and development agenda; relevance to enhancing support for agriculture in Africa; and relevance in strengthening country level policy implementation processes. Overall, the review confirmed that CAADP is highly relevant to the goal of accelerating the growth of the agriculture sector in Africa. One of the greatest value additions of CAADP has been its success in realising a coherent voice to

Africa's commitment to agricultural growth and overall development. The commitment of the Heads of State to pursue a growth rate in agriculture of 6%, coupled with a pledge of increasing national budgetary allocations for the sector to 10% attests to this voice. This was further reinforced by the commitment secured from major development partners to promote agricultural growth. Moreover, the advent of CAADP energized countries to build and continue strengthening credible agriculture strategies.

Effectiveness of CAADP

The review notes that CAADP has had modest levels of effectiveness, arguably explained by its nascent stage of implementation in most countries. However, the latent potential of the framework in delivery of value addition was highlighted. For example, the regional dimensions bring to the fore opportunities for extra support to country efforts – in terms of peer learning, reviews and capacity strengthening; the analytical work espoused by the framework undoubtedly reinforces the rigour in planning at sector level; through CAADP's efforts to promote harmonisation, alignment and coordination efforts of policies, strategies and plans of government, development partners and civil society, there is increased likelihood of not only realising more coherent and amenable agriculture frameworks, but also more possibilities of increased domestic and external funding. Furthermore, the pillar frameworks and the principles of the framework potentially provide useful information for strengthening the implementation in a wide cross-section of agriculture areas.

Sustainability of CAADP

Sustainability was assessed in terms of ownership, local capacities and autonomy, and reflecting upon its relevance to the country level processes in agriculture. The review confirmed that the CAADP goals are quite compatible with the objectives of the national medium term plans. CAADP has successfully generated ownership at the highest political levels on the continent. However, at national level, the sense of ownership of the framework is rather weak. Moreover, it is only in the recent past that there are emerging deliberate efforts to strengthen local capacities at regional and country level on all CAADP processes. Fast tracking local capacity strengthening, together with increased "autonomy" of CAADP is recommended as part of the strategies to ensure continuity of CAADP processes.

Recommendations

The review recommends that the intrinsic value of CAADP at country level is further exploited; the framework can potentially be a comprehensive long term development framework against which the multiplicity of existing frameworks can be aligned and harmonised towards a coherent country-level Agriculture Development Investment Plan and more credible programmes formulated. Additionally, the latent potential and opportunities presented by the various tenets of the framework, such as the pillar frameworks, principles and values that have only been exploited in earnest should be used more systematically as references in subsequent country level planning and implementation processes.

Southern Africa (Working Paper 4)

The team working in Southern Africa visited Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa and Zambia, as well as COMESA, SADC and the Pillar 1 and 3 lead pillar institutions, the University of Zambia (UNZA) and UKZN respectively.

The team concluded that CAADP is very relevant to the challenges facing agriculture in the region, but is little known at country level, largely as a result of inadequate stakeholder capacity, both human and

financial. At least in Malawi and Zambia, the Maputo target budget allocations have been met and growth in the sector in Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia has been at least 6% in the last few years. Some progress has been made in fostering stakeholder consultation and participation, but mainstreaming CAADP implementation into local structures has not worked well at country level. Mainstreaming has been effective at regional level in COMESA but less so in SADC. However, SADC has realigned its major Regional Indicative Strategic Plan (RISP) to the CAADP principles. The main threat to CAADP's sustainability is seen to be the lack of human and financial resources and institutional capacity at REC and country level.

A summary of the key lessons learnt and recommendations are presented below:

Roundtable processes

General lesson: The “blue print” presentation of the roundtable processes has limited the implementation of CAADP principles in countries which have had considerable planning processes before CAADP came on board.

Context: Countries such as Zambia have had comprehensive planning processes that go back as far as 15 years. The planning processes that involved wide consultation of stakeholders were undertaken during formulation of investment strategies and development plans including; the Agriculture Sector Investment Programmes (ASIP); the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) and; the Five Year National Development Plans (FNDP). A number of stakeholders in such countries did not see the value of embracing all the stages of the roundtable processes. This resulted in reduced commitment and fatigue with respect to the pursuit of full roundtable processes.

General lesson: The Focal Point Person (FPP) is one of the most critical entities influencing the extent to which CAADP agenda is promoted at country level. This arrangement has had serious constraints, resulting in slow implementation of the CAADP agenda at the country level.

Context: The FPP has been beset by serious capacity challenges due to a number of factors, the key ones being: (i) given that s/he is an individual person, this brings in the question of how much they can do; (ii) most FPPs are lowly placed, making them less influential; (iii) FPPs have been doing CAADP work during their spare time (some during weekends), this has drastically reduced their performance; (iv) the FPPs have had no budgetary provision to facilitate their promotion of the CAADP agenda.

General lesson: Unless something is urgently done to focus on processes beyond the compact which are tangible and move the country agenda forward, the credibility of the roundtable process faces the danger of total erosion.

Context: There is currently a belief that seems to suggest that once a country signs a compact, much of the needed resources will flow in. However, with Rwanda having signed the compact two years ago and not much resources have come in from cooperating partners, many countries are beginning to question the value of the roundtable processes.

