



**Regional Workshop on Accelerated Domestication of Malabo Declaration by Members
States and Regional Economic Communities**



27 Feb to 2nd March, 2018

Protea Hotel by Marriot Lusaka, Zambia

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) Regional Workshop on Accelerated Domestication of Malabo Declaration by Members States and Regional Economic Communities culminated from the African Union Commission (AUC), NEPAD Planning and Coordination Agency (NPCA) and Regional Economic Communities (RECs) Annual Joint Planning Meeting held in Kigali in November 2017. The Kigali meeting resolved that individual RECs organize a one-week regional convening where all Country Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) focal points and other important CAADP stakeholders would meet to discuss and agree on key issues pertaining to accelerated domestication of the Malabo Declaration.

The COMESA Regional workshop was held from 27th February to 2nd March, 2018 at Protea Hotel, Lusaka, Zambia. Its main objective was to mainstream certain thematic areas relevant under Malabo Declaration, into the National Agriculture Investment Plans (NAIP) and Regional Agriculture Investment Plans (RAIP) processes; aimed at helping member states and RECs to conduct an informed process, for enhanced alignment and harmonization with the Malabo Declarations. Among the thematic areas addressed were gender, resilience and adaptation of agriculture to climate change, Agriculture Vocational and Technical Education and Training (ATVET), land policy and governance, nutrition, private sector investments, among others.

The workshop was attended by 38 representatives, who included: Country CAADP focal points and statisticians from Uganda, Rwanda, Malawi, Zimbabwe, Eritrea, Seychelles, Zambia, Swaziland, Ethiopia and Kenya; partner organizations such as AUC, NPCA, RECs (COMESA, Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) and East African Community (EAC)), CAADP Non State Actors Coalition (CNC), Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (ReSAKSS), Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and GIZ. The workshop was facilitated by Africa Lead consultants.

The workshop was officially opened and closed by COMESA's Director for Industry and Agriculture, Mr. Thierry Mutombo Kalonji. In his opening remarks, Mr. Kalonji recognized Eritrea as new entrants in the CAADP process. He called on participants to use this forum to share experiences and aim at driving the meeting to achieve its expectation, to advance agriculture transformation. He called on participants to use recommendations of the Biennial Review Report to drive change through evidence-based decision making.

The workshop culminated in the development of detailed Country roadmaps with clear deliverables, responsibilities, timeframe towards NAIP Formulation/implementation. By sharing experiences and lessons learned from Biennial Review exercise, participants reviewed their Country road maps, with aim to trigger transformation at country level. The next steps include: creating awareness on Malabo Domestication at country level, aligning NAIPs to National budgets and plans, enhancing data management systems and implementing the developed roadmaps. Partners committed to support member states implementation of the CAADP process

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	iv
1.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 About the Workshop	2
1.2.1 Why the Workshop?.....	2
1.2.2 Who Participated?.....	3
1.2.3 Workshop Process.....	3
2.0 WORKSHOP DISCUSSIONS AND OUTPUTS	4
2.1 Scene Setting and Opening Session	4
2.2 Embedding Malabo compliant Regional and National Agriculture Investment Plans in region and country systems of planning and budgeting	5
2.2.1 Review of Guidelines and Progress of RAIPs	5
2.2.2 Country NAIP Implementation Review	6
2.2.3 Lessons learned from NAIP Implementation Review.....	7
2.3 Review of existing tools and instruments for integrating thematic issues into operations for an effective implementation on the ground	8
2.3.1 Thematic Presentations and Discussions	8
2.3.2 Inaugural Biennial Review Report; Lessons Learned.....	10
2.3.3 Aligning the NAIP to the County planning process.....	11
3.1 Workshop Evaluation.....	11
3.2 Next steps.....	12
OUTPUT I: COUNTRY ASSESSMENT TRAFFIC LIGHTS	14
OUTPUT II: DISCUSSIONS ON THEMATIC AREAS	16
OUTPUT III: DISCUSSIONS ON BIENNIEL REVIEW REPORT	21
OUTPUT IV: NAIP FORMULATION COUNTRY ROAD MAPS	24
ANNEX 1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	51

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AATS	Africa Agriculture Transformation Scorecard
AGRA	Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa
ATVET	Agriculture Vocational and Technical Education and Training
AUC	African Union Commission
BR	Biennial Review
CAADP	Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme
CNC	CAADP Non-State Actors Coalition
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
EAC	East African Community
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NAIP	National Agriculture Investment Plans
NPCA	NEPAD Planning and Coordination Agency
NSA	Non-State Actors
RAIP	Regional Agriculture Investment Plans
RECs	Regional Economic Communities
ReSAKSS	Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System
STC	Specialized Technical Committee

1.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1 Introduction

The Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for shared Prosperity and improved Livelihoods was adopted by the African Union Heads of States and Governments in June 2014. The Malabo Declaration which has seven key performance areas, introduces a much stronger and clearer focus on delivery and results. To translate these commitments into results, the Heads of States called upon the AUC and NPCA to develop an implementation strategy and roadmap that would facilitate translation of the 2025 vision and goals of Africa Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation into concrete results and impacts.

To ensure mutual accountability for results and actions a Biennial Review (BR) process was conducted. The BR mechanism led by AUC aims to provide a platform for mutual accountability, peer review and peer pressure that motivates increased performance of each member state to deliver on targets set for Malabo declarations. This process was conducted and involved tracking, monitoring and reporting on the implementation progress in achieving the provisions of the Malabo Declaration.

The inaugural report and the Africa Agriculture Transformation Scorecard (AATS), comprising individual country performance scores on progress made for implementing goals set in the Malabo commitment was presented to the Assembly in January, 2018. The report among others, identified the need to kick-start the formulation of informed NAIP for Malabo implementation and operational mutual accountability, supported by a strong Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and statistical data systems.

In their Annual Joint Planning Meeting held in Kigali in November 2017, which was preceded by country requests expressed by Ministers of Agriculture in their Specialized Technical Committee (STC) of October 2017, AUC, NPCA and RECs resolved to organize a one-week regional convening with individual RECs; where all Country CAADP focal points and other important CAADP stakeholders will meet to discuss and agree on key issues pertaining to accelerated domestication of the Malabo Declaration.

Based on this, COMESA convened a meeting whose objective was to mainstream certain thematic areas relevant under the Malabo Declaration, into the NAIP and RAIP processes, with an aim to help member states and RECs conduct an informed process for more alignment and harmonization with the Malabo. Among the thematic areas discussed were: gender, resilience and adaptation of agriculture to climate change, ATVET, land policy and governance issues, nutrition, and private sector investments, among others

The four-day workshop brought together 38 participants drawn from Seychelles, Rwanda, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Kenya, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Swaziland and Malawi: in addition to representatives of partner RECs (IGAD and EAC), AUC, NPCA, CNC, ReSAKSS, AGRA, FAO and GIZ. Africa Lead supported the workshop by providing the facilitation team.

The workshop was officially opened and closed by the Director, Industry and Agriculture, COMESA- Mr. Thierry Mutombo Kalonji. In his opening remarks, Mr. Kalonji applauded Eritrea for their come back to participate in the CAADP process. He acknowledged the tools developed to drive agriculture transformation and called on participants to go beyond the tools and apply new technology that will boost agriculture production, besides efforts to advance agriculture transformation. He called on participants to drive the meeting to achieve expectation and use the forum to share experiences that advance agriculture transformation. He further called on participants to refine the BR report and use its recommendations, in making evidence-based decisions.

1.2 About the Workshop

1.2.1 Why the Workshop?

The objectives of this workshop were:

1. To ensure Malabo compliant Regional and National Agriculture Investment Plans are firmly embedded in region and country systems of planning and budgeting, to strengthen the foundation for successful implementation.
2. To agree on mechanisms to strengthen accountability architecture by setting up operational Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems and capacitated agricultural statistics.
3. To share and review existing tools and instruments for integrating thematic issues into operations for an effective implementation on the ground

The specific objectives to support these objectives were outlined as:

1. To create awareness among agriculture stakeholders on the Malabo Declaration and its impact on programme implementation at country and RECs level
2. To revisit the Country CAADP Implementation Guidelines and discuss their use in implementation of NAIPs and RAIPs, and other programmes relevant to agriculture & food security
3. To understand the specific country context of NAIP formulation and implementation, in particular regards to policy and planning; finance and investment; coordination and (development) cooperation; and monitoring and accountability
4. To build a consensus among CAADP focal points and experts, as well as technical partners around a way forward with respect to supporting the formulation of the new/next NAIP
5. To identify specific needs for institutional strengthening to successfully implement the NAIP in coordination with other programmes, in pursuit of Malabo Declaration targets

6. To agree on a revised template for a roadmap towards formulation of a new NAIP; highlighting deliverables, roles and responsibilities of partners, timelines and coordination mechanisms
7. To provide support towards implementation of RAIPs
8. To agree on tracking mechanism on roadmap formulation; and continental and regional country support missions
9. To review the REC's actions, plan and agree on key movers to accelerate RAIP implementation

1.2.2 Who Participated?

The workshop was attended by 38 participants drawn from AUC, RECs (COMESA, IGAD, EAC), ReSAKSS, AGRA, FAO, GIZ, CNC and Country CAADP focal points and statisticians from Uganda, Rwanda, Malawi, Zimbabwe, Eritrea, Seychelles, Zambia, Swaziland, Ethiopia and Kenya. The workshop was facilitated by Africa Lead consultants. See *ANNEX I: List of Participants*

1.2.3 Workshop Process

The workshop was a facilitated process delivered through thematic presentations, plenary discussions, country self-assessment, syndicate discussions, question and answer sessions. A planning meeting involving AUC, NPCA, COMESA and facilitation team was held prior to the workshop to agree on process and have a common understanding on the workshop agenda.

