



Final Review Report

Johannesburg, South Africa

September 2019

Table of Contents

1	CAADP Independent Technical Review Report	2
1.1	Purpose of the Review	2
1.2	Request for the Independent Technical Review.....	2
2	Main Findings on the form of the LASIP II Document–.....	2
3	Main Findings on the substance of the LASIP II Document	3
3.1	Overarching criteria	3
3.1.1	Alignment with CAADP vision, principles and strategy	3
3.1.2	Existence of sound expenditure plan.....	4
3.1.3	Prioritization within the investment plan	4
3.1.4	Identification of policy issues and steps required to resolve them.....	4
3.1.5	Programme balance.....	5
3.2	Institutional criteria.....	6
3.2.1	Viability of implementation arrangements.....	6
3.2.2	Stakeholder consultation	6
3.2.3	Inter-Ministerial collaboration and coordination	6
3.2.4	Status of donor harmonization	6
3.2.5	Links to regional agriculture sector development plans.....	6
3.2.6	Incorporation of private sector	7
3.3	Technical criteria	7
3.3.1	Consistency with Transformation, growth and poverty reduction goals	7
3.3.2	Adoption of policy and programmes best practices	7
3.3.3	Links with existing sector programmes/projects.....	8
3.3.4	Monitoring and evaluation framework.....	8
3.3.5	Risk assessment.....	8
4	Conclusion.....	8
5	Annexes	10
6	Guidelines for Country Investment Plan Review Criteria	14

Acknowledgments

The African Union would like to express deepest appreciation to the IFPRI / ReSAKSS, for dedicating time to review key components of the draft LASIP II document despites receiving the request for support at rather short notice.

Disclaimer

This report does not reflect the official opinion of any of the institutions whose representatives were involved in the review exercise. It is rather their expert opinion resulting from collective reflection on the subject that has been captured here to support finalization of the LASIP II of the Republic of Liberia.

Review Team

Dr Augustin Wambo Yamdjeu (Team Leader), Dr Bernice Mclean and Mr Erick Sile (African Union Development Agency-AUDA-NEPAD), Dr Laila Lokosang (African Union Commission), Dr Manson Nwafor (ReSAKSS)

1 CAADP Independent Technical Review Report

1.1 Purpose of the Review

The Independent Technical Review follows upon completion of the formulation of the National Agriculture Investment Plan (NAIP) or Regional Agriculture Investment Plan (RAIP) and preferably occurs before the Business Meeting as a critical milestone in the operational implementation of the country or regional compact and investment plan. The Independent Technical Review is undertaken as a part of a due diligence process to ascertain that the plan comprehensively addresses agricultural transformation and sustained inclusive agricultural growth for the country or region. Recommendations of the Technical Review are subsequently presented to the requesting party and are to be considered as input to augment the national/regional Implementation Roadmap which is developed to operationalise the investment plan. The review exercise is conducted by an external review team led and managed by the African Union Development Agency (AUDA-NEPAD).

1.2 Request for the Independent Technical Review

Upon completion of the Liberian Agricultural Sector Investment Plan II (2018-2022), the Government of the Republic of Liberia (GoL), through its CAADP Focal Point in the Ministry of Agriculture. The African Union Development Agency put together the following team of experts that undertook a desk review of the LASIP II: Dr Augustin Wambo Yamdjeu (Team Leader), Dr Bernice Mclean and Mr Erick Sile (African Union Development Agency-AUDA-NEPAD), Dr Laila Lokosang (African Union Commission), Dr Manson Nwafor (ReSAKSS).

Summary of Main Findings of the Review

Overall, the main findings of the review are clustered in two main categories. On the one hand, we have an overview on the form of the document, and the other hand we present our perspectives on the substantive content of the second Liberia Agricultural Sector Investment Plan (LASIP II) document along 6 main components.

This brief report presents the findings of the AUDA-NEPAD led review of the LASIP II (2018 - 2022) in its second generation. With regard to the methodology, this review report focuses on the degree of alignment with CAADP values, principles and frameworks (Malabo Declaration, the New Country Implementation Guidelines, and the Biennial Review Mechanism).

In application of the Independent Technical Review guidelines and methodology, we clustered the findings of the review in three main categories. On the one hand, we have an overview on the form/structure of the document, and the other hand we present our perspectives on the substantive content of the LASIP II RAIP document along 6 main components. In addition to that, the review makes some specific commentary and formulates some recommendations under key thematic issues captured in the LASIP II document.

2 Main Findings on the form of the LASIP II Document–

The document is found to provide a very good review of the agriculture sector performance for the first generation of LASIP. Indeed, the authors' of empirical information and analysis and discussions is particularly commendable. Explanations and interpretations of findings based on review of facts has enriched the review as well.

Coming to LASIP II, I find the identified components rationally identified. However, I feel that the Plan has left out some pertinent intervention areas without which it would not have “worn the right boots for climbing the rough cliff” on the journey towards achieving the Malabo 2025 and SDG 2030 targets! I outline this missing links as follows:

Component 1: Food and Nutrition Security

- There is need to include a strategy for improving access to energy, linking with the energy sector. Oftentimes access energy is often neglected in food insecurity discussions, but it is one of the major factors affecting food consumption, and even processing (drying, smoking and cooking). Food may be available, but making to the table might be curtailed by lack of cooking energy. Food losses is also significantly caused by lack of access, availability and affordability.
- AU has decided that home-grown school feeding be expanded in Africa with increased domestic resources. Good food consumption culture can be promoted through school meals programmes. Considerable literature informs of the multi-pronged benefit of home-grown school feeding programme for learners and smallholders. It is therefore, advocated that LASIP II includes a strategy on scaling up home-grown school feeding programme.