Maputo commitment (10%) and growth (6%)

General lesson: The Maputo commitments of 10% and 6% needed to be elaborated on by technocrats, packaged and disseminated in such a way that they would take into account individual country socio-economic development stages, thereby allowing each country to adopt what is most appropriate to it.

Context: The 10% budget allocation does not take into account the country's level of development. The more developed a country, the less the total allocation to agriculture is needed, as other areas become more important. In the case of the Southern Africa region, South Africa allocates 1.5% of its total annual budget to agriculture. Its current development status does not require a 10% allocation. In addition, the targets did not take into account value addition as well as other sub-sectors such as fisheries which fall under the agricultural sector. Namibia and Mozambique have important fisheries sub-sectors which contribute substantially to the countries' Gross Domestic Product. The prominence of Botswana's livestock sub-sector vis-à-vis the overall country's economy cannot be over-emphasized. These issues needed to be carefully studied, analyzed and taken into account when implementing the CAADP agenda at country level.

CAADP organisation

General lesson: The primary driver of agriculture production and productivity, the private sector, still feels a stranger and not sufficiently part of CAADP, thereby seriously undermining the chances of success of the CAADP agenda.

Context: There is a strong perception by the business sector and farmer organizations that CAADP is government driven. They do not feel part of CAADP, citing that whenever they must participate in something related to CAADP, it is usually by invitation. This makes them feel that they are not in the driver's seat.

Communication and Information

General lesson: Poor communication and information flow is one of the single most importance hindrances to the promotion of CAADP agenda beyond its present successes and has seriously undermined the knowledge about CAADP at regional, country and district levels.

Context: There is generally poor communication and information flow about CAADP at regional and country levels. Even information about the good things which CAADP has brought about is not being adequately disseminated to those who should receive it. For instance, SADC feels they are not being adequately informed about what is going on regarding CAADP. Second, in Mozambique, the technocrats did not know much about CAADP. It was merely a political pronouncement which was not adequately communicated to the technocrats. In part, this explains the absence of an FPP in Mozambique. Third, in Zambia, efforts to interview the Permanent Secretaries of the Ministries of Agriculture and Finance were frustrated when it was made clear that the PS level does not know much about CAADP. Fourth, there is inadequate flow of information to all those who need it about the good progress Pillar 3 is making regarding their efforts to influence policy as well as contribute to effective monitoring and evaluation of food security issues.

Key Conclusions and Recommendations

The implementation of CAADP principles has had a good start in the Southern African region at both regional (REC) and country levels. Cooperating partners consulted spoke positively about CAADP. They were convinced that this is the way to go for the region's agriculture. However, there is need to consolidate the gains made so far by strengthening capacities at both REC and country levels to promote the CAADP agenda. Even COMESA which has made tremendous effort in running with the CAADP vision needs to be helped in terms of capacity. This capacity is primarily with respect to human and financial resources. There is also need to deal with structural issues at the country level in terms of institutionalizing the housing of

Focal Point functions. These issues need urgent attention if the CAADP vision is to be kept afloat in the region.

Notwithstanding the above point, CAADP principles are little understood and appreciated by the average technocrat. The situation is far much worse at lower levels. Many stakeholders consulted in the Southern African region were talking about the dire need to “take CAADP to the people at the grass roots level”. This entails inter alia, a two-fold approach. First, an effective communication and information flow strategy needs to be implemented that ensures that the CAADP agenda is fully appreciated at REC, country and district levels. Second, there is urgent need to get the “flagship” projects going at both country and regional level. This will go a long way to making CAADP known and appreciated. When the flagship activities are seen on the ground, it will be a lot easier to relate to CAADP due to the tangibility of such activities.

The lead pillar institutions particularly UKZN for Pillar 3, though late-comers, are beginning to take up their rightful position in the implementation of CAADP and they should be encouraged and supported. With the pillar framework documents now in place, their visibility and influence should be far much more pronounced in the next few years. However, for the pillar institutions to perform as expected, the following actions need to be undertaken. First, there is dire need to build their capacity in terms of human resource and finances. The current level of resources at their disposal is far too small, given the continental mandate they have. The efforts which have already been initiated of networking with other universities to strengthen capacity are a step in the right direction. These should be encouraged and strengthened further. Second, there is need to re-emphasize, redefine and specify the pillars’ roles vis-à-vis their interactions with RECs and countries regarding the promotion of the CAADP agenda. Strong links need to be developed between lead pillars on one hand, and RECs/countries on the other. Third, there is need to strengthen the links between the four pillars, given that they are all complementary toward the achievement of the overall CAADP vision and goals. Such links should be formalized.

5. Recommendations: The Way Ahead

The Review has concluded that CAADP stands at a critical point: it has successfully assembled the support of DPs behind CAADP and now has promising tools and the resources with which to implement the process at country level. However, so far there is little to show on the ground, and this could jeopardise future support. The recommendations set out below are an attempt to strengthen and support the direction in which CAADP is evolving and propose some strong remedies for its weaknesses. The existence of the CAADP MDTF offers the possibility that the recommendations can be put into practice.