The process of the workshop involved:

1. Scene setting - opening session and introductions of participants. In his presentation the facilitator highlighted on the background, scope and objectives of the workshop; and defined roles and responsibilities of each group of participants.
2. Country self-assessment - Countries assessed themselves based on an earlier circulated template; aimed at giving a sense of where countries are in implementation of CAADP Malabo, sharing experiences and learning from each other. To lay the foundation, input presentations were made by AUC and RECs on CAADP Country Implementation under the Malabo Declaration and RECs overview and status of the regional CAADP process respectively.
3. Thematic presentations were made, aimed to expose countries to thematic issues relevant under Malabo that need to be mainstreamed into the NAIP and RAIP processes; thus, help member states and RECs to conduct informed processes, for more alignment and harmonization with the Malabo. The thematic areas covered included gender, resilience and adaptation of agriculture to climate change, ATVET, land policy and governance

issues, nutrition, private sector investments, among others. Question and answers session helped to clarify issues and build a common understanding

4. Syndicate group discussions were held to discuss issues emerging from thematic presentations, and share experiences on how to incorporate these themes into the country NAIP process
5. Country Group Discussions were conducted to review tools presented, give highlights of the BR report, and develop Country road maps to align and harmonize the country NAIP process with CAADP Malabo
6. Workshop evaluation - The core team held debrief and consultative meetings as the workshop progressed to assess what went well, what could have been done better and strategize for the next session/day. At the end of the four days' workshop, an evaluation form was used to capture the participants' views. Additionally, each member state and REC highlighted the lessons learned and next steps after the workshop.

2.0 WORKSHOP DISCUSSIONS AND OUTPUTS

2.1 Scene Setting and Opening Session

To set the scene of the workshop, opening remarks were made by representatives of AUC and NPCA. This preceded the official opening of the workshop by the COMESA Director for Industry and Agriculture, Mr. Thierry Mutombo Kalonji. A highlight by the facilitator on the background, objectives expected deliverables of the workshop helped to give a common level understanding for all participants.

The session highlighted that:

- Countries are at different stages of implementing the CAADP Malabo process
- Successful cases exist and can be used as learning tools
- Workshop culminated from the joint AUC, NPCA and RECs planning meeting, which resolved that individual RECs convene meetings for all Country CAADP focal points and key CAADP stakeholders to discuss and agree on key issues to accelerate domestication and implementation of Malabo Declaration
- Workshop is designed to give a sense of where countries are in implementing CAADP Malabo process and come up with roadmap to progress the process
- BR report was presented to AU summit and adopted by the Heads of states.
- New entrants such as Eritrea were ready to participate in the process
- Agriculture transformation should focus on sustaining livelihoods beyond food security. Thus, increase production to feed population and trade in agricultural commodities
- Regional CAADP compacts and NAIPS are tools to address agriculture challenges

Member states are called to:

- Discuss and agree on how to utilize information from the report to trigger change;
- Share experience and learn from each other to advance agriculture transformation,
- Refine report to attract financial support and make decisions on the next steps with an aim to improve performance in 2020
- Translate results to action and trigger agriculture transformation i.e. go beyond tools and advance efforts that boost production and trigger agricultural transformation

2.2 Embedding Malabo compliant Regional and National Agriculture Investment Plans in region and country systems of planning and budgeting

2.2.1 Review of Guidelines and Progress of RAIPs

To strengthen the foundation for successful implementation of CAADP Malabo, it is imperative that Malabo compliant RAIPs and NAIPs be firmly embedded in region and country systems of planning and budgeting. Based on this, presentations were made on “*the Country CAADP Implementation Guidelines and their use in implementation of NAIPs and RAIPs, and other programmes relevant to agriculture and food security*” and “*REC overview and status of the regional CAADP process*”, to create awareness on the Malabo Declaration and its impact on programme implementation at country and RECs level.

The following issues emerged from the presentations:

- NAIP jargon is a CAADP term that refers to the National Agriculture Investment Plan, however, the term is customized at Country level.
- Unlike Maputo Declaration, Malabo Declaration is broader and recalls the Maputo commitment, and goes beyond to look at thematic areas for agricultural transformation.
- Though sector groups existed at country levels during CAADP Maputo, they did not have targeted milestones considered in CAADP Malabo
- Composition of 10% public investment in agriculture is clarified by the core function of Government (COFOG); which reviews and defines government spending that contributes to agriculture
- Analysis has shown that 10% investment in agriculture alone may not be sufficient to trigger agricultural transformation, and subsequently 6% growth. Countries must therefore set strategies for effective management of resources to unlock additional investment from private sector
- Private sector engagement is critical for NAIP implementation. But their role in delivering NAIP needs clarification since countries handle private sector differently
- Variation in Country progress could be associated with different capacities in implementing CAADP Malabo

- RECs (COMESA, IGAD, and EAC) strive to collaborate and enhance synergy and complementarity in programmes. Thus, avoid duplication and ensure coordinated and effective support to member states
- COMESA implements CAADP under the secretariat's institutional structures, housing CAADP under the Division of Agriculture and industry
- IGAD has partially completed the RAIP development process, while COMESA and EAC are on progress.

The recommendations arising from the presentations included:

- a) Despite different terminologies used at Country level, NAIPs should be developed in line with CAADP guidelines
- b) Countries should align their NAIP to country planning process and national budgets to ensure effective implementation at country level
- c) Countries need to leverage on capacities of private sector and engage qualified expertise at their disposal to validate assumptions made in country investment plans
- d) AUC/NPCA to share guidelines on public expenditure review
- e) While RECs mobilize resources at regional level, domestic resource mobilization should be done at national level. Innovative systems must be in place to ensure sustainability
- f) Support Missions for CAADP implementation at country-level should aim to build on previous and existing processes
- g) Each member state or REC based on their country specificity is free to add more indicators to the 43 Malabo indicators to be tracked
- h) There is need for a clear communication strategy to allow all member states know what is happening among partner states

2.2.2 Country NAIP Implementation Review

Member states conducted a self-assessment based on a template provided and presented their results in a plenary session. Further to this, mapping of Country progress was done using Country status scorecard, where member states used green, yellow and red colors to highlight processes that had been completed, ongoing and not complete respectively (*See Output I: Country Assessment Traffic Lights*).

These findings helped to:

- a) Understand the specific country context of NAIP formulation and implementation, regarding: policy and planning; finance and investment; coordination and (development) cooperation; and monitoring and accountability.
- b) Build a consensus among CAADP focal points and experts as well as technical partners around a way forward with respect to supporting the formulation of the new/next NAIP

- c) Identify specific needs for institutional strengthening to successfully implement the NAIP in coordination with other programmes in pursuit of Malabo Declaration targets

The main observations made were:

- Progress of NAIP formulation and implementation varies from one country to the other e.g. Rwanda is implementing NAIP II and formulating NAIP III, while Malawi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Zambia, Seychelles, and Uganda are at different stages in formulating NAIP II. Zimbabwe and Swaziland are formulating NAIP I, while Eritrea is a new entrant in the process
- Process is as important as document. Member states are keenly following the process and engaging relevant partners while integrating comments from the BR report as they formulate and refresh their NAIPs
- Ethiopia is building strong relationships with private sector to strengthen mutual accountability. It has a web-based agriculture management system, which is now being scaled up to all parts of the country, to monitor agricultural system
- Formulation of country investment plans are in alignment with country's planning cycle and national policy, and as a result Countries are at different stages of the NAIP process
- AUC/ REC will mobilize support for each country based on their stage in the CAADP Malabo process. Currently COMESA is working closely with Zimbabwe

2.2.3 Lessons learned from NAIP Implementation Review

Key lessons learned from sharing regional and country experiences in embedding Malabo compliant RAIP and NAIP in region and country systems of planning and budgeting, were outlined as:

1. Status of countries in relation to NAIP formulation / implementation is varied thus each country has different support needs
2. Weak capacity in terms of human, infrastructure and financial resources is a common challenge to member states. Thus, it is critical to strengthen capacity for M&E and maintenance of agricultural statistics
3. 70% of African population rely on agriculture. Aligning the Country's NAIP and RAIP to Malabo commitments is a prerequisite to a successful agricultural sector
4. BR mechanism is catalyzing/ stimulating change at country level with desires to enhance accountability and performance. Member states are already adopting recommendations of the Biennial Review report and are incorporating them into country plans to guide their agricultural interventions