Component 2:

- It would be good to add an activity for identifying priority commodities with value chain development.

For the rest of the components (3 and 4), I am generally happy with the identified and described strategies and activities under them.

3 Main Findings on the substance of the LASIP II Document

This section focuses solely on the substance of the document under review. From the findings of the LASIP II, some recommendations/suggestions are presented per below, for consideration by the GoL, under each of the components against which the review was conducted.

3.1 Overarching criteria

3.1.1 Alignment with CAADP vision, principles and strategy

The Malabo declaration outlines the key principles and values of CAADP to include among others: a) the pursuit of agriculture-led growth as a main strategy to achieve targets on food and nutrition security and shared prosperity; b) the exploitation of regional complementarities and cooperation to boost growth; c) the application of principles of evidence-based planning, policy efficiency, dialogue, review, and accountability, shared by all NEPAD programs; d) the use of partnerships and alliances including farmers, agribusiness, and civil society; and e) support implementation at countries levels, and regional coordination and harmonization.

In terms of agriculture being regarded as a key driver for growth and poverty reduction, the government has committed to this in principle but in practice the commitment appears not to be strong. For example, the share of agriculture expenditure in total expenditure in the last 3 years (2016 to 2018) has been below the 10% Maputo declaration at a value of 2%. The share is equally low compared to the West Africa average of 7% (ReSAKSS WA, 2019). In addition, its

performance in a second major strategy element in CAADP – the 6% agricultural growth target – is equally not encouraging. In the 2016 – 2018 period the country recorded a negative growth of - 8.1% compared to a positive growth for the whole of West Africa of 2.7%¹.

In terms of exploiting regional complementarities, Liberia is an active participant in regional consultations and is usually open to regional approaches to issues. Presently, Liberia has notable challenges in its agriculture and related data management system. As such, its commitment in the past to evidence based policy making may be characterized as weak. However, it has shown reasonable interest in (but low implementation) of dialogue and review processes that enrich decision making and accountability. Much more work is still needed in this area. In terms of the use of partnerships, there is a general agreement in official circles on this but the implementation of arrangements to ensure that strong partnerships exist needs much more improvement. In terms of the country's commitment to regional arrangements, it can be rated highly as the country is typically willing to participate in regional planning and review processes. Overall, it may be summarized that the country's alignment with the principles and values of CAADP is moderate and requires improvement.

3.1.2 Existence of sound expenditure plan

Less than 43% of LASIP I budget was mobilized. Although insufficient to fund the National investment plan, the core of this funding was obtained mainly through multilateral and bilateral partners. LASIP I was apparently highly subsidised and there is strong indication that LASIP II will rely on donors' funding as well for its implementation. The document does not indicate the GoL's contribution over the total expenditure. It is not clear either how LASIP II budget is embedded within the country's national budget.

To ensure adequate financial contribution of the GoL and to allow government's tracking of its expenses, it is recommended that the budget of LASIP I be somehow embedded within the national budget. Countries which have successfully funded their NAIPs, such as Malawi and Rwanda, had found ways to table NAIP expenses during national budgeting processes. This has resulted in easy allocation of government's funds to the implementation of the NAIPs and smooth tracking of the 10% of public expenditures the government had committed to allocate to agriculture.

3.1.3 Prioritization within the investment plan

Priority commodities have been identified and funding increases towards these commodities would help address food security and nutrition issues in Liberia. However, it is unclear from reading LASIP II how prioritization of activities was arrived at. There is a five year investment plan built around 5 programmes. But LASIP II does not give much information about the rationale of the sequencing of activities across the 5 programmes.

3.1.4 Identification of policy issues and steps required to resolve them

The report from the last BR review in 2016 had 3 core recommendations for Liberia: (a) Liberia should implement measures aimed at doubling agricultural productivity to meet the related target of CAADP Malabo Declaration. (b) The country should strengthen agriculture data collection on the Malabo commitments to inform missing indicators so as to improve its performance level in the next round of the Biennial Review Reporting. (c) The country should also improve national multi-sectoral coordination body and multi-stakeholder body to enhance CAADP-based Cooperation, Partnership and Alliance. A review of the planned activities and expected results in the proposed LASIP II document indicates that a good plan has been outlined to address items (b) and (c) above. If the activities in the LASIP II document in these areas are successfully

¹ Based on World Development Indicators data

implemented, there will be substantial improvement in them and in the general policy environment.

In terms of specific policy changes, the LASIP II has equally planned on addressing a number of policy and legislative issues in the planned activities. It is impressive that a number of policy stocktaking or reviews are planned. This shows that the government is keenly aware of the role the policy environment plays in moulding outcomes. While it would have been better to conduct these policy reviews before the LASIP II's implementation commences, it is good they will be done in the course of the NAIP's implementation. It is however suggested that these policy stocktaking and reviews occur as early as possible in order to inform policy revisions and the parliament's legislative agenda.