Concept

CAADP as a framework and service provider

CAADP is, by definition, intended to be comprehensive. The framework needs to be revisited to include emerging issues such as climate change and bio-energy, as well as properly integrating livestock, fisheries and forestry. The links with resource mobilisation need to be specifically addressed including suggested mechanisms for making this effective, and fully integrating the role of the private sector, civil society and farmers’ organisations. This is also the moment for CAADP to move beyond being simply a “process”, driven by a vaguely-defined CAADP agenda and by roundtables, to become a provider of services – what might be called “continental public goods” - in support of accelerating growth in the agriculture sector. Such services would draw increasingly upon African institutions and African expertise and would be demand-driven.

Recommendations:

- **Revise CAADP document:** The content and structure of the basic CAADP document and the four pillars should be revisited in order to take account of important emerging issues including climate change and bio-energy, and at the same time better integrate livestock, forestry and fisheries. It should also be complemented by more detailed guidance to governments on the planning and investment process. This means taking the roundtable process one step further by translating growth opportunities into detailed investment projects and programmes.
- **Reposition CAADP as a provider of services:** As part of revisiting the basic CAADP document, the opportunity should be taken to set out the implications of moving CAADP beyond being just as a framework into becoming a provider of services, including the crucial role that can be played by providing technical assistance at country level delivered by PLIs and other African institutions, to strengthen sector policies, strategies and investment planning. A continent-wide technical assistance programme would constitute the practical manifestation of efforts to bring coherence to the development of African agriculture embodied in the four pillar frameworks. The programme would be guided by the pillar lead institutions, each of which would actively develop a network of partners in each region and at country level as the resource that would be used to deliver technical support.
- **Engage with the private sector:** Strenuous efforts must be made to engage with the private sector, civil society and farmers' organizations when further elaborating the framework.

Institutional Aspects

Governance structures

The status and roles of the CAADP Secretariat must be clearly defined with respect to AU and the RECs, and it must be made accountable for delivering specific outputs. The ambiguities in the overall governance structure of CAADP must be resolved and the necessary resources and capacity building provided. The overall governance structure of the MDTF also needs to be defined.

Recommendations:

- **Prepare for NEPAD-AU integration:** Undertake an assessment of the implications for CAADP of the integration of NEPAD into the AU, and prepare for changes to AU governance structures.
- **Define clear responsibilities for all stakeholders:** Work with the AU to set out an unambiguous definition of the roles, responsibilities and reporting channels of the CAADP Secretariat, AUC, RECs and PLIs with respect to the agriculture sector. In particular, the nature of the linkages between the PLIs and CAADP Secretariat should be set out clearly.
- **Strengthen the role of the CAADP PP:** The CAADP PP should be given a formal mandate within the oversight mechanisms of CAADP as a joint stakeholder forum that advises on the annual work programme and assesses performance.

Political context

As an integral part of NEPAD which is itself a programme of the AU, CAADP should be unambiguously linked to AU structures, in particular the AUC. However, the proposed changes to AU governance could potentially disrupt NEPAD and CAADP implementation. Achieving sustained external political support amongst DPs and at country level should be a top priority.

Recommendations:

- **Renew political support at country level:** Renewed political support for CAADP within Africa should be sought at country level through identifying a high level “champion” in each country to carry forward the CAADP agenda.
- **Broaden and consolidate political support:** Support for CAADP should be broadened by, *inter alia*, launching a new round of efforts to lobby within DP agencies on behalf of CAADP through the CAADP PP; promoting the active participation of national and regional farmers’ organisations in the CAADP process through ensuring that they have a voice in national, regional and continental fora; fostering stronger and regular working level contact between the CAADP Secretariat and the AU Commissioner for Rural Economy and Agriculture; and, launching a series of events with each REC to consult on the way ahead in implementing the recommendations of the CAADP Review.
- **Report on progress regularly:** A system should be put in place to enable the CAADP Secretariat to report on implementation progress to its external partners and AU, regularly and reliably. This would greatly strengthen CAADP’s credibility and secure political support. The establishment of a “scorecard” system that would encapsulate a range of different indicators of progress including country level growth performance and domestic resource mobilisation, as well as delivery of DP commitments to providing resources should be an integral component of the reporting system.

Management and administration

The CAADP Secretariat should be empowered to fulfil its responsibilities. However, the flow of additional human and financial resources into the Secretariat should be conditional upon thorough reorganisation of the Secretariat, substantially strengthening its management, streamlining its procedures, introducing a proper results-based management (RBM) system with clearly-defined outputs, reporting channels and accountability. The RECs should also be strengthened in order to fulfil their roles in supporting CAADP implementation properly.