5. There is a lot of un documented progress happening at members state level which needs to be documented and used for peer learning
6. Several initiatives have been done to domesticate CAADP Malabo at National and Regional level. However, there is need to strengthen coordination efforts to ensure Africa feeds its population
7. NAIP is a process with different phases, where member states move freely from one stage to the other in consultations with partners e.g. AUC, NPCA, RECs
8. Country commitment is a critical factor to a successful CAADP process. CAADP agenda should not be a parallel process but inform existing policy frameworks at country level
9. The ever-growing importance of integrated planning for ensuring sustainable agriculture growth
10. The regional communities are at different levels of CAADP Malabo processes. Since priorities are set up by member states, flexibility in approaches is critical to align at continental level.
11. Each REC is committed to finalize formulation of the RAIPs
12. Gained knowledge on development of RAIPs and their existing complementarity role to the NAIPs
13. Governments responsibility to increase the budget allocated to agriculture related activities to 10% aims at triggering private sector investment
14. Agriculture transformation is a journey Africa has started and countries, RECs, AUC/NPCA just need to increase efforts and coordinate better at all levels
15. BR reporting should not be viewed as a competition but a peer learning process, where countries identify gaps and develop interventions that will lead to agriculture transformation, growth and improved livelihoods

2.3 Review of existing tools and instruments for integrating thematic issues into operations for an effective implementation on the ground

2.3.1 Thematic Presentations and Discussions

This session involved expert presentations on existing tools and instruments as an input to expose countries to thematic issues relevant under Malabo, to be mainstreamed into the NAIP and RAIP processes. The themes covered included:

- a) Agribusiness and Agro-industry Development, and Trade
- b) Country Agribusiness Partnership Framework (CAP-F)
- c) Enhanced Resilient Production Systems and Livelihoods to Climate Change Related Risks
- d) Skills Development and Employment Creation in support of Africa's Sustainable Rural Development
- e) Analytical support to guide the design of National Agricultural Investments Plans

f) Enhancing the Role of Non-State Actors (NSAs) in the CAADP Process

Issues emerging from these presentations included:

- CAP-F does not clarify roles of RECs and member states, and how to engage AUC support
- To create a vibrant economy, countries must set strategies to mobilize masses to buy local goods and engage consumers in planning. Countries e.g. Rwanda have initiatives that promote local products
- It is critical that RECs be placed at the center of implementing Malabo
- CAADP seeks to place agriculture at the top of the Continent's vision. This is a challenge to countries e.g. Seychelles where agriculture is not number 1 growth enhancing sector
- Different channels be used to disseminate this information at country level
- There is need to tap into information from different institutions e.g. International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) on agri-business
- Agri-business framework is building on what exists rather than duplicating efforts. It will consider the use of Policy dialogues to assist countries implement existing frame works
- Farmers are part of Private sector. Public sector needs to create a conducive policy environment and policy infrastructure, that is well coordinated to trigger policy change
- CAP-F will support the BR process by capturing commitment and measuring performance of private sector to invest in relation to their commitment
- Resilience gets inputs from different intervention measures, and thus should be an integral part of planning but not limited to one program area within the NAIP
- Skills development is critical in delivering on many targets. Rather than just discuss it, member states should think about interrogating content the presentation and make it operational e.g. by lobbying resources to fund TVET
- There is need for more clarity on the potential for agriculture contribution to TVET at national level to create jobs for the youth. Countries need to identify skills to be developed, match Country's skills development to the investment in NAIPs, then use TVET to develop the right skills
- ReSAKSS are service providers who respond to demand. AUC is ready to support Countries that articulate the demands to link discussions to deliverables

Further to this, five groups were randomly formed to further interrogate the presentations and build on them using practical experience, and additionally unlock understanding to avoid mistakes in future BR reporting. The results of the syndicate group discussions are detailed in *Output II- Discussions on Thematic Areas*.

A key recommendation from the discussions was:

- Need for a one stop shop/ a hub of information to bring together tools developed by other institutions, and where support in these thematic areas can be found. A function established within AUC would facilitate access to services and minimize duplication

2.3.2 Inaugural Biennial Review Report; Lessons Learned

A presentation was made on the findings of the inaugural Biennial Review report presented to and adopted by the heads of states at the AU Summit held in January 2018. To explore how to use the results of the report to mainstream areas that require attention in NAIP formulation and strengthen planning, participants discussed the report in groups using guided questions. It was evident that BR report was already triggering action for countries to strengthen data collection infrastructure. The details of the group discussions are illustrated in *Output III: Discussions of BR Report*

The lessons learned from the BR report were highlighted as:

1. Good data management and M&E systems are key contributors to Successful BR reporting.
2. Countries must maintain adequate data management capacity and establish well-coordinated structures that incorporate other institutions managing data
3. There is need for national validation of draft scorecards by technical teams at county levels, to get country concurrence before submission of report to the RECs
4. The results of the process can be useful to trigger learning, support and agricultural transformation, only if the Country report is genuine and reflects reality of the Country
5. BR process was a catalytic exercise to generate data and inform policy based on evidence.
6. The BR report should help member states to identify priority areas for action and plan effectively. From the report countries have an opportunity to reflect and revise some of the targets and interventions that are not operational nor do not trigger change
7. Overall score does not reflect the overall performance on all commitments. It is imperative that Member states review the recommendations made in the report and score card, and incorporate into the next NAIP
8. Countries are at different stages in implementation of the CAADP Malabo. Alignment of Country NAIP to Malabo and incorporating BR measurement indicators into the country data management and M&E system is key to effective implementation and measurement of results
9. Inclusivity in implementing the BR process and tracking of indicators at every step of the process is a pre-requisite for quality BR process and reporting

10. While providing incentive for good performance, BR process gives opportunity for peer learning to enhance agricultural transformation

Recommendations arising from the presentation of BR Report were:

1. Member states take responsibility to unbundle report, identify audience and communicate relevant information
2. Member states should let each lesson challenge them positively and lead to progress
3. AUC/NPCA/ RECs to document success stories as standards / procedures for future learning
4. Report be used to strengthen evidence-based planning and implementation

2.3.3 Aligning the NAIP to the County planning process

Participants working in their country groups developed roadmaps to align the NAIP to the Country planning process, while incorporating relevant thematic issues and recommendations of the BR report into the NAIP. A revised template for a roadmap towards formulation of a new NAIP was used, highlighting deliverables, roles and responsibilities of partners, timelines and coordination mechanisms as shown in *Output IV: Country NAIP Formulation Road Maps*. This is expected to provide support towards implementation of the RAIPs

3.0 WORKSHOP EVALUATION AND NEXT STEPS

3.1 Workshop Evaluation

The participants' perspectives of the workshop, was captured through an evaluation.

The participants indicated that the workshop:

- Was well-structured, enlightening and exceeded their expectation.
- Was well moderated, interactive and encouraged effective participation
- Met its objectives, generating a lot of information.
- It went beyond sensitization on Malabo to catalyze country process to mainstream Malabo commitments into their next process.
- Was timely and supportive to the on -going NAIP development process and specifically important to countries still lagging behind in the process
- A learning process with well-articulated facilitation and highly experienced and skilled experts

The most learning points were identified as:

- Knowledge of the implementation status of agriculture investment plans at National and regional levels
- Learning from other countries' experiences - need for frequent peer reviews
- BR process was a catalytic exercise to generate data and inform activities
- Need to Assess lessons learned from BR report and score card and incorporate in NAIP
- Aligning Malabo compliant NAIPs to Country plans and budgets to facilitate implementation
- Understanding processes in formulation of next NAIP and Country roadmap
- Country roadmap development should be an inclusive process involving all stakeholders
- The value of the BR report in incorporating recommendations into country process to strengthen evidence-based planning and implementation
- Inclusivity and proper coordination of all stakeholders is key to the CAADP Malabo process
- Data management and tracking of indicators is a major challenge for most member states
- Creating awareness on domestication of Malabo is a continuous process
- The role of the BR process plays in contributing to agricultural growth and development
- The overall score of the scorecard does not necessarily indicate the performance of each indicator
- The commitment by AUC/ RECs and technical experts to support the NAIP process
- The importance of agriculture in economic growth and livelihood improvement
- Domestication of Malabo commitments in Country NAIP is not straight line but has to adopt to countries unique situation
- Gained knowledge of support available in implementing NAIP

The facilitation of the workshop ranged from good to very good in relation to professionalism, knowledge of the process, delivery and engagement of participants. It was noted that despite notification for meeting and travel coming late, the conference venue and accommodation were at the same venue, thus created a conducive environment for learning

3.2 *Next steps*

Participants

- Share workshop discussions with senior ministry officials to plan a way forward
- Mobilize resources from development partners at country level
- Finalize NAIP formulation road map and implement it as planned
- Internalize BR report with key stakeholders and strategize on implementing recommendation to enhance agriculture transformation
- Organize CAP –F launch

- Strengthen data management system to develop tracking system
- Review NAIP 2 process and enhance engagement with county governments
- Organize for peer review / joint sector review meetings
- Engage AUC in providing support in formulation and implementation of country level road maps
- Learn from challenges and success stories to improve performance of 2020 BR exercise

RECs

- RECs will continue working together and enhance coordination in a way to minimize duplication
- Strengthen coordination of CAADP process at regional level

Technical Partners/ ReSAKSS

- Provide technical expertise services in supporting the CAADP process

Facilitators

- Develop and submit final workshop report to Africa Lead

Africa Lead

- Receive report, edit, add value and submit

AUC/ NPCA

- Receive final report, edit and send to countries –
- Use report as basis of engagement of AUC /REC and provide support to member states as identified
- Annual CAADP partners platform – 25-27th April, 2018
- PS retreat - preceded by CAADP focal point meeting
- Strategize with RECs and member states to fine tune peer learning and support to CAADP implementation

CAADP Non-State Actors Coalition (CNC)