In addition, a number of legislations were highlighted as requiring further work for the country's food and nutrition objectives to be achieved. Overall, the LASIP II document indicates that good attention has been paid to policy issues. The most important area in terms of the policy circle is the monitoring, reviewing and dialogue processes which were among the key recommendations from the last BR report. This is a key area that can determine the success or failure of the NAIP given the very low capacity of the country in this area.

3.1.5 Programme balance

A review of the programme components reveals that the 4 sub-sectors are addressed in the LASIP II with attention paid to supporting expansion in all 4. Attention was also paid to irrigation, extension and road and other infrastructure including those that can reduce post-harvest loss. A large portion of the budget (over 75%) goes to addressing these issues while 18% was budgeted for food reserve, social protection issues etc. Overall, the budget appears well focused broadly.

One area that requires adjustment is the allocation to planning, monitoring, evaluation and review processes. Presently, these account for .3% (less than 1%) of the LASIP II's budget. They are captured under the lines C.4.2 Policy process support, C.4.4 M&E systems and accountability mechanisms and C.4.4 M&E systems and accountability mechanisms

A key challenge in many countries is the weak attention paid to evidence based planning, monitoring, review and dialogue processes. This leads to government's reviewing process based on the number of activities implemented/amount of money spent rather than the percentage of the population reached or the decrease in the overall targeted indicator (as opposed to intermediate activity indicators). To address this challenge which leads to having no clear evidence of impact, it is important that planning, monitoring, review and dialogue processes are well funded. It is recommended that at least 5% of the budget should be allocated to these 3 budget lines as they are the best way to confirm that the LASIP II achieved good results and for good program management to occur while it is being implemented. Given, the low capacity in this area, it is important that it is given sufficient budgetary provision in order to obtain improvements in it which are vital to the overall success of the LASIP II.

In order to better track the efficiency of budgeting and spending decisions, it would be useful to reorganize the budget according to the expected outcomes in the strategic framework. Presently, there is a level of mismatch between the two where it is not clear where some outcomes are addressed in the budget.

3.2 Institutional criteria

3.2.1 Viability of implementation arrangements

A graphic presentation could help clarify and visualize the connections existing among the various components of the management and implementation architecture of the LASIP II. As of now it is not clear how the sustainability of the proposed mechanism has been ensured.

3.2.2 Stakeholder consultation

From the draft document, it appears that the process that consisted of the review of the previous LASIP I and followed through to LASIP II was inclusive. However, a close analysis of the identity of the constituencies mobilized for that purpose does not suggest that this has been fully inclusive. For instance, it is not clear how the private sector was mobilized and how much influence did they have on setting the key priority.

3.2.3 Inter-Ministerial collaboration and coordination

Another striking element is the apparent limited engagement with other line ministries whose role are central in coming up with a LASIP that is fully Malabo compliant in the sense that it mobilizes multisectoriality as the number one principle. This could, therefore, also beg the question: what is the definition of agriculture in Liberia if the former is not aligned to the COFOG?

3.2.4 Status of donor harmonization

The document made reference to the Agriculture Donor Working Group (ADWG) that has once existed and functioned; with the Ministry of Agriculture being the convener. It was then replaced with the Food and Nutrition Technical Committee (FNTC) in which the coordination of the food security has to be discussed. After a long period of non-functionality, the FNTC is being reactivated. However, one is not sure how effective the donor coordination and harmonization operates within the countries. Yet, this is a very critical element that guarantees the success of the NAIP in all high performing countries.

3.2.5 Links to regional agriculture sector development plans

Under the ECOWAP, member countries are expected to align in two ways (a) implement activities that reflect the common ECOWAP/CAADP/MALABO framework and (b) implement activities and regional instruments that promote regional integration. In terms of alignment with the vision of the ECOWAP/CAADP, the LASIP II demonstrates significant alignment based on the range of activities considered and the choice of indicators. If implemented successfully, it will address a large proportion of areas of interest under the ECOWAP/CAADP. In terms of supporting activities that promote regional integration, the LASIP II explicitly targets maintaining compliance with regional and international trade policies and regulations including regional ECOWAS instruments. It also aims at improving quality control measures and standards which are important for international trade. It equally acknowledges the key role intra-ECOWAS trade is to play in the implementation of the ECOWAP.

In spite of the above, it does not discuss measures to address the obstacles to intra-ECOWAS trade in the areas of border controls etc. This will need to be better developed in the projects that will comprise LASIP II. However, it should be noted that Liberia is an active participant in regional dialogues and is usually open to playing roles expected of it. In addition, the LASIP II explicitly targets knowledge and skills sharing at the international level as way of improving stakeholders' implementation capacities.

3.2.6 Incorporation of private sector

Countries which have had successful NAIPs have involved the private sector from the planning stage. LASIP does not indicate when and how the private sector voice was taken into consideration. Despite the fact that there is mention in the document of the importance of the private sector for a successful LASIP implementation, it remains unclear how these important stakeholders were engaged and the fraction of the budget the private sector will be willing to fund, after the consultations.