Recommendations:

- **Undertake an institutional assessment:** An independent institutional assessment of CAADP should be undertaken that would cover the Secretariat and CAADP offices at the RECs in order to identify technical and support staffing and capacity building needs. Key elements of the assessment should be to explore: ways of restructuring and strengthening the CAADP Secretariat with professional staff and streamlined supporting systems, possibly including the appointment of an Office Manager to relieve the Head of the Unit from day-to-day bureaucratic tasks; opportunities for minimising the number of seconded staff and ensuring that all staff are answerable to the Head of the Agriculture Unit; mechanisms to provide the CAADP Secretariat with greater financial and administrative autonomy subject, of course, to the usual reporting, accounting and audit procedures; the steps needed to endow the CAADP Secretariat with full legal status; procedures to enable the CAADP Secretariat to recruit consultants quickly and efficiently, and to hire short- and longer-term staff; ways of creating a “cluster” of high level technical support provided by DP agencies aimed at strengthening the CAADP Secretariat, possibly using UKZN or FANRPAN as a base;
- **Put in place a results-based management (RBM) system:** A RBM system should be designed and launched that includes:
 - **Prepare a log frame:** A log frame should be prepared which indicates clearly-defined and time-bound outputs for which the CAADP Secretariat is accountable and the activities that will be undertaken in order to realise the agreed outputs; the thinking about how this process can be put in place has started and is laid out in the Strategic Plan 2008 -2013.

- **Annual work plan and budget:** A detailed annual work plan and budget should be prepared, within the frame of a rolling three year programme that specifies the activities for which the Secretariat is responsible and which would be presented to the CAADP PP.
- **Ensure effective management of the MDTF:** In finalising the governance and management structure of the MDTF, the following factors should be considered: incorporating adequate checks and balances in the use of resources under the 11 “child” funds; in the interests of coherence, ensuring a voice for the CAADP Secretariat in the overall execution of the programme; ensuring that different fund activities are mutually reinforcing. In addition, African governments should be encouraged to contribute to the MDTF and hence also merit a “voice” in its governance and management.
- **Strengthen the capacity of RECs:** The RECs should be strengthened in order to: communicate more effectively at country level; facilitate the work of CAADP country teams; and, ensure that they have capacity to participate actively in country level processes.

Communications

Inadequate communications has always been a concern and its neglect has contributed to the evident low levels of understanding about CAADP and poor ownership at country level. Some first steps in improving this situation have been taken. The CAADP Secretariat now has a communications specialist and a new web site was launched in March 2009. Communications must be improved urgently and the link with knowledge management needs to be made stronger.

Recommendations:

- **Develop a medium-term communications and knowledge management strategy:** A communications and knowledge management strategy should be formulated that:
 - Strengthens the flow of information between countries, RECs, CAADP Secretariat and DPs;
 - Improves the management of CAADP documentation.
 - Provides an electronic portal for information on good practices in agricultural sector planning and implementation, an entry point for access to expert groups associated with the PLIs, and e-learning opportunities directly offered by CAADP or links to those agencies that provide e-learning.
 - Targets as a priority the regions which are presently less engaged in the CAADP implementation process, north Africa (UMA), and central Africa (ECCAS).
 - Identifies short films/videos on the successes and challenges of CAADP that can be made by a production team that is able to feed its material into global TV and information systems commissioned.
- **Strengthen global advocacy:** A system should be put in place will enable the Secretariat to deliver world class advocacy and lobbying messages on behalf of African agriculture issues aimed at world leaders.
- **Strengthen continental advocacy:** The CAADP Review should be launched on the CAADP web site and used as an opportunity to:
 - Initiate continuing debate on CAADP issues through a blog.
 - Encourage joint communications work with the PLIs and FPs and encourage the RECs to follow COMESA’s example and appoint someone responsible for CAADP communications.
 - Launch a campaign to familiarise DWGs at country level with the vision and roles of CAADP.

Implementation Processes

As a political process, CAADP has to reflect the environment within which it works. This means that it must tread carefully when seeking ways of enhancing debate about reforms in the agriculture sector, whilst at the same time delivering the best available knowledge and skills support. It must also accept that politics plays an inevitable part in programme and project design.

The recommendations of the Review are based on the perception that the critical constraint at country level in the process of achieving higher investment in the agriculture sector is *less* in drawing up broad strategies, which are often politically sensitive and jealously guarded, and *more* in translating broadly conceived strategies into sound, practical and feasible investment programmes and projects on the ground. It is recommended that the balance of effort reflected in the existing processes and the proposed draft Guide be slightly shifted. The process should be built upon renewed efforts to generate local ownership of the process and also reflect the great diversity in Africa with respect to needs, priorities and skills.

Although there are many different ways in which CAADP implementation might be achieved, the Review would like to suggest as a possible scenario, a seamless process at country level which would help to resolve many of the dilemmas that currently impede implementation. The dilemmas include the “compact signing”, which has become a sticking point in the process; the absence of a post-compact action plan; and the lack of any systematic link between CAADP implementation and well-known DP resource mobilisation processes. The seamless process would start with country diagnosis, identifying a “champion” and launching the CAADP framework. It would move into an iterative cycle of stocktaking, analysis and investment programme design. Each cycle would strengthen local capacity to undertake analysis, formulate policies and design investments through creating and making use of enhanced M&E systems. The cycle would comprise two overlapping stages:

- **I: Policy dialogue:** carefully diagnosed and empowered policy dialogue supported by analytical tools, leading to a “due diligence” report and peer review, followed by the signing of a memorandum of understanding (MoU) or compact.
- **II: Investment programme design:** assistance in formulating a resource mobilisation strategy tailored to a country’s specific situation and opportunities, with strong technical support in detailed investment programme and project design in close collaboration with identified DPs, including capacity development and M&E, leading to the financing of a SWAp or individual projects as part of a PBA