- Collaborate with government in providing support to the CAADP process

OUTPUT I: COUNTRY ASSESSMENT TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Country Assessment Traffic Lights

Green for: "Yes"

Red for: "No / Not Yet"

Yellow for: "Not able to establish"

	Ethiopia	Kenya	Malawi	Rwanda	Seychelles	Swaziland	Uganda	Zimbabwe	Zambia
1. Stakeholders' mobilization / Announcement of the Malabo domestication process: NAIP formulation/Refresh		Green							Yellow
2. Development of stakeholders meeting documents/ Concept notes/Invitations		Green							Red
3. Meeting with stakeholders to develop country roadmap for NAIP formulation/Refresh		Green							Red
4. Develop a communication strategy for NAIP formulation/Refresh		Green							Red
5. Put on place a steering task force led by the Ministry with clear responsibility and periodicity of meetings and composed by stakeholders' representatives		Green							Red
6. Develop a stocktaking for the first NAIP/ Capitalization and lessons learnt from the first generation of NAIPs (governance, process, formulation, financing, implementation)		Green							Red

7. Develop thematic reviews to inform NAIP formulation: Private sector, land governance, youth and skills, markets and competitiveness, growth opportunities, etc.		Green							Yellow
8. Holding consultations with specific players: local governments, Private Sector, youth, NSA, DPs....		Green							Red
9. Formulation of a draft second-generation NAIP strategic framework with the results framework and tentative investment plan		Yellow							Red
10. Determination of relevant policy instruments (investments and measures) to be addressed by the second-generation NAIP		Green							Green
11. Conduct a validation with stakeholders for inputs		Green							Red
12. Improve the draft NAIP with the stakeholders' inputs		Yellow							Red
13. Assessment of investment cost of the draft first five-year operational plan of the NAIP		Red							Red
14. Conduct an independent review		Red							Red
15. Integrate the review findings in the NAIP		Red							Red
16. Conduct a business meeting		Red							Red
17. Revisit the budget submission and MTEF align with the planning instrument		Green							Red
18. Identification of the potential sources of funding		Green							Red

OUTPUT II: DISCUSSIONS ON THEMATIC AREAS

Thematic area	Questions	Output of the Discussions
1. Private sector inclusion and engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual farmers • Large scale, corporate, local investors • Foreign Investors All motivated by profit	a) How do you think the private sector can play an important role in implementing the NAIPs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct a stakeholder analysis to define what constitutes the private sector in each country; and a Capacity Needs assessment for each of the players - Organising private sector apex bodies – they need to be better coordinated - Engagement of private sector in Planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and accountability of NAIP process - Farmers to organise themselves into associations and engage with other private sector partners as a unit - Need for increased access to financial services for smallholder farmers - Incentivise domestic private sector - Effective participation will require private sector to be incentivised to invest and share quality data - Investments (such as agro-processing, seed, markets, access to credit) - Largely value addition, processing, but can also be involved in innovative primary production, intensive cultivation, contract farming - Establish Incentives: appropriate, conducive business environment; ease of doing business; access to land; business permits; taxes; infrastructure support; research and new technology development; fixing markets imperfections/distortions; maintaining law and order; good governance; zero tolerance to corruption. - Social responsibilities: regulations to compel private firms to channel part of their CSR to agriculture investment
	b) What effort can be made by Governments to mobilize private investments?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Creating conducive environment (infrastructure, tax incentive, risk guarantee, provision of land on lease - By government providing guarantees which will reduce risk. - Tripartite agreement between, government insurance and other support institutions and value chain actors. - Policies supportive of private sector investments e.g. on land tenure system, credit, agric. Inputs, water. - Government should build in and ensure regular mutual accountability - Gov't needs to deliberately institutionalise PP dialogues with domestic investors

Thematic area	Questions	Output of the Discussions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Build public sector capacity to engage with the private sector - Build government political will that goes beyond commitment to response - Prioritise policies that will increase private sector investments in specific value chains
	c) Can you share experience on how private sector support increased incomes of smallholders?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rwanda (One stop investment shop); - Kenya (Private sector alliance); - Zimbabwe (PPPs Command Agriculture) - Ethiopia – there is a private sector task force under the technical committees that drive implementation of the sector strategy - PPP Tea Estates in Rwanda - Brookside milk value chain investment in Uganda
2. Increasing Resilience Resilience: about bouncing back Knowledge of unavoidable shocks; risks. Current focus: climate related risks; Preparation to minimize the impacts of climate change	What can Governments do to make Agriculture sector more resilient?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase government funding to resilience matters and not relying on donors e.g. Increased investment in climate smart agriculture; avoid project mode actions, - Increased agriculture/ crop insurance - Capacity building and awareness on resilience - Promote and increase investment in water management systems e.g. water harvesting, storage, irrigation - Conducive policies to enhance resilience - Focus more on adaptation at livelihood levels; livelihood-based resilience programmes - Enhance national coordination, stakeholder's approach to addressing resilience - Invest in early warning system - Conduct more research on resilience and support farmers to adapt to climate change - Promote sustainable land management - Proper futuristic planning - Resilience- build along value chain. At each of stage according to the varied needs and responses. It could be a global economic shock, climate shock etc. - Climate risk preparedness body - Governments take more responsibility beyond economic development and GDP growth. Through identification pockets & types of risks. Identify methods and programmes of addressing those risks. - Government needs to increase investment in research, energy/solar, irrigation etc - Small holder farmers can invest in afforestation, soil and water conservation on farmland and

Thematic area	Questions	Output of the Discussions
		<p>catchment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Institute social protection/safety net programmes that build resilience in the short term e.g., in Ethiopia the productively program is feeding about 7mil people; there is also a livelihood program etc. - There is need to strengthen inter-ministerial collaboration/coordination around resilience
3. Strengthening capacity for implementation and coordination	How can Government especially ministries involved in the Agriculture sector deal with the issue of limited capacity for implementation and coordination?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide leadership for the process at highest level in government - Agriculture needs to get on the agenda by heads of state. High level multi-sectoral coordination. - Holistic approach to match capacity needs and development with investments in agriculture both in private and public - Set up the right institutional arrangements E.g. ATA in Ethiopia, PMU at Min of Agriculture, Sector WGs in Rwanda and Zimbabwe (coordination) - Cluster arrangements – cutting across different Ministries - Ministries of agriculture need to involve other line ministries supporting other value chains and rural development programmes - Ministries need budget lines for stakeholders’ coordination - Need for strategic, structured coordination starting with high level leadership in the country, understood by stakeholders at national level. Inter-governmental coordination - Operational coordination by lines ministries - Agricultural sector working groups with refined terms - Tailored Capacity development measures/Trainings - Info and advocacy to raise awareness - Governments seem to invest more in planning and less in investment, there is need to change this dynamic – government needs a long-term vision and plan that enables it to build/invest in long-term capacity strengthening. - There is need to use national capacities, there is a lot of international consultancies being used by governments and align these national capacities in areas they are well versed in. - Strengthening the institutional capacity is very important - Need for national governments to be familiarised on the technical capacity available to support them in planning, implementation and reporting - Establish and strengthen multi-sectoral working groups

Thematic area	Questions	Output of the Discussions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthen M&E systems - Allocate more financial resources for implementation and coordination
4. Type of support required by RECs and MS from AUC/NPCA	What types of support are required by RECs and Member States from AUC/NPCA to address the key themes under Malabo?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technical backstopping (biennial review process and Africa agriculture transformation scorecard); - Capacity building plan (peer review mechanisms, learning & sharing experiences and lessons learnt, training, field visits, etc.); - Member states expect a harmonized approach between AUC/NPCA and RECs; - Capacity in Monitoring & Evaluation and Knowledge Management - Support member states to sensitize and advocate for Malabo at policy level. - Technical support in areas where there are challenges in capacity – specialized technical support in a systematic way (e.g. M&E, communication strategy), - Capacity for writing good proposals that can be taken to investment agencies - Resource mobilization - Cross fertilization of ideas and lessons - Mainstreaming regional agenda - Consistent and systematic peer review - Across all areas, there is need for technical, financial and organisational support - More forums for sharing information/experiences - Assistance unpacking continental information e.g., frameworks, - Declarations, guidelines i.e., break down what operationalisation of these would mean (or look like) at each level of their operation (continental, regional and national). Technical capacity in monitoring and evaluation - Where is the “<i>One-Stop Shop</i>” in AUC- NPCA where one can get all the tools they need to Domestic Malabo – this can be an individual, unit a team etc. makes it easier to support all teams - Creating awareness on the existence of implementation tools that exist at continental level - Support the establishment of dedicated units to coordinate CAADP implementation - Capacity building on CAADP implementation - Create awareness and political buy-in on ownership of Malabo and CAADP
5. Roles of AUC, NPCA,	What should be the different roles of	AUC/NPCA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduce- high level sensitization and advocacy

Thematic area	Questions	Output of the Discussions
RECs and MS	AUC/NPCA, RECs and Members States in 4) above?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordination - Policy direction - Resource mobilisation for the sector at continental level with global partners - Awareness and political buy-in - Coordination of all Malabo Declaration related activities - Technical backstopping - Alignment of all continental initiatives related to/informing the Malabo agenda (ATVET, climate change etc.) - Advocacy and sensitization
		RECs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue advocacy while training individuals at member state level - Implementation technical support for member states - Resource mobilization at regional level - Regional policy harmonization - Coordinate and lift member states - Domestication of the Malabo declaration at regional level - Technical backstopping - Development of RAIPs compliant with the Malabo declaration
		Member states <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue with implementation - Apply all the above at a national level - Implement and coordinate at national Level - Mobilize resources at national level and create conducive environment - Reporting progress - Domestication of the Malabo declaration at national level - Development of NAIPs compliant with the Malabo declaration - Inter-institutional collaboration among all stakeholders