3.3 Technical criteria

3.3.1 Consistency with Transformation, growth and poverty reduction goals

One question that keeps coming back is: does Liberia have an overall National Development Plan (NDP) that is meant to frame the overall vision of the country for the medium to long-term? The LASIP has to use the NDP equivalent as the bedrock and therefore, clear reference and more importantly, FULL ALIGNMENT to it is a must.

The forecasted agriculture and non-agriculture growth rates in the plan are below the 6.6% and 15.5% required to achieve the Malabo 2025 targets of halving poverty and eliminating hunger as indicated in an IFPRI study. However, these appear to be independent estimates that are unrelated to the plans in the LASIP II. Overall, no clear sectoral and poverty reduction targets were set in the plan. Only expenditure and commodity productivity and production targets were set in the plan.

The volume of planned expenditures in the plan is adequate to achieve the MALABO poverty and hunger reduction plans based on the IFPRI analysis i.e. for the 2018 to 2022 period. Of course, an inability to source the required funds would imply a constrained ability to achieve the targets. In terms of production and productivity targets, large annual increases in area cultivated appear to be relied upon to achieve this: oil palm (16%), Rubber (5%), Cocoa (11%), Rice (19%) and Cassava (5%). It may be better to target a higher level of increase in yields instead of high area expansion rates.

The plan targets covering 125,000 people in a social protection (social safety net) program. However, available analysis indicates that almost triple this number will require social protection if the MALABO goals are to be achieved by 2025. Overall, the plan appears not to have been based on a comprehensive model that would allow the generation of macro as well as sectoral targets. It would be good to do more detailed analysis which can generate clearer and more consistent targets at the commodity as well as macro level. This can be done as part of the planned reviews.

The review has unveiled that, worryingly, LASIP I struggled throughout since its launch. The plummeting government investment in the agriculture and food security sector (soaring funding gaps), never improving net trade in agricultural commodities, the dismal performance in food security and nutrition indicators, speak for themselves.

3.3.2 Adoption of policy and programmes best practices

The poor performance of the sector speaks of the deficit in implementation of the well-articulated policies and strategies (i.e. those to transform the agricultural sector). This indicates a steep cliff to climb in as far as LASIP II is concerned.

Even though the document suggests that a series of policies and programme documents from the ministries responsible for Agriculture and Health were consulted, it remains a bit unclear how

the materials have been harnessed and fed into the current version of the LASIP II. Here is an important question for which a clear-cut answer is hard to find throughout the LASIP II document: what is the nature and role of the *Liberia Agriculture Transformation Agenda (LATA)* in between LASIP 1 and LASIP 2?

3.3.3 Links with existing sector programmes/projects

See section right above for reference.

3.3.4 Monitoring and evaluation framework

The results framework and M&E indicators show that adequate plans have been made for Monitoring and evaluation. The document indicates that a detailed Liberia Agriculture Monitoring and Evaluation System (LAGMIS) has been developed with the support of USAID. However, it is not clear how functional the system presently is. It is hoped that with funding the already created system will address the needs of the LASIP's implementation.

The strategic/results framework for the LASIP II shows that careful thought has been given to achieving the food and nutrition security goals of Liberia in line with the areas of focus encouraged by the ECOWAP/CAADP. If the results in the framework is achieved, reasonable changes will be observed in a wide area of issues in food and nutrition security in Liberia. However, the absence of growth and poverty reduction targets makes it challenging to monitor high level goals achievement. Only commodity targets are indicated in the plan. This should be addressed.

3.3.5 Risk assessment

This could be further detailed to explore the main risk that could prevent implementation of the LASIP II from achieving its main targets in a manner that is consistent with the Malabo Declaration and the National development Plan (NDP) which seems to be missing here.

4 Conclusion

From the review of the present LASIP II document, besides detailed recommendations made in sections of the report, the following concluding remarks could be arrived at:

5.1. Reading through the assessment, the outbreak of Ebola set aside, one gets a sense that implementation of the LASIP I was rather challenged by some many factors; hence achievements are rather limited. It our hope such a quick summary is accurate.

5.2. The document is well written and easy to read and understand. However, some sentences and segments are incomplete or repeating. A thorough editing of the whole document is therefore recommended.

5.3. An Executive Summary is missing. Having one could make reading and understanding of the document even much easier.

5.4. The document needs to have better-structured presentation of the methodology mobilized in its formulation. As of now, such aspect appears to be too lightly presented in the document.

5.5. The review observed that building capacity within Ministry of Agriculture to drive implementation of the LASIP should be seen as urgent.

5.6. It is critical that the country fully embraces multisector approach that the Malabo declaration is calling for.

5.7. Throughout the document, as missing element of the analysis is the “HOW”. In as much as there is some good level of clarity on what has to be done and why, one is not always sure HOW exactly the LASIP II document “intends to things and using which instruments.” It is therefore highly recommended that the CAADP country team revisits the document and comes up with a clear set of key policy instruments that will be mobilized to drive implementation on the ground.

5.8 The preparation of the overall implementation plan of the LASIP II could give the opportunity to address some of the recommendations and points raised in this report and which cannot be directly inserted in the main LASIP II document itself.