Stage I: Policy dialogue

The process of CAADP country level implementation has been perceived as being rather like a “blue print” and “top down”, with countries often attempting to retro-fit their existing strategies to the CAADP pillars. It must be accepted that almost all governments (except those in a post-conflict situation) have formulated their own agriculture sector strategies and programmes, often with substantial assistance from IFIs and universities. The task of engaging governments on the CAADP agenda should be to trigger dialogue on policy issues and to identify gaps in their policies and strategies. A thorough diagnosis must be undertaken of each country including an assessment of their planning and implementation capacities so as to provide any technical and analytical support requested which will enhance the quality of the policy dialogue. An implementation “road map” would then be prepared and explicitly agreed by the government concerned: as the draft “CAADP Implementation Guide” puts it, “...*energy and motivation*” from within the country is a *non-negotiable requirement...*”. The road map would include many of the elements suggested in the “Guide” including an identification of capacity development needs, and would lead the way into a

customised set of design support activities. Incorporating many of the elements listed below, the policy dialogue process would culminate in a due diligence report and peer review that would endorse all the key aspects of a country's policy and strategy framework in much the same way as was expected from a compact.

The process described above will not be quick and its implementation in each country will vary. However, it is likely to provide a more solid foundation for the design of country investment programmes that are truly "owned" by all stakeholders, are credible to DPs and will enable a new resource mobilisation strategy to take root.

Recommendations:

- **Identify a national CAADP partner institution at country level:** Replace the CAADP Focal Point with a CAADP partner institution which would be empowered by access to resources, to work with the CAADP Country Team to carry out the implementation process; a CAADP "champion" at a senior level in government in each country would provide political support for the process.
- **Establish a CAADP Country Team:** At country level, a CAADP Country Team, embedded in the CAADP partner institution, would be established with access to supplementary resources for conducting its work and with reporting responsibilities nationally, to the relevant REC and to the CAADP Secretariat. The team would be inter-disciplinary and inter-ministerial.
- **Design and support a customised implementation process:** A flexible process that is customised to the needs and capabilities of each country and that builds upon and strengthens national programmes and supports national planning bodies, should be designed, including the following characteristics:
 - Launching the CAADP process with a detailed diagnosis of the gaps in a country's strategy and policy frameworks, and an assessment of its planning and implementation capacities.
 - Identifying an "entry strategy" for each country that will ensure the creation of rapport between decision-makers and those delivering support for the process on behalf of CAADP.
 - Providing support in conducting agriculture sector public expenditure reviews (PER) in order to assess the efficiency of expenditure in the sector and to identify the scope for and constraints to increased resource utilisation in agriculture – which could be conducted with support from UN and/or World Bank – as well as support for other pillar design issues.
 - Actively engaging specific donors and IFIs from the beginning of the process at country level and specifically, the local donor working group (DWG) for agriculture, which would jointly with government, agree on the scope and resources needed for the exercise.
 - Taking full account of established programme and project formulation procedures of the different DPs, especially the IFIs.
 - Offering to enhance capacity to undertake evidence-based analysis tailored to existing country data availability and, where appropriate, including econometric modelling.
 - Broadening analytical work to include institutional assessment, socio-economic and environmental assessment and identification of absorptive capacity constraints.
 - Setting up and providing specific capacity building support for inter-ministerial CAADP teams, built around existing planning units which would be inter-sectoral and inter-disciplinary, coordinated by a team from the Secretariat and the RECs.
 - Providing a set of technical support drawn from PLIs, RECs, AU and other institutions including the private sector tailored to the specific priorities of each country.

- Providing sufficient time, resources and facilitation to enhance consultations with all stakeholders in the design process, in particular engaging farmers' organisations and other parts of the private sector.
- Focusing on creating an environment for policy dialogue and the formulation of a viable long-term investment framework as the added value from CAADP rather than resource mobilisation *per se*
- Marking the conclusion of the initial policy dialogue with a MoU or, if all parties agree, with a "compact".
- **Introduce a slower, phased implementation approach:** Implementation should be made more demand-driven and should focus efforts on a limited number of countries – say, 10-15. Countries that already in the roundtable process should be encouraged to reaffirm their commitment and engage in the investment programme design stage (described below) even before a MoU or compact is signed. The selection of target countries should be clearly demand-driven by setting a rather high threshold of commitment at country level, especially in terms of the human resources committed and guaranteed collaboration of key decision-making institutions, before embarking on the roundtable process. Other criteria that could be applied might include the following:
 - High levels of food insecurity
 - Support for enhanced sector analysis and programme design is sought
 - Domestic and external resources are lacking
- **Institutionalise the strategy, policy and investment design process:** Building upon the formation of a CAADP Country Team, the cycle of policy dialogue, strategy formulation, investment programme design, implementation, M&E should become an iterative process that demands continuous inputs from evaluation and reporting.
- **Put in place a peer review mechanism:** As a critical element of the overall process, a credible peer review mechanism should be put in place. This would draw upon the specific technical and sectoral skills of the PLIs as well as national institutions such as universities, and would serve not only to allow countries to gauge their policies, strategies and performance against others, but also to share experiences and good practices in the sector.

Stage II: Investment programme design

Stage II would follow in a seamless way from Stage I. Indeed, much of the groundwork for investment programme design would be carried out during the policy dialogue stage.