OUTPUT III: DISCUSSIONS ON BIENNIEL REVIEW REPORT

No	Questions	Output of the Discussions
1	What do we learn from the Country Scorecard and the BR Report?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is need to improve country data collection and management systems and M&E systems – have good and reliable agricultural statistics and management. Most countries lack basic data due to low investment in data management; Inadequate capacities in data management; Poor stakeholders' coordination for data submission - There are too many indicators, and some complex - The report should have simpler versions for understanding by policy makers, politicians, other actors, etc. - There is need for national validation of draft scorecards by technical teams at county levels, to get country concurrence before submission to heads of states - Country performance on the areas of Malabo commitments i.e. Areas where countries are on track and not on track in terms of performance; Areas of good performance, areas requiring attention and need to strengthen - The process has brought about peer learning and pressure to report and improve scores - There is need for a more detailed synthesized country report to be used to engage national actors - There is need for cross-sectoral/ministerial coordination considering that Malabo addresses various performance areas - Overall score does not reflect the overall performance on all commitments - Countries that did not participate in the process will be motivated to join in - Identifies Strengths and weaknesses - Recommendation will help us design programmes to improve - Identify type of data missing; mainstreaming such in data collection protocols of relevant national data collection agencies (e.g. National Bureau of Statistics) - Triggered actions to improve agricultural statistics in the country (e.g. higher budget lines)
2	How can the Country Scorecard help to identify gaps in achieving Malabo Targets that can inform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scorecard provides a snapshot of areas in which countries are weak – areas that can be strengthened during NAIP implementation - Scorecard puts pressure for countries to strengthen their data systems; to monitor implement and report on the NAIP - Scorecard brought awareness to areas that were not being captured through the BRR process - The results can be basis for re-engagement with stakeholders and generate further discussions to improve

No	Questions	Output of the Discussions
	NAIPs to deliver expected results?	<p>NAIPS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report can be used to identify country areas of weaknesses- capacities, institutional organizations, etc. and improve - The report can be used for re-aligning plans, resource allocation - Countries can assess and compare with other countries to fill missing gaps - Gives a quick visible feedback on areas that need attention as well as recommendations for improvement - The indicators to be adopted in the result framework of NAIPs formulation process - Data required is from various ministries/sectors rather than one single source: this calls for collaboration between relevant sectors/ministers - Inadequate statistics/data in terms of quality specifically tailored to Malabo (not disaggregated accordingly) - The scores for different performance targets help identify areas that require attention - The recommendations on the country score cards provide action points for government and other stakeholders - Inform NAIP formulation process by identifying areas where enough attention was not given to Malabo targets - The periodic nature of BR reporting provides incentives for country to maintain good performance and improve on areas of poor performance - Opportunity for peer learning from good performers
3	How do we use the Biennial Review Report to strengthen evidence-based Planning and Implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Domesticating the report with stakeholders - Sharing report with key people in authority- Ministers, policy-makers, MPS, private sector actors, etc. - Develop mechanisms to ensure that actions are taken (including funding) where there are gaps - Ensure the country recommendations provided are acted on - Report helps identify areas where there is no or weak evidence - Strengthen or establish systems for capturing and or analysis of data - Use the other country data and recommendations to identify additional areas for policy action - BRR could trigger further, deeper research to generate evidence that can be used to improve planning and implementation - BRR could influence countries that did not report to be technically supported to strengthen their evidence base for planning, implementation and reporting - Country reports and scorecard could be used to identify areas for technical support Joint planning with

No	Questions	Output of the Discussions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> key stakeholders (Resource mobilization, technical expertise) - Building agriculture statistics/database for countries - Support to 1% allocation for research and analysis - The scores clear point out on areas requiring intervention - Helps identify priority areas and develop targets in the NAIPs - Guide review of interventions that might not be 'working' - It requires joint stakeholders planning, implementation and monitoring
4	How do we use the Biennial Review Report to strengthen Mutual Accountability in your country (Joint Sector Reviews)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish or use existing joint multi-stakeholder forums/taskforces to break down the outcomes of the BRR into programs, projects or actions to address the gaps - Use the BRR as an entry point to engage Non-State Actors, particularly private sector, to share data and better understand their role in addressing country system gaps - Provision of space and platform for dialogue and accountability - Lobby for agriculture financing and technical support - Articulation and implementation of roles and responsibilities - Address data gaps - Pull out relevant outcomes/results and share with different audience - Forms basis for the Joint Sector Reviews at Country level - This will assist in forward planning by different groups as part of an improvement efforts - Provides a common reference for stakeholders to review sector performance - Government can use it to formulate policy incentives for the private sector to increase investment into the sector - Develop partner can also use the report to review their performance and identify areas of intervention - Domesticated the report and review with stakeholders how their support contributed to overall country performance and scores - Discuss with stakeholders the key areas of weaknesses, learn from other countries and plan early to address the gaps

OUTPUT IV: NAIP FORMULATION COUNTRY ROAD MAPS
ETHIOPIA NAIP 2 FORMULATION ROAD MAP

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
1. Country profiling/Country status					
MTR of the PIF I Conducted	MOANR & MOLF	Government ministries and agencies (MOFEC, Planning Commission, Institute of Agricultural Research and others	World Bank, FAO, CIDA, GIZ, EU	August 2015	Financial support from USAID
Malabo domestication conducted	MOANR & MOLF	Government ministries and agencies (MOFEC, Planning Commission, Institute of Agricultural Research ATA and others	AUC, NEPAD, FAO, RESAKSS and others	MAY 2017	Financial support from AGRA
Updating the Executive committee and NAIF done	MOANR & MOLF	Government ministries and agencies (MOFEC, Planning Commission, Institute of Agricultural Research and others	World Bank, FAO, CIDA, GIZ, EU and others	June 2017	
2. Thematic studies to inform NAIP					
Policy reforms undertaken to support NAIF II (seed system, contract farming, extension system, livestock breeding policy etc.)	MOANR & MOLF	ATA USAID AGRA Oxfam ISSD and others	World Bank, FAO, CIDA, GIZ, EU and others	2016-2017	
New areas of policy reforms under way		Government ministries and agencies (MOFEC, Planning Commission, Institute of Agricultural Research ATA and others			
3. Processes/Consultations					

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
Joint sector working group established NAIF TF	MOANR, MOLF & MOFEC	Government ministries and agencies (MOFEC, Planning Commission, Institute of Agricultural Research ATA and others	World Bank, FAO, CIDA, GIZ, EU	June 2017	
Serious of consultations have been undertaken by NAIF TF to develop TOR and Concept note,	MOANR & MOLF	Government ministries and agencies (MOFEC, Planning Commission, Institute of Agricultural Research ATA and others	World Bank, FAO, CIDA, GIZ, EU	June 2017	
TOR endorsed by ExCom	MOANR & MOLF	Government ministries and agencies (MOFEC, Planning Commission, Institute of Agricultural Research ATA and others	World Bank, FAO, CIDA, GIZ, EU	July 2017	
4. Formulation/Refresh of the NAIP					
Recruitments of independent consultants done	NAIF TF	Government ministries and agencies (MOFEC, Planning Commission, Institute of Agricultural Research ATA and others	World Bank, FAO, CIDA, GIZ, EU	August 2017	Financial support from World Bank
Desk Review undertaken	NAIF TS	EDRI	World Bank, FAO, CIDA, GIZ, EU	September – December 2017	
Development of draft second-generation NAIP preparation is underway	NAIF TS	EDRI	World Bank, FAO, CIDA, GIZ, EU	January-March 2018	
Determination investments framework to be addressed by the second-generation NAIP	NAIF TS	EDRI	World Bank, FAO, CIDA, GIZ, EU	April 2018	
5. Technical Review and Validation					

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
Inter-ministerial consultation	NAIF TS	Government ministries and agencies (MOFEC, Planning Commission, Institute of Agricultural Research ATA and others	World Bank, FAO, CIDA, GIZ, EU	June 2018	
Conduct validation with stakeholders for inputs	NAIF TS	Government ministries and agencies (MOFEC, Planning Commission, Institute of Agricultural Researches ATA and others	World Bank, FAO, CIDA, GIZ, EU RECs NEPAD, COMESA,	June 2018	
Independent Review	MOANR MOLF	RECSs AUC	RECs NEPAD, COMESA	June 2018	Fund from RECs
6. Business Meeting					
Inauguration of the NAIF II	MOANR MOLF	stockholders	World Bank, FAO, CIDA, GIZ, EU RECs NEPAD, COMESA, and others	July	Fund from RECs
7. Drafting the MTEF and aligning the NAIP with the budget process	MOANR MOLF	MOFEC			
8. Strengthening country systems for coordination through inter-ministerial and Sector Working group					
Updating the executive committee, the RED & FS WG and the NAIF Implementation TF and delegation of	MOANR MOLF	Government ministries and agencies (MOFEC, Planning Commission, Institute of Agricultural Researches ATA and	World Bank, FAO, CIDA, GIZ, EU and others	July 2018 onwards	