5 Annexes



Independent Technical Review of National Agricultural Investment Plans Concept Note and Terms of Reference

November 10, 2017

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to provide guidance for the review of National Agricultural Investment Plans (NAIPs) and for the Business Meeting to be held after the NAIP review. The document discusses the objectives and outcomes of each of these steps to enable the country to move rapidly towards implementation of quality agriculture programmes. This document elaborates a common framework to rally local and international expertise and development partner and private sector support to country CAADP processes in liaison with the African Union Commission (AUC), the NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency (NPCA) and Regional Economic Communities (RECs).

The technical independent review note consists of three sections: the first outlines the scope, content, objectives and outcomes of the technical review of the NAIP; the second provides guidelines for the Business Meeting to be held following the NAIP review to finalize the expenditure / spending plan for the NAIP; and the third discusses ongoing efforts to strengthen CAADP implementation at the country level and ensure a rigorous, evidence-based policymaking process.

1. Technical Review of the National Agricultural Investment Plan: what it stands for

1.1 Goals and Outcomes of the Technical Review

Once the National Agriculture Investment Plan is ready, the Government will make available copy of the NAIP to partners through the REC, AUC and NPCA. This submission of the NAIP to the respective REC and AUC and NPCA will formally trigger the technical review.

The NAIP technical review is part of the overall CAADP implementation process, and will be informed by other key CAADP-related reviews and analyses, including country Joint Sector Review (JSR) assessment and JSR reports. In particular, it is important and critical that the review be based on, and make full use of, the thematic reports prepared by experts to guide NAIP design including but not limited: the country Status Assessment and Profile, the country Goals and Milestones Report, and the country Policy and Program Opportunities Report, etc...

The technical review is a critical step in the operational implementation of the NAIP. The primary objective is to collectively evaluate for:

- the likelihood for the investment programs to meet the different goals and commitments called for in the Malabo Declaration as well as country-level goals, as summarized in the country Goals and Milestones Report;
- the use of best practices and other technical guidance in the country Policy and Program Opportunities report in designing the above investment programs;

- the technical realism (alignment of resources with results) and adequacy of institutional arrangements of the programs;
- the integration of CAADP principles of inclusive review and dialogue and the extent and quality of the mutual accountability system;
- adequacy of institutional arrangements for effective and efficient “delivery” including information and knowledge support, M&E and on-going evaluation and learning, as informed by country Institutional Architecture Assessment and action plan to address institutional weaknesses;
- coherence and or consistency between policies, implementation arrangements and delivery mechanisms and investments areas, priorities or programme objectives;
- appropriateness and feasibility of the indicators for impact and system or capacity improvement and accountability; and
- potential to contribute and link to regional integration objectives.

The **purpose of the review is not to approve or grade the investment programs**, rather, it is to ensure that every possible action is being taken to make sure that the objectives and targets laid out in the plan and defined in the CAADP/Malabo agenda will be met. The exercise has to be done by an independent group of experts who have not been involved in the NAIP design and development, as to avoid any conflict of interests. As such, the review should be seen and approached as an exercise to lay the groundwork for successful implementation of the plans reflected in the NAIP. The outcome of the review should therefore be a set of concrete, implementable actions to ensure the following:

- (i). The NAIP reflects a sufficient degree of realism;
- (ii). Policy, process and system requirements are in place to ensure successful implementation;
- (iii). A realistic spending plan is in place to meet the resource needs of the NAIP from budgetary and Development Partner resources;
- (iv). Adequate Mutual Accountability tools and mechanisms are in place, such as a high-quality agricultural JSR, a well-functioning country Biennial Review process, an operational consultation platform, etc.;
- (v). Institutional infrastructure is aligned and adequate for effective policy formulation, implementation and review.
- (vi). Multi stakeholder coordination in place to ensure inclusiveness and ownership of the NAIP.

The main outcomes of the review include:

- 1) An Independent Technical Review Report available to help the Government to finalize the NAIP for further engagement at the Business meeting

The review will focus on the areas described earlier

Table 1: Undertaking the Technical Review of the National Agriculture Investment Plan and Programmes

Activity/Outcomes	Govt Responsibilities (Country CAADP Team)	Other Lead Players	Timeline Date limit	Remarks
Technical Review of the National Agriculture Investment Plan				
The review of the investment plan (or due diligence process) would be conducted by a review team led and managed by AUC and NPCA in liaison with the REC concerned	Govt lead [verify] - Local coordination - Make NAIP Document available for the review - Critical Ministry of Finance / Economic Planning role and responsibilities	- CAADP Technical Networks - CAADP Non-state actors Coalition - Consulting companies - etc	3 weeks [verify] including one country mission of 05 days	Reference Documents: - Country JSR assessment and recent JSR reports - Country Biennial Review report - Country Status Assessment and Profile - Country Goals and Milestones Report - Country Policy and Program Opportunities Report - Country Institutional Architecture Assessment
2) Review Report				
3) Final NAIP document – ready for business meeting				
4) Spending Plan				

The review follows a set of criteria and benchmarks. Once the review has been completed, the investment plan plus the review report will be circulated to RECs, AUC, NPCA, Development Partners agencies, other CAADP implementation institutions and key stakeholder groups. All background materials would be assembled on the NEPAD and respective REC web site with hypertext links to all technical, policy and other background documents and working papers.