Recommendations:

The key steps in supporting countries' efforts to translate strategies into concrete investments are:

- **Formulate country-specific resource mobilisation strategies:** A key element of Stage II would be a country-specific resource mobilisation strategy. This would identify key strategic partners in investment, including IFIs and donors, the private sector, non-traditional donors and foundations, and would include projections of government's own resource commitments. The objective would be to harmonise and give coherence to all external support for the sector. This would include familiarising governments with programme-based (PBA) and sector-wide approaches (SWAs) for the sector, and the opportunities for innovative sources of financing such as carbon finance, private equity funds and the use of aid funds to leverage commercial bank finance. The successful leveraging of substantial investment resources under Pillar 1 through TerrAfrica with GEF and DP funding, provides a model that could possibly be replicated for resource mobilisation for entire

country programmes. The key aspect of this approach is the role played by a lead financing institution in setting the procedures and standards for approval of funding.

- **Formulate a medium-term capacity building programme:** An integral part of creating greatly enhanced sector planning and programme design capability at country level is the need for systematic capacity building and experience sharing. For this reason, a central element of Stage II would be the design of a medium-term capacity building programme for the sector, prioritising skills required for sector analysis and investment programme design. Country level diagnosis of sector strategy and policy formulation, programme and project planning capabilities would need to be undertaken to inform the design of a capacity development programme tailored to each country's needs.
- **Establish an Investment Preparation Facility:** In order to deliver credible and effective support to governments in formulating investment programmes in the sector, an Investment Preparation Facility should be established that would directly target increased investment in agriculture. The facility would complement resources provided by IFIs and donors for country level sector analysis and programme formulation and would comprise two main elements:
 - **Immediate support for investment:** The IPF would provide additional resources to selected countries so as to strengthen evidence-based analysis, project design and stakeholder consultation processes so as to:
 - Strengthen sector analytical work
 - Identify and formulate specific, well-designed sectoral and sub-sectoral investment programmes/projects
 - Seek to put in place a sector-wide (SWAs) or programme-based (PBA) approach for agriculture, with basket funding and project financing from all the main DPs supporting agriculture in the country concerned
 - **Resource mobilisation:** A national resource mobilisation strategy would be prepared, tailored to each country's needs and opportunities, which would include:
 - Identifying key strategic partners in investment, including IFIs and donors, the private sector, non-traditional donors and foundations
 - Projections of government's own resource commitments to the sector in the medium term
 - Exploring the opportunities for innovative sources of financing such as carbon finance, private equity funds and the use of aid funds to leverage commercial bank finance as part of the overall resource mobilisation strategy.
 - **Capacity building:** As part of the support for investment programme preparation, the IPF would deliver capacity building in sector planning and programme design at country level. This would include:
 - Transferring skills in sector analysis and investment programme design through in-country, tailored formal courses
 - On-the-job training directly linked to the investment programme formulation tasks
 - Systematic experience sharing across the continent
- **Establish an effective M&E system:** A timely and effective M&E system would be an integral part of Stage II. This would need to incorporate indicators drawn from each of the four pillars, along the lines of those already proposed by Pillar 3.

Central support functions

In addition to the recommendations made above with respect to the CAADP Secretariat, there are important decisions to be made and agendas to be set in support of CAADP at the continental level which will support the process at country level.

The proposals in the draft “Implementation Guide” for creating **CAADP Country Teams**, based on existing national institutions, also stresses the need for the team to be more open to a multi-stakeholder process. The aim would be to broaden responsibility for implementation beyond government and a single ministry-appointed Focal Point to a team that would ensure a much more inclusive approach to development and would address priorities perceived by the private sector and civil society as well as tackling issues that might challenge government.

Along the same lines, a **CAADP Resource Group**, comprising the Secretariat, RECs and PLIs is proposed that would support country level implementation and capacity development. This group would quickly acquire experience in implementation processes for the benefit of all countries and would support the work of country teams until they become self-sustaining. An important implication of this proposal, which is broadly endorsed by the Review, is that it will remove from the RECs sole responsibility for CAADP implementation. This will lessen the urgency of reforming and strengthening the RECs, which is a long-term task, and provide a task team that is exclusively focused on country level implementation.

General recommendations:

- **Identify feasible “flagship” programmes:** Resources should be mobilised for further “flagship” programmes¹³ that will demonstrate CAADP’s continental scope and coherence, each involving a cross-section of countries, drawing upon the examples of TerrAfrica and FAAP. In particular, the establishment of “centres of excellence” in agricultural sciences, outlined below, offer the opportunity for CAADP to fulfil its role as a provider of continental public goods.
- **Foster links with non-traditional donors:** Foundations that are active in the sector and non-traditional donors that are increasingly active in supporting private investment in agriculture should be approached with a view to securing their participation in country level programming.
- **Support formulation of regional strategies for agriculture:** RECs should be encouraged to focus more on formulating regional strategies for agriculture which answer to their primary regional responsibilities, as has been undertaken in ECOWAS. These can serve as frameworks for individual country strategies and stimulate greater attention to regional issues, for example, trade in staple crops and agricultural products, cross-border livestock trade, and animal disease. These strategies should focus on identifying “regional public goods” that could evolve into focused programmes of technical assistance support delivered by the RECs.

Knowledge recommendations:

- **Expand ReSAKSS:** A second phase ReSAKSS programme should be prepared with sufficient resources to operationalise the M&E framework and ensure that the lessons from the first phase can be addressed including:
 - Extending the analytical support work to engage policy makers in applying the results of the analysis.

¹³ Examples might include NERICA rice, and the Africa Adaptation Plan for Agriculture which would address the issue of climate resilient agriculture

- Incorporating analysis of public expenditure efficiency and public financial management in the sector.
- Making specific provision for transferring analytical skills to African institutions.
- Preparing a programme to support systematic strengthening of country statistical and data gathering systems in countries where data bases are poor.
- **Focus more on knowledge management:** An important continental public good is the management of knowledge in the agriculture sector. This could include:
 - Undertaking a systematic continent-wide meso analysis of agriculture sector programmes in order to identify constraints to effective outcomes and capacity constraints in the sector.
 - Facilitating exchange of experiences in sector planning and implementation within and between regions.
 - Providing the resources to guarantee that PLIs net with relevant institutions across the continent and support knowledge transfer and analysis in each country.
 - Broadening the involvement of African institutions in each of the pillars to include expert groups of individuals.
 - Targeting technical capacity building support to the RECs where capabilities are least developed (ECCAS, SADC) to facilitate financial support from DPs.
 - Ensuring that all CAADP documents are available in both French and English and that meetings are provided with interpretation facilities In order to remedy the perceived Anglophone bias in CAADP and to foster more effective experience sharing.
- **Build centres of excellence in agricultural sciences:** The decline in resources dedicated to research and development (R&D) in agricultural sciences in Africa should be reversed through CAADP delivering a “flagship” continental public good in the form of creating a network of “centres of excellence” in agricultural sciences in Africa. This should identify and strengthen sub-regional centres as a cost-effective way of using scarce resources, but linking them with counterpart national institutions to promote and support good practices in biological sciences. This would aim to:
 - Establish a network of leading institutions to implement R&D projects.
 - Promote the sharing and efficient utilisation of scarce finance, human and physical R&D resources.
 - Build a network of state-of-the-art R&D facilities.
 - Provide R&D infrastructure that will attract back and use the skills of African scientists from the diaspora.
 - Provide focal points for the African scientific community.
 - Develop the capacity of African scientists.
 - Facilitate knowledge sharing and management in the biosciences.
 - Attract investment in biosciences research.

M&E recommendations:

- **Establish a set of feasible performance indicators:** The informal set of CAADP performance indicators, which is limited to the completion of roundtables and signing of compacts, should be broadened on the basis of a results-based management system and associated log frame at the CAADP Secretariat, REC and country level. This would include:

- Creating a simple system to report on key indicators on a regular basis at country and REC levels, feeding into a continent-wide system, drawing on the work on indicators conducted by GDPRD.
- Setting up a “scorecard” as a composite of selected indicators as a way of reporting to Heads of State and to DPs.
- **Carry our impact studies:** A programme of impact studies to be agreed between countries, RECs and DPs should be drawn up, with sufficient funds to allow several studies to be carried out each year, with the results to be reported back to the CAADP PP and AUC.

Renewed Partnerships

After five years, and with less than expected results, it is important for CAADP to strive to renew its existing partnerships with countries, RECs, PLIs and DPs, as well as forging new ones with the private sector, civil society, emerging donors and foundations.

Recommendations:

- **Re-Launch CAADP:** Use the results of the Review to re-launch CAADP at the AU Heads of State Summit in July 2009 with proposals for a strengthened set of guiding principles, implementation modalities for CAADP as a service provider, and a more coherent governance and administrative structure.
- **Seek new partnerships:** New partnerships should be sought including:
 - With new initiatives such as the UN Secretary-General’s High Level Task Force (HLTF) on Food Security and the Global Partnership for Agriculture and Food Security (GPAFS) should be pursued, with CAADP providing a framework for activities in Africa and ensuring coherence in programmes at country level.
 - With major new players in the agricultural sector, targeting emerging donors, in particular China, and foundations such as AGRA.
 - With the private sector and civil society, giving them a “voice” in the governance of CAADP, possibly through regional farmers’ associations, business associations and chambers of commerce.
 - With organisations such as the Association of European Parliamentarians for Africa (AWEPA), under the EU “*Mobilising Parliaments for NEPAD*” (MPN) programme, in order to bring CAADP to the notice of voters in the west.
- **Keep African agriculture on the development agenda:** Efforts should be redoubled to keep African agriculture on the development agenda at a time when global recession is hitting the revenue of African governments and potentially threatening the scale of development assistance.
- **Consolidate existing partnerships:** A new round of efforts should be launched to:
 - Lobby within DP agencies on behalf of CAADP through the CAADP PP and help make sure that DP political commitment at headquarters level is transmitted to country level DP offices and DWGs.
 - Renew political support within Africa, country-by-country, led by the CAADP Secretariat in collaboration with the RECs, targeting countries which have been slow in adopting the CAADP framework, and include efforts specifically addressing parliamentarians.
 - Forge stronger and more systematic links with the APF in order to execute the goal of reporting back to DPs on CAADP’s progress.