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
responsibility		others			
9. Roadmap for policy reform					
Road map for NAIF Implementation	MOANR MOLF	Government ministries and agencies (MOFEC, Planning Commission, Institute of Agricultural Research ATA and others		June 2018 and onwards	

KENYA NAIP2 FORMULATION ROADMAP

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
1. Country profiling/Country status					
-Malabo domestication process through stakeholder's mobilization is ongoing: Almost complete at National level and now moving to 47 County level governments -Two documents from stakeholder meetings are developed: Joint Sector Review and Institutional Architecture Assessment -Four meetings for development of Agriculture Sector Transformation & Growth Strategy and RAIP2 roadmap which indicates timeframe for each activity is in place process to end by June 2018 -Communication strategy for NAIP formulation is developed: Concept note, branding, awareness creation at both levels of Governments, High level Briefs, -A task Force of experts and Government officials, complete with a Secretariat is in place; The Steering committee is headed by the Principal Secretary in the State Department of Crops Development	Ministry of Agriculture & Irrigation	FAO, AGRA and Africa Lead	Africa Lead	June,2018	
-Stock taking supplemented by Diagnostic modeling and studies are	Ministry of Agriculture &	FAO, AGRA and Africa Lead	McKenzie	June,2018	Insufficient data

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
being conducted to inform NAIP development including inputs from lessons learnt during implementation of NAIP1 -	Irrigation				
Seven consultation meetings with key stakeholders have been conducted:	Ministry of Agriculture & Irrigation	-DP Group; -Council of Governors; -Private Sector Alliance; -Parliamentary Committee on Agriculture	Africa Lead	March,2018	
2. Thematic studies to inform NAIP					
Five thematic review areas are identified: Agricultural Transformation agenda, Transformation Result Areas, Agricultural Sector Transformation, Investment & Implementation plan to inform NAIP formulation are in place	Ministry of Agriculture & Irrigation	FAO; University Dons	FAO	March,2018	
3. Processes/Consultations					
Seven consultation meetings with key stakeholders have been conducted:	Ministry of Agriculture & Irrigation	DP Group; Council of Governors; Private Sector Alliance; Parliamentary Committee on Agriculture	McKenzie Consultants	March,2018	

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
4. Formulation/Refresh of the NAIP2					
	Ministry of Agriculture & Irrigation	FAO, AGRA and Africa Lead	McKenzie Consultants	June,2018	
5. Technical Review and Validation					
Two validation activities have been conducted	Ministry of Agriculture & Irrigation	Africa Lead	Local experts		
6. Business Meeting					
	Ministry of Agriculture & Irrigation	FAO, AGRA and Africa Lead, EAC	FAO	August 2018	Business meetings will be conducted at the end of NAIP2 formulation
7. Drafting the MTEF and aligning the NAIP2 with the budget process					
Government MTEF for Financial Year 2017-2018 is completed	Ministry of Planning and devolution	World Bank	IMF	Financial Year 2018-2019	NAIP2 will be aligned to MTEF budget process for Financial Year 2018-2019
8. Strengthening country systems for coordination through inter-ministerial and Sector Working group					

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
Country CAADP Team-	Ministry of Agriculture & Irrigation	Members are drawn from sector ministries, state corporations, NGO, Civil society, Farmer organizations, Private Sector and Development Partners, Research institutions, Universities, County governments			
Joint Agriculture Sector Coordination Committee (JASCCOM)- for coordination between the National and County level governments	Ministry of Agriculture & Irrigation	Development Partners (World Bank, AfDB, SIDA, GIZ	Local Experts	Dec, 2018	Coordination structures at County levels are being strengthened
Thematic Working Groups- Sub-committees of JASCCOM- represented by County CECs and National Government officials; TWGs handle various themes such as Extension and Research, Policy, Projects/Programmes, etc.	Chair: -Country Executive Committee Member for Agriculture(CEC)	Council of Governors; World Bank, AfDB, SIDA, GIZ	SIDA	Dec 2018	
Agriculture and Rural Development Donor Groups	FAO	SIDA, GIZ, EU, JICA, USAID,	FAO	In existence	
9. Roadmap for policy					

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
reform					
Relevant policy instruments like Food and Nutrition Policy; Research and Extension policy; National Trade and Investments policy and measures are in place, but Agriculture Policy is yet to be completed	Ministry of Agriculture & Irrigation	-Attorney General Office -Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade -Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research & Analysis (KIPPRA) -Tegemeo -Parliamentary Committee on Agriculture	Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research & Analysis (KIPPRA)	June, 2018	Agriculture Policy is at Cabinet level for approval

SEYCHELLES NAIP REVIEW ROAD MAP

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
3. Country profiling/Country status					
	Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture (MFAg)	GOS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dept. Trade • Min. Health • NBS (statistics) • Department of public administration • Dept. Economic planning • Ministry of family affairs 	FAO IFAD ReSAKSS	Q3 2018	
4. Thematic studies to inform NAIP					
Food Insecurity Experience Survey	National Bureau of Statistics	FAO			
National Vulnerability Assessment	As above	World bank			
Others to be identified with reference to the Malabo Commitments					
3. Processes/Consultations					
Capacity needs assessment for NAIP implementation as a component of the total capacity assessment for NAIP implementation	Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture	Seychelles Agricultural Agency SAA Seychelles fisheries Authority SFA	ReSAKSS		

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
		National Biosecurity Agency NBA Ministry of Finance MOF DPA			
Joint Sector Review (JSR)	Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture	Government Ministries Civil society Private sector	ReSAKSS		
4. Formulation/Refresh of the NAIP					
Incorporate Malabo Commitments into the revised SNAIP. This will be done after the CNA and JSR. If additional resources are mobilized, other assessments can be done that reflects our ability or capacity to respond to our Malabo commitments. A complete implementation capacity assessment can be done in preparation for incorporating Malabo commitments.	Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture	SAA SFA NBA Civil society Private sector Min Finance	ReSAKSS		
5. Technical Review and Validation					

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
	MFAg	Not yet established. Could be a TCPf with FAO or technical assistance from the AU			
6. Business Meeting					
	MFAg	Min. Finance Department of public administration			
7. Drafting the MTEF and aligning the NAIP with the budget process	MFAg	Min. Finance and DPA			
8. Strengthening country systems for coordination through interministerial and Sector Working group	Not yet decided	Not yet decided			
9. Roadmap for policy reform					
(see template for policy formulation)					

MALAWI NAIP ROADMAP FORMULATION

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
1. Country profiling/Country status					
2. Thematic studies to inform NAIP					
3. Processes/Consultations					
4. Formulation/Refresh of the NAIP					
5. Technical Review and Validation					
6. Business Meeting					
6.1 Draft Code of Conduct and MoU	Ministry of Agriculture Irrigation and Water Development	DPs, Civil Society, Farmers organizations	Africa LEAD		
6.2 Revise the CAADP Compact	Ministry of Agriculture Irrigation and Water Development	DCAFS	Africa LEAD		
6.3 Draft Communique	Ministry of Agriculture Irrigation and Water Development	-			
6.4 Edit and print NAIP Copies	Ministry of Agriculture Irrigation and Water	FAO	-		

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
	Development				
6.5 CAP F launch and Private Sector Engagement	Ministry of Agriculture Irrigation and Water Development	MCCCI, Ministry of Industry and trade	Grow Africa/AUC		
6.6 Hold stakeholder consultation meetings (DPs, Farmer Organizations, Private Sector, Government Departments and Line Ministries)	Ministry of Agriculture Irrigation and Water Development				
6.7 Organize the Business Meeting	Ministry of Agriculture Irrigation and Water Development	Govt. Depts and Line Ministries. DPs Civil Society Farmer Organizations MCCCI	AUC COMESA		
6.8 Sensitization and awareness creation at all levels	Ministry of Agriculture Irrigation and Water Development	Civil Society/NGOs Farmer Organizations			
7. Drafting the MTEF and aligning the NAIP with the budget process					
7.1 Finalize the NAIP aligned budgeting template	Ministry of Agriculture Irrigation and Water Development	MoF			
7.2 Sensitize stakeholders on use of the template	Ministry of Agriculture Irrigation and Water Development	-	FAO		
7.3 Engage Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning on adoption of NAIP Programmes into the Programmes Based Budgeting	Ministry of Agriculture Irrigation and Water Development	MoF	DCAFS AUC		
8. Strengthening country systems for					

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
coordination through interministerial and Sector Working group					
8.1 Reconstitute the TWGs	Ministry of Agriculture Irrigation and Water Development				
8.2 Re-orient the EMC, SWG and TWGs and Intervention Area Coordination Structures	Ministry of Agriculture Irrigation and Water Development				
8.3 Prepare schedule of meetings and define plan of work for each structure	Ministry of Agriculture Irrigation and Water Development				
9. Roadmap for policy reform					
9.1 Identify policy reform areas to facilitate NAIP implementation	Ministry of Agriculture Irrigation and Water Development				
9.2 Prepare plan for reforms (ToRs?)	Ministry of Agriculture Irrigation and Water Development				