1.2. The Components, methodology, criteria and tools for the Technical Review

The basic approach of the review consists of assessing proposed actions and outcomes in the programmes against CAADP / Malabo principles and country specific targets, objectives, practices, and approaches stated in the NAIP or defined during the analytical support for NAIP design. The criteria are measures of the consistency or lack thereof of the programs with the above indicators. The main components and tools for the review include the following:

1. Alignment with the CAADP and Malabo principles, values and targets: The Country CAADP Implementation Guidelines under the Malabo Declaration setting out the vision, principles, core strategy elements, and impact expectations;
2. Coherence and consistency with transformation, growth and poverty reduction objectives and targets: The country Goals and Milestones Report defining the long term agricultural productivity, growth, and trade performance goals, and the related poverty outcomes;
3. Embodiment of technical best practices and CAADP / Malabo priority areas/issues: The country Policy and Program Opportunities document laying out the key strategic issues, core program elements, and best practices;
4. Operational quality and implementation readiness: The country JSR assessment and reports, Biennial Review (BR) report, and country Status Assessment and Profile and associated lessons on the country's current agricultural performance, agricultural funding landscape, policy review and dialogue systems, etc.;
5. Detailed investment programs showing inputs, outputs, outcomes, and institutional arrangements;
6. The 2016 CAADP Donor Support and Coordination Framework and the 2009 Guidelines for Donor Support to CAADP Process at a Country Level documents which outline modalities for engagement between local development partner agencies, government and other stakeholders

Component 1: Alignment with CAADP / Malabo vision, principles, and strategy elements.

Reference: Country CAADP Implementation Guidelines under the Malabo Declaration

The component's objective is to find out whether all key vision elements, principles, and strategy core elements, as defined in Annex I, are reflected in the country's programs and, where there are gaps, to help fill these in order to ensure full alignment.

Component 2: Consistency with long term growth and poverty reduction options

Reference: Country Goals and Milestones Report

The objective under this component is to evaluate whether: (i) the overall growth targets that are specified or implied in the plans, in general, and (ii) the changes in individual sub-sectors and related targets, in particular, diverge from the sector-wide performance and poverty reduction outcomes underlying the long term strategic scenarios. For instance, each of these scenarios is linked to required changes in sub-sector growth rates, trade performance, overall public expenditure levels, and assumptions about the efficiency of sector policies.

Component 3: Adoption of best practices and inclusion of core program elements

Reference: Country Policy and Program Opportunities and Best Practices Report

This component of the review seeks to find out where clearer definition and understanding of the strategic issues and better integration of best practices can help improve the design of the plans and maximize the chances of success. The review will be guided by the analysis of best practices, policy opportunities and recommended actions in the country Policy and Program Opportunities and Best Practices Report.

Component 4: Coordination capacities and implementation readiness

Reference: JSR assessment/reports, Biennial Review report, country Status Assessment and Profile

Under this component, reviewers will use lessons from previous analyses to ensure that necessary institutional and policy elements are in place to enable successful implementation of the NAIP. The objective is to agree on: (i) a joint action plan to meet the policy, budgetary, and assistance commitments and (ii) identify and confirm modalities for mutual review, including dialogue fora and supporting knowledge systems to track and report on such commitments.

Component 5: Operational realism of investment programs

*Reference: Detailed investment programmes
Project evaluation guides such as the World Bank's A User's Guide to Poverty and Social Impact Analysis; the World Bank's Tools for Institutional, Political, and Social Analysis of Policy Reform: A Sourcebook for Development Practitioners; and OECD's Promoting Pro-Poor Growth: A Practical Guide to Ex Ante Poverty Impact Assessment*

The objective is to verify and confirm the adequacy of the content, cost and institutional arrangements, and where necessary, to identify the operational and design improvements to be carried out to ensure successful implementation. Independent consultants will be mobilized to complete this component of the review.

6 Guidelines for Country Investment Plan Review Criteria

Overarching Criteria		Information Source
1	<p>Alignment with CAADP vision, principles and strategy</p> <p>Purpose: To assess the extent to which all the key vision elements, principles and strategy core are reflected in the country's investment plan and, where gaps exist, what measures are proposed to ensure full alignment.</p> <p>Approach: It is important to ensure that "alignment" is used as a genuine measure of the coherence and soundness of the investment plan and not simply as a token statement of adherence to CAADP principles.</p> <p>Importance: High</p> <p>Recommendation: Since all countries that have gone through the first generation of NAIPs should have demonstrated broad alignment with CAADP, the judgement on this criterion is most likely to be a qualitative statement identifying areas where adjustments might be</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roundtable background documents • Strategic options • Thematic analysis

	made to enhance the alignment with CAADP and coherence of the plan.	
2	<p>Existence of sound expenditure plan</p> <p>Purpose: To assess the aggregate feasibility of the incremental financing proposed, identify sources of existing or pipeline financing available, and establish the scale of the financing gap.</p> <p>Approach: The scale of incremental financing should be assessed against:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current development and recurrent budget commitment and budget outcomes • Overall budget scale and financing against Maputo commitment (10%) <p>The financing plan should be comprehensive so that it covers both on- and off-budget financing sources, both core sector and related sector budgets, and traditional and non-traditional donors.</p> <p>Costing of programmes should be assessed by reviewing a detailed breakdown of incremental costs based on unit costs where available and estimates. Results-based budgeting should link expenditures to outcome and outputs contained within a results or logical framework.</p> <p>Importance: High</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>i) If the projected size of incremental funding is greater than indicated by the IFPRI analysis, and/or represents an increase of more than 30% over existing budgets, even if less than the 10% target, the scale of the investment plan should merit detailed review.</p> <p>ii) The expenditure plan should clearly show all known financing sources with a full breakdown by donors or government source. It is not necessary to demonstrate how the gap will be financed at the review stage but clear linkages should be made with prioritization of expenditures.</p> <p>iii) A full PER will be a pre-requisite to implementing a SWAp or PBA arrangement and should be a core part of the review process. If no in-depth PER is available, a rapid budget assessment focusing on core PER elements can be useful in the review, in particular an analysis of budget outcomes in the sector in recent years. PERs should be fully integrated into budget planning and monitoring process and undertaken on a regular basis (yearly if possible).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National budget documents • Budget outcome reports • Estimate of Maputo commitment scale • IFPRI analysis • Donor assistance strategies
3	<p>Prioritisation within the investment plan</p> <p>Purpose: To demonstrate that the sequencing of investment in the sector and within individual programmes has been properly considered.</p> <p>Approach: Presentation of different levels of priority (e.g. high, medium, low) in the investment plan with a clear explanation of why the particular level of priority has been assigned, together with</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation plan

	<p>explicit list of criteria used: readiness, capacity, need for sequencing, impact, etc.</p> <p>Importance: High</p> <p>Recommendation: If priorities are not clearly indicated in the plan and programmes, the overall plan should be reformulated.</p>	
4	<p>Identification of policy issues and steps required to resolve them</p> <p>Purpose: To ensure that outstanding policy issues are recognised and that measures to address them have been considered.</p> <p>Approach: The identification by government of policy issues indicates an understanding of the importance of the policy environment when formulating an investment plan. Policy issues that go beyond the sector but which are important in influencing the success of the investment plan should also be identified.</p> <p>Importance: High</p> <p>Recommendation: There are always policy issues that need to be resolved. It will remain as a judgement by the reviewers whether the specific issues are critical to successful implementation. It is advised to have an annex of policy actions and reforms that will lead the implementation of the NAIP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JSR and BR reports
5	<p>Programme balance</p> <p>Purpose: To assess the extent to which the investment plan is comprehensive in scope.</p> <p>Approach: The plan should propose investments that address the constraints in all the main sub-sectors as well as in the main areas in which public investment can play an important role.</p> <p>Importance: Medium</p> <p>Recommendation: An investment plan that fails to provide for investment in the main sub-sectors and services should prompt specific questions about the reason why certain areas have been excluded.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of sector scope • Existing budget allocations • Proposed budget allocations
Institutional criteria		Information Source
6	<p>Viability of implementation arrangements</p> <p>Purpose: To assess the capacity of the main institutions within the sector to implement the proposed investment plan.</p> <p>Approach: Although it is difficult to assess the viability of future implementation arrangements, the institutional assessment should provide an indication of any systemic weaknesses or gaps in the way public investments are implemented.</p> <p>Importance: High</p> <p>Recommendation: Failure to provide clear and uncomplicated lines of management and reporting should be a cause for concern. Proposals to contract out service delivery and to follow the principles of subsidiarity should be viewed positively. If a formal institutional</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional architecture assessment report and associated capacity-building plan

	assessment has been carried out, its conclusions and recommendations should be cross-checked against proposed implementation arrangements and measures to strengthen identified weaknesses. If no adequate institutional assessment has been carried out, the plan should include proposals and a timeline for undertaking such an assessment.	
7	<p>Stakeholder consultation</p> <p>Purpose: To assess the extent to which the investment plan is likely to have the full support and ownership of the main stakeholders.</p> <p>Approach: The investment planning process should document the scope and form of stakeholder consultations that took place.</p> <p>Importance: Medium</p> <p>Recommendation: Although stakeholder consultation is built into the roundtable process, it is crucial that this continues throughout the investment plan formulation process as well. Any indication that the private sector has not played an active role should raise questions about the capacity of the plan to mobilise private investment in the sector. CSOs – especially farmer organisations - should have been engaged in investment planning both nationally and at local level.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investment plan process documents • CSO consultation proceedings • Chamber of Commerce reports • CNC Report
8	<p>Inter-ministerial collaboration and coordination</p> <p>Purpose: To identify constraints to implementing a sector investment plan that incorporates infrastructure and services that support agriculture.</p> <p>Approach: Review existing inter-ministerial collaboration mechanisms and proposals to strengthen them.</p> <p>Importance: Medium</p> <p>Recommendation: Inter-ministerial collaboration is difficult to achieve in any administration. The group of ministries and agencies critical to agriculture should be identified and collaboration mechanisms assessed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional assessment report
9	<p>Status of donor harmonization</p> <p>Purpose: To determine the likelihood that donor assistance will be effectively coordinated and that planning, financing and reporting processes are simplified.</p> <p>Approach: The commitments made by donors in the Compact should be unpacked through extensive discussions with the DPWG.</p> <p>Importance: Medium</p> <p>Recommendation: Two main scenarios need to be assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If government decides to formulate a SWAp for the sector, a clear indication is needed of the state of readiness of donors to pool resources and harmonize processes in support of the SWAp. Mechanisms for accommodating donor funding outside the SWAp must also be explicit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with government and DPWG

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a SWAp is not proposed, individual donors are likely to retain their separate identities and processes, but it is important to determine the extent to which they are prepared to adhere to the agreed programmes and activities, to facilitate joint programme assessments or appraisals, and to fund “on budget”. <p>If the DPWG does not operate on a regular basis or has important partners absent, the capacity of the government to prepare an investment plan with genuine ownership by stakeholders and to support harmonized external assistance will be in doubt.</p>	
10	<p>Links to regional agriculture sector development plans</p> <p>Purpose: To determine whether the investment is consistent with regional agriculture development plans formulated by the relevant REC.</p> <p>Approach: The investment plan should be examined to determine the extent to which it includes explicit measures to promote regional trade, knowledge sharing etc.</p> <p>Importance: High (if plan exists)</p> <p>Recommendation: At present, only ECOWAS has prepared a fully articulated regional agriculture development programme (ECOWAP). The process of undertaking a similar exercise in other RECs is likely to be slow and therefore, individual country investment plans cannot be expected to be consistent with regional plans. However, the explicit understanding of the need to promote regional trade, for example, should be viewed positively.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional sector development plans prepared by RECs
11	<p>Incorporation of private sector</p> <p>Purpose: To assess the efforts that have been made to bring the private sector into the investment planning process and to incorporate specific private sector investment into the plan.</p> <p>Approach: The roundtable and investment planning processes should document the extent of private sector involvement and register specific concerns and priorities expressed. Policy measures to encourage private sector investment should be reviewed. Estimates of private sector investment as part of the plan. The investment plan should be able to extract public and private expenditures in the proposed investment plan. Ensure coordination mechanism between Government and Private is available or proposed in the NAIP</p> <p>Importance: High</p> <p>Recommendation: An investment plan that has been drawn up without active private sector participation should be seriously questioned. The absence of policy measures in support of the private sector in agriculture should be seen as a serious flaw. Credible estimates of projected private investment are unlikely to be found in</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Records of consultations with the private sector • Chamber of Commerce • Estimates of private sector investment

	many cases but an indication might be obtained by extrapolating from recent patterns of investment.	
--	---	--

Technical criteria		Information source
12	<p>Consistency with Transformation, growth and poverty reduction goals</p> <p>Purpose: To ensure that the investment plan is consistent with the sector growth targets established and will achieve the expected impact on poverty reduction.</p> <p>Approach: Estimates of rates of productivity and income growth included in each major programme, together with clear indication of target groups and the impact of the investment on income.</p> <p>Importance: High</p> <p>Recommendation: If any of the major programmes is unable to demonstrate a credible projection of productivity growth and rates of incremental income growth for small farmers and rural enterprises, the programme should be seriously questioned.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goals and Milestones Report
13	<p>Adoption of policy and programme best practices</p> <p>Purpose: To determine whether the investment plan and its component investment programmes and policies adhere to recognized best practices.</p> <p>Approach: Assess the overall investment plan and each investment programme against the best practices and recommended core program elements specified in the country Policy and Program Opportunities report.</p> <p>Importance: High</p> <p>Recommendation: If there are major discrepancies between any programme and the best practices recommended in the Policy and Program Opportunities report, that programme should be examined in detail in order to verify that important design features have not been overlooked. The adherence of investment plan as a whole to best practices and recommended actions should be assessed as well, and any missing elements should be questioned.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy and Program Opportunities report
14	<p>Links with existing sector programmes/projects</p> <p>Purpose: To assess the extent to which the new investment plan builds on existing programmes in the sector.</p> <p>Approach: Map new investment programme components against existing sector programmes and projects.</p> <p>Importance: Medium</p> <p>Recommendation: The new investment plan should be based upon a thorough analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of existing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme and project portfolio review • Independent project evaluations

	programmes, building upon those programmes and projects that have demonstrated positive impact on growth and poverty reduction.	
15	<p>Monitoring and evaluation framework</p> <p>Purpose: To assess the scope, methodology and implementation modalities of the M&E framework</p> <p>Approach: Detailed brainstorming around the investment plan results framework and the feasibility of the indicators proposed. Review of alignment with RF. Assess proposals to conduct baseline surveys and the adequacy of the data gathering system.</p> <p>Importance: High</p> <p>Recommendation: An incomplete M&E framework suggests that the results framework itself has not been thoroughly thought through.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investment plan results framework • CAADP Results Framework
16	<p>Risk assessment</p> <p>Purpose: To be able to assess the likely impact on programme outcomes if certain critical assumptions are not met and to identify potential mitigation measures.</p> <p>Approach: Risk assessment is a tool for identifying the consequences associated with failures in achieving specific programme objectives, outputs, reforms, cost escalation or other changes. It facilitates critical thinking about key assumptions in programme design and mechanisms for preventing or mitigating risks. It should involve all major element of a programme and would usually take the form of a risk matrix that links risks, their likelihood of occurrence or importance, and proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>Importance: Medium</p> <p>Recommendation: Any programmes for which there are no credible mitigation measures should be considered for exclusion from the plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy and programme documents • Risk analysis