- **Adopt new, more nuanced “headline” CAADP targets:** Additional new, more appealing political target for CAADP¹⁴ should be adopted, which might refer to trade in foodstuffs or the level of food imports in the continent, as well as providing scope for a more sophisticated definition of the Maputo commitment, for example, linking target expenditures to the contribution of agriculture to GDP.

6. Strategic Plan 2008-2013: Comments

NEPAD’s Agriculture Strategic Plan 2008 – 2013 was released at the end of 2008. It has five main strategic areas:

- Partnership and coalition building to link resources with agriculture investment programmes
- Promoting the quality of CAADP implementation
- Facilitating and coordinating M&E
- Managing communication and information
- Harnessing key thinking on emerging agriculture-related issues

The Strategic Plan is moving CAADP in the right direction, including the beginning of a results-based management framework and the preliminary definition of outcomes which define the role of the Secretariat. The draft “CAADP Implementation Guide” provides many of the details about how the CAADP implementation process could be improved. Some of the key elements of the Plan that are viewed positively are set out below:

- The Plan continues to put resource mobilisation at the top of the agenda, but wisely restricts its scope to “quality agricultural investment programmes”.
- The Secretariat sees its role as advocating for the mobilisation of increased resources using such mechanisms as the CAADP PP.
- The importance of aligning private sector partners behind CAADP is stressed. However, this clearly is meant to include only philanthropic foundations and emerging donors and no specific attention is given to the role of the indigenous private sector or FDI.
- The Plan highlights the importance of communication and information as a powerful mechanism for partnerships and begins to set out what could become a knowledge management strategy.
- The development of M&E systems is given priority so that progress can be monitored and provide inputs to knowledge management.
- The Plan foresees a role for CAADP in stimulating African scholarship and also acknowledges some of the emerging issues that must be addressed such as climate change and bio-energy.
- The proposed “expanded team structure”, which would include the Secretariat and relevant parts of the RECs and PLIs, is sound but likely to be challenging in an environment where communications are poor and staff have many and different responsibilities.
- The administration of the Secretariat is expected to remain completely in the hands of DBSA. Although this helps the Secretariat to remain “lean”, the cost in terms of autonomy and flexibility could prove excessive.

¹⁴ The 10% budget commitment and 6% growth target are considered to be too technocratic to have broad political appeal

- The proposals in the Plan to move away from tied donor funding of the Secretariat towards direct funding of the work programme, and to make reporting and accountability of seconded staff clear, are critical.
- Although the Plan envisages stronger collaboration with the AUC, it is not clear what the practical implications might be.
- The proposal to collaborate more effectively with other NEPAD Units and undertake joint activities is an important step towards a more cohesive NEPAD.

7. Conclusions

CAADP as a political concept has experienced a long and painful genesis in what is, in almost all African countries, a highly sensitive area. CAADP has to tackle the reform of processes at country, regional and continental levels that address food security, access to land and water, markets and knowledge. It was built upon a wave of political commitment to reducing desperate poverty and hunger through substantially increasing investment in the agriculture sector and achieving this based upon African ownership and leadership.

Although NEPAD successfully brought a coherent voice to Africa's commitment to development and attracted strong support from development partners, the agriculture part - CAADP - was initially greeted with some scepticism. However, after five years, CAADP has gone further than any other part of the Partnership in articulating African leadership, embracing the adoption of CAADP principles from Heads of State down to line ministries. It has also secured strong commitment from all the main DPs.

The implementation of CAADP – the translation of the broad concept and principles into reality at regional and country level – has been in process for much less than five years and for this reason the Review considered it inappropriate to assess its impact on agricultural growth. The focus was rather on assessing the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the CAADP implementation process and on making recommendations about how this might be improved.

There is no doubt that CAADP is recognised as being highly relevant to the goal of accelerating the growth of the agriculture sector in Africa. The CAADP approach has proved itself relevant at country level and has been able to accommodate major new challenges such as high food prices, climate change and bio-energy. However, CAADP needs to strengthen its relevance to the private sector and to providing more effective technical support that can inform individual country's strategy and policy formulation.

The processes that have evolved to translate the CAADP principles into reality, through broad consultation and by trial and error, have had limited effectiveness. They have been constrained by sometimes confused objectives, overly ambitious targets, lack of human and financial resources, and governance and administrative structures that are not adapted to the scale of the task in hand. However, many different factors are coming together to promise a much more hopeful and effective future. At a technical level, sound frameworks have been put together for the four pillars that will better inform country level policy and strategy dialogue and a new, more "user-friendly" set of guidelines have been drafted for implementing the roundtable process. The CAADP Secretariat is on the cusp of a new era as NEPAD is fully integrated into the AU, with a substantive NEPAD Chief Executive. It also finds itself well prepared with a credible, results-based five-year strategic plan. The promise of success over the next five years is

underwritten by the availability of resources, in the form of the US\$60 million Multi-Donor Trust Fund that will empower the processes that are now ready to go.

The Review is in broad agreement with both the CAADP Secretariat's Strategic Plan and its draft Implementation Guide. Its recommendations should be seen in the context of these two documents, as suggestions about how they could be further strengthened.