UGANDA NAIP FORMULATION ROADMAP

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
1. Country profiling/Country status					
Documentation of the performance of the agriculture sector and the economy in general.	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	Uganda Bureau of Statistics; Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development; National Planning Authority; Office of the Prime Minister	World Bank USAID Netherlands Embassy JICA	On - going	Country status indicators incorporated in the Logical Framework for regular collection and analysis
Align the ASSP to the Malabo declaration	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	AUC, ReSAKSS, AGRA, FAO	Agriculture Donor Sub-Group of the Sector Working Group	On - going	The technical review workshop is scheduled in April 2018
2. Thematic studies to inform NAIP					
Framework implementation plans for the priority and strategic commodities, Agriculture Mechanization, Water for Production, Institutional Development, Communication Strategy, Extension service provision and Agriculture Research	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry of Fisheries	Ministry of Water and Environment, Ministry of Works and Transport, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development Ministry of Local Government	World Bank USAID Netherlands Embassy JICA	Completed	These have formed the basis for value chain investments in the agriculture sector
3. Processes/Consultations					
Sharing the revised Malabo Compliant draft ASSP with AUC and other partners	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	AUC	Ag. Donor sub-group	April 01, 2018	All documents from the alignment process of the ASSP to Malabo shared with partners
Validation of the Malabo compliant	Ministry of	Ministry of Finance,	Ag. Donor sub-group	April 30, 2018	The dates will be

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
ASSP	Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	Planning and Economic Development; National Planning Authority; Office of the Prime Minister, AUC, COMESA			agreed between MAAIF and AUC
Review the M&E Framework and validate it	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development; National Planning Authority; Office of the Prime Minister, AUC, COMESA	Ag. Donor sub-group	April 30, 2018	To be done jointly with validation of ASSP
Approval of the road map by the Agriculture Sector Working Group	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development; National Planning Authority; Office of the Prime Minister, CSOs, Academia	Ag. Donor sub-group	April 30, 2018	ASWG to get appraised on the alignment and validation process
Mid Term Review of the implementation of the ASSP a wider stakeholder consultation	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development; National Planning Authority; Office of the Prime Minister	Ag. Donor sub-group	August 2018	Review of the performance of the sector stakeholders in the ASSP implementation
Capacity development on the Malabo and Biennial Review process-continuous	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development; National Planning	Ag. Donor sub-group	April 30, 2018	Training of CAADP Country Team and other stakeholders on data collection

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
		Authority; Office of the Prime Minister, AUC, COMESA			and management for the compliant ASSP
Updating the indicators and carrying out self - assessment on the implementation of Malabo to inform Biennial Review	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	ReSAKSS EPRC	FAO, AGRA	October 2018	Improving availability of data
Biennial Review 2019	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	USAKSS, ReSAKSS, FAO	Ag. Donor sub-group	April 30, 2018	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
4. Formulation/Refresh of the NAIP					
Completed during the formulation of the NAIP 2 called the Agriculture Sector Strategic Plan					
5. Technical Review and Validation					
Completed in March 2017					
6. Business Meeting					
Holding a business meeting after the Mid Term Review	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development; National Planning Authority; Office of the Prime Minister, AUC, COMESA	Ag. Donor sub-group	November 2018	
7. Drafting the MTEF and aligning the NAIP with the					

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
budget process					
Completed as part of the formulation of the NAIP 2					
8. Strengthening country systems for coordination through inter-ministerial and Sector Working group					
Already exists					
9. Roadmap for policy reform					
Already being implemented					

ZIMBABWE NAIP FORMULATION ROADMAP

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
1. Country profiling/Country status					
Stocktaking exercise for NAIP 1, compiling lessons learnt (governance, process, formulation, financing, implementation)	Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement	OPC, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, ZIMSTATS, FAO	COMESA		
Evaluation of ZIMASSET (Food Security and Nutrition Cluster) 2013-2018	Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement	OPC, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, ZIMSTATS,	FAO, UNDP		The cluster focus area are crop and livestock production, financing, resilience, Policy, nutrition and food safety, coordination of the agricultural sector
2. Thematic studies to inform NAIP					
Coordination of resilience initiatives (ZRBF, GCF)	Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement	Ministry of Environment, Water and Climate	EU, UNDP, FAO		
Public Expenditure Review for the agriculture sector (1. PBB 2.ODA)	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning	Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement,	EU, DFID, USAID, ZIMSTATS, FAO, UNDP,		Consultant commissioned to look at level of disaggregation under PBB and focus on off budget expenditure by donors
Appropriate investment models in	Ministry of Lands,	Ministry of Finance and	FAO, UNDP		Financing small

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
Agriculture (change in farming structures and security of tenure issues)	Agriculture and Rural Resettlement	Economic Planning, RBZ, BAZ			holder agriculture in Zimbabwe is a challenge because of collateral issues. There is need to establish what models can be used to finance farmers considering they are viewed as high risk
Control of plant pests and diseases (Tuta absoluta, fall armyworm)	Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement	Agriculture Research Council	FAO, UNDP, EU		
Resilience: Barrier analysis for small grains					Low adoption of small grains which are drought resistant
3. Processes/Consultations					
Workshop on Malabo domestication process with stakeholders	Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement	OPC, Ministry of Environment, Water and Climate; Ministry of Transport, Ministry of Youth and Women Affairs, Ministry of Industry and Commerce, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, ZIMSTATS FAO, UNDP, EU, World Bank	All NGOs who cover Malabo commitments led by CARITAS Zimbabwe		
Development of a communication strategy for NAIP 2	Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement	OPC, FAO, UNDP, EU, World Bank	All NGOs who cover Malabo commitments led by CARITAS Zimbabwe		There is need for recruitment of a consultant

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
NAIP 2 Strategic framework and results framework developed	Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement	OPC, FAO, UNDP, EU, World Bank	All NGOs who cover Malabo commitments led by CARITAS Zimbabwe		There is need for recruitment of a consultant
4. Formulation/Refresh of the NAIP					
Stakeholder consultations (NAIP 2)	Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement	OPC, Ministry of Environment, Water and Climate; Ministry of Transport, Ministry of Youth and Women Affairs, Ministry of Industry and Commerce, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, ZIMSTATS, Ministry of Health and Child Care	FAO, UNDP, World Bank		Stakeholder consultations shall be led by MLARR supported by line Ministries and other technical partners
NAIP 2 first draft presentation to stakeholders	Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement	OPC, Ministry of Environment, Water and Climate; Ministry of Transport, Ministry of Youth and Women Affairs, Ministry of Industry and Commerce, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, ZIMSTATS FAO, UNDP, EU, World Bank	All NGOs who cover Malabo commitments led by CARITAS Zimbabwe		Consultant needed to consolidate all contributions from stakeholders.
Consolidation of stakeholder	Ministry of Lands,	OPC, Ministry of	All NGOs who cover		Consultant needed

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
comments	Agriculture and Rural Resettlement	Environment, Water and Climate; Ministry of Transport, Ministry of Youth and Women Affairs, Ministry of Industry and Commerce, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, ZIMSTATS	Malabo commitments led by CARITAS Zimbabwe, FAO, UNDP, EU, World Bank		to consolidate all contributions from stakeholders.
Validation workshops	Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement	OPC, Ministry of Environment, Water and Climate; Ministry of Transport, Ministry of Youth and Women Affairs, Ministry of Industry and Commerce, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, ZIMSTATS FAO, UNDP, EU, World Bank	All NGOs who cover Malabo commitments led by CARITAS Zimbabwe		Consultant needed to consolidate all contributions from stakeholders.
5. Technical Review and Validation					
Independent technical review	COMESA, AUC	Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural resettlement	World Bank, FAO, UNDP		
6. Business Meeting					
High level Business meeting	Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement and	OPC, Ministry of Environment, Water and Climate; Ministry of	All NGOs who cover Malabo commitments led by CARITAS		The high-level business meeting for the first NAIP

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning	Transport, Ministry of Youth and Women Affairs, Ministry of Industry and Commerce, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, ZIMSTATS FAO, UNDP, EU, World Bank	Zimbabwe		was held in July 2017.
7. Drafting the MTEF and aligning the NAIP with the budget process					
Alignment of the NAIP with the budget process	Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement and Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning	ZIMSTATS	FAO, UNDP, EU, World Bank,		The process has already begun. A consultant was hired by World Bank to look at the level of disaggregation of the budget lines under PBB and make appropriate recommendations. Consultant with also focus on off budget expenditure by donors and regroup it into the recommended budget lines under PBB.

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
8. Strengthening country systems for coordination through inter-ministerial and Sector Working group					
Agriculture Sector Steering Working Group	Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement	OPC, Ministry of Environment, Water and Climate; Ministry of Transport, Ministry of Youth and Women Affairs, Ministry of Industry and Commerce, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Ministry of Health and Child Care, ZIMTRADE, ZIMSTATS	All NGOs who cover Malabo commitments led by CARITAS Zimbabwe, FAO, UNDP, EU, World Bank		New members need to be added in the ASSWG created by ZAIP 1 so that all commitments are covered
9. Roadmap for policy reform					
Ease of doing business reforms (reduction of compliance costs, relook at overlapping statutory instruments)	Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement	OPC, Ministry of Industry and Commerce, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Zimbabwe Investment Authority, Agricultural Marketing Authority, Zimbabwe Revenue Authority ZIMTRADE, ZIMSTATS	FAO, UNDP, EU, World Bank		Reforms have already started
Subsector policies (livestock, extension, mechanization and irrigation, land, horticulture)	Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement	OPC, Ministry of Environment, Water and Climate; Ministry of Youth and Women	All NGOs who cover Malabo commitments led by CARITAS Zimbabwe, FAO,		Livestock, Mechanization and Irrigation, Land and Horticulture

ITEM	LEAD Government INSTITUTION	KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	LEAD DEVELOPMENT/ TECHNICAL PARTNERS	DEADLINE	REMARKS
		Affairs, Ministry of Industry and Commerce, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Livestock Meat Advisory Council, Horticulture Development Authority, Zimbabwe Lands Commission, ZIMTRADE, ZIMSTATS	UNDP, UN Women, EU, World Bank		policies have already been drafted they now await Cabinet approval.

RWANDA NAIP 3 FORMULATION ROAD MAP

Activities	Outputs	Responsible	March				April				May				June				July				August				September				October				November				December			
			Week1	Week2	Week3	Week4	Week1	Week2	Week3	Week4	Week1	Week2	Week3	Week4	Week1	Week2	Week3	Week4	Week1	Week2	Week3	Week4	Week1	Week2	Week3	Week4	Week1	Week2	Week3	Week4	Week1	Week2	Week3	Week4	Week1	Week2	Week3	Week4				
Preparatory Work	Share the roadmap and requirements of the PSTA 4 Formulation (MINAGRI)	Agreed governance structure					X																																			
	TaskForce to Drive PSTA 4 process (set-up, Kick-off meeting, etc)	Mapping of available resources					X	X	X																																	
	Concept note guiding consultation process	Consensus agreement on draft roadmap					X	X	X	X																																
	Mapping of Recent and Ongoing Studies and Reports	Mapping of studies to inform the analytical phase					X	X	X	X	X																															
	Concept note guiding analytical work						X	X																																		
	Abbreviated concept note for the knowledge seminar	Talk for the national consultant(s)					X	X	X	X	X																															
	Any other relevant study to inform the process (climate smart agriculture, youth, trade, nutrition...) – feasibility by Task Force						X																																			
	Inclusive stakeholder consultations (Both agencies, DPs, Private Sector, Farmers organizations, civil society and academia)						X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																												
	Prepare Talks for PSTA 4 development						X	X																																		
	Finalize Talks and circulate among team members									X	X																															
	MINECOFIN - Sector Strategic Plan elaboration roadmap (MINAGRI/FAO)	Sector Feedback by the 27 th April 2017 on PSTA4 Process										X																														
	ASWG meeting to validate initial progress	Validate outputs from preparatory phase discuss mapping document of studies to inform the next analytical phase												X																												
Analytical work	Review the Mapping documents and identify gaps and Concept Note for the knowledge Seminar	Short report with key findings and recommendations on document review (see guiding questions)			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																											
	TaskForce to Drive PSTA 4 process											X	X																													
	Draw lessons from the analysis of documents												X	X	X	X	X																									
	MINECOFIN - Procurement of Consultants to facilitate in the SSPs elaboration	SSPs elaboration aligned to the Vision 2050 and EDPRS 3 preparation roadmap													X																											
	ASWG meeting to provide further guidance for PSTA process	Validation of the report from the analytical work agree on an outline for the PSTA4 CN													X																											
Writing of the CN for PSTA4	Write a draft concept note	PSTA4 concept note										X	X																													
	Write draft Talk for the international consultant to write the PSTA4 (incl. Results Framework, M&E Framework & ASP III)	Talk for the international consultant who will write the PSTA4										X	X																													
	MINAGRI/FAO																																									
	KNOWLEDGE SEMINAR																X																									
	MINECOFIN - Submission of first draft of sector priorities to MINECOFIN	Submission of Sector projections in 2050 - 10 th May 2017										X																														
	MINECOFIN - Consultations between Sectors and Districts during the period	Submission of first draft of <u>sector priorities</u> to MINECOFIN - 27 th May 2017												X																												
	MINECOFIN - Submission of second draft of sector priorities to MINECOFIN	Submission of first draft of <u>sector priorities</u> to MINECOFIN - 30 th June 2017															X																									
	TaskForce to Drive PSTA 4 process																																									
	Finalize concept note												X		X																											
	ASWG meeting to provide further guidance for PSTA process	Validated PSTA4 CN approval of the Talk for the international consultant															X																									
Writing of PSTA4 and related documents	Hiring process (tender requirement, etc)	draft PSTA4										X	X	X	X																											
	TaskForce to Drive PSTA 4 process																																									
	MINAGRI/FAO																																									
	MINECOFIN - Draft one of the Sector Strategy submitted to MINECOFIN for quality assurance	Draft one of the <u>Sector Strategy</u> , submitted to MINECOFIN for quality assurance - 15 th July 2017														X																										
	MINECOFIN - Draft two of the Sector Strategy submitted to MINECOFIN for quality assurance	Draft two of the <u>Sector Strategy</u> , submitted to MINECOFIN for quality assurance - 31 st August 2017																	X																							
	MINECOFIN - Final Draft of the Sector Strategy available	Final Draft of the Sector Strategy available - 15 th September 2017																		X																						
	MINECOFIN - Final draft approved by ASWG	Final Sector Strategy approved by SWG - 10 th November 2017																															X									
	MINECOFIN - Approved final draft submitted to MINECOFIN																																									
	ASWG meeting to provide further guidance and validation to PSTA process after MINECOFIN comments	Final draft of the Sector Strategy available - 17 th November 2017																																								
	Independent review and financial review by AUC/INPECA/CONESA on Malabo compliance																																									
PSTA4 Validation (Quality control of draft, sharing draft to stakeholders and presentation to BL (SR) – [Identify Ag. Sector priorities for 2018-2019])																																										
Cabinet approval																																										
Independent technical review	Report Validation																																									
Business Meeting / Investment Platform	Business meeting with key stakeholders (BEYOND NEXT 2017)																																									

ANNEX 1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

COU NTR Y	Name	Organization	Designation	Email Address
	AUC			
Ethio pia	Prof Ayalneh Bogale	AUC-DREA	CAADP Advisor	ayalnehb@africa-union.org
Ethio pia	Mr. Ernest Ruzindaza	AUC-DREA	CAADP Team Leader	ruzindazae@africa-union.org
Ethio pia	Mr. Mark Fynn	AUC-DREA	CAADP Advisor	FynnM@africa-union.org
Ethio pia	Mr. Maurice Lorka	AUC-DREA	CAADP Advisor	mauricelorka@gmail.com
Ethio pia	Beatrice Egulu	AUC-DREA	Policy Officer	NakacwaB@africa-union.org
Ethio pia	Ms. Carol Jilombo	AUC-DREA	CAADP Communication Officer	Jilomboc@africa-union.org
Ethio pia	MR Solomon Engdawork	AUC-DREA	Acting Clerk	EngdaworkS@africa-union.org
South Africa	Eric Sile	NEPAD	CAADP Advisor	Erick.Sile@nepad.org
RECs				
Djibo uti	Mr. Abdel Moneim Elhoweris	IGAD	CAADP focal person Food Security and Nutrition Expert	moneim.elhoweris@igad.int
Tanza nia	Fahari Gilbert Marwa	EAC	Principal Agricultural Economist	fmarwa@eachq.org

COU NTR Y	Name	Organization	Designation	Email Address
Zambia	Dr. Mbosonge Mwenechanya	COMESA	CAADP focal person	MMwenechanya@comesa.int
Zambia	Mr. Mpunga Joseph	COMESA	Senior Investments Promotion Officer	jmpunga@comesa.int
Zambia	Mr. Thierry Mutombo	COMESA	Director of Agriculture and Industry	tkalonji@comesa.int
	Trainers			-
Kenya	Joseph Karugia	East and Central Africa (ILRI)	Trainers	J.Karugia@cgiar.org ;
Kenya	Paul Guthiga	East and Central Africa (ILRI)	Trainers	P.Guthiga@cgiar.org ;
Uganda	Isaac Matsatsa	Makerere University, South Africa	Trainers	ishinyekwa@eprcug.org ;
Member States Representatives				
Eritrea	Mr. Misghina okbaselasie	Ministry of Agriculture	Head of Agricultural Statistics office	solomon@moa.gov.er / solomonhw@yahoo.com / hsolomon07@gmail.com / msgyex.ok@gmail.com
Eritrea	Mr. Tesfai Ghebremariam Hailom	Ministry of Agriculture	Unit head of field Crops Development	msgyex.ok@gmail.com
Kenya	Mr. Tom Dienya	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries	Data Management	tm.dienya@gmail.com
Kenya	Dr Isiah Okeyo	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries	CAADP FOCAL PERSON	iokeyo1@yahoo.com ;
Malawi	Mr. Emmanuel J. Mwanaleza	Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water	Principal Statistician	kachingwedk@yahoo.co.uk ; rmusopolep@gmail.com

COU NTR Y	Name	Organization	Designation	Email Address
		Development		
Mala wi	Mr. Readwell Musopole	Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development	Deputy Director of Planning and CAADP Focal Person	jofilisimwanaleza@yahoo.com
Rwan da	Mr. Joas Tugizimana	Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources	Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist	jckayisinga@minagri.gov.rw
Rwan da	Claude Bizimana	Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources	CAADP FOCAL PERSON	claud.bizimana@gmail.com
Seych elles	Ms. Mermedah Moustache	Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture	CAADP FOCAL PERSON	mnalletamby@gov.sc
Swazil and	Howard V. Mbuