



**Assessing the Quality of the Agricultural Investment Program (NAIP) documents  
Key Criteria**

***Second generation of The Gambia National Agricultural Investment Plan (GNAIP – II)***

Parameters / Criteria	Comments
<p><b>PROCESS</b> (Compliance with the 8 steps of the methodological guide; Respect of the inclusive and participative approach; High political portage)</p>	<p><b>1).</b> There is no evidence that the launch of the formulation process benefit from high political backing beyond the Ministry in charge of agriculture Weak political could be source of insufficient appropriation /ownership that can negatively affect the implementation of the GNAIP II.</p> <p>One can overcome with such a problem by reinitiating the national political mobilization for the validation process of the GNAIP II:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a Official communication (including the draft GNAIP II report) of the Minister in charge of Agriculture to his colleagues from intersectorial ministries (environment, livestock &amp; fishery, trade, health, social protection...) to inform on the status of the process and request their comments on the draft report;</li> <li>b Official communication/information at the weekly Ministerial Council to inform and to request high political portage (Vice-President or Prime Minister)</li> <li>c Organization of the validation workshop under the auspices of a high political authority (Vice-President or Prime Minister)</li> </ul> <p><b>2).</b> Inclusiveness and intersectoriality Sectorial departments actively participated in the process. But what is not very clear is the participation of the technical and financial partners – Normally the target is '50% at least major Donors active in agriculture and rural sector are included'.</p>

<p><b>CONTENT</b> (Effectiveness of taking into account some commitments (Malabo, SDG, Climate agreement, ECOWAP+10 Conference); Effectiveness of taking into account some critical issues (nutrition, climate change, gender, youth employment, value chains, resilience, intra-regional trade, matrix of public policies, private sector mobilization strategy...))</p>	<p><b>3).</b> The issue of ‘Employment’ needs to be more developed. Explain how the promotion of the agri-food value chains can generate jobs for youth, women...Such an indicator should be part of indicators of impacts for all sub-sectors (Section 3.4 ‘Expected impacts)</p> <p><b>4).</b> The required incentive measures that can make happen the suggested transformations or expected impacts need to be well documented. The idea is to have the decision-makers bear in mind that the changes and impacts will not happen if some structural incentive measures are not implemented. For example, boosting the agri-food value chains (crops, vegetables, livestock, aquaculture...), requires an ‘Incentive Comprehensive Agricultural Investment Framework’ (including land right, tax, financing and credit policies, agricultural support policies...).</p> <p><b>5).</b> Overall structure to be harmonized:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid the duplications between sections ‘3.3. Strategic axis / Priority areas’, ‘4.1. Priority interventions’ and ‘4.2. Detail presentation of components of the plan’.</li> <li>• Section 3.4. ‘Expected impacts’: The first tables in paragraphs 3.4.1 to 3.4.3 present some impacts but the following ones (as from paragraphs 3.4.4) discuss ‘Priority interventions’. Just harmonize.</li> </ul>
<p><b>STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK</b> Effectiveness of alignment with the result framework of the CAADP, RAIP’ Framework, economic and social development strategy of the country</p>	<p><b>6).</b> There is a weak consideration of the ECOWAP. The ECOWAP process is missing (pages 3-5).</p> <p>After the Maputo Declaration and before the Malabo 2014, the ECOWAP process is to be inserted, including the formulation of the first generation of NAIP and the RAIP (2008-2010).</p>
<p><b>COHERENCE</b> Effectiveness of coherence between instruments (investments and measures) and objectives; Effectiveness of budget coherence</p>	<p><b>7).</b> The budget for Program 1 ‘Value chain promotion on food crops and vegetables sub-sector’ should include a budget line for the implementation of incentive policies measures as it is for the other programs</p> <p><b>8).</b> The overall “Results framework” of GNAIP II should include indicators/targets concerning the contribution of livestock, fishery... sub-sectors to ‘Food Self-Sufficiency’.</p> <p><b>9).</b> Targets/indicators for the impact ‘Food self-sufficiency’ should be normally expressed as “Amount of Unit / Capita” (for example: kg of local milled rice / capita)</p> <p><b>10).</b> The table (16) on ‘Key Impacts Indicators and Targets’ should include a column with the reference value (2019) for each of the targets. This can help appreciating the magnitude of progress.</p>
<p><b>OVERALL FORMAT</b></p>	<p><b>11).</b> The first draft is too long. Concision is required. The main challenge remains to avoid/eliminate the duplications between sections ‘3.3. Strategic axis / Priority areas, ‘4.1. Priority interventions’ and ‘4.2. Detail presentation of components of the plan’.</p>

<b>OTHERS</b>	<p><b>12).</b> Part II – GNAIP I Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The institutional transformations/evolutions, in particular those related to the empowerment of farmers' organizations, private actors... and the improvement of their contribution to the implementation of agricultural policies also need to be part of the GNAIP I assessment;</li><li>• The evolutions of incentive environment or facilities also need to be well documented.</li></ul>
---------------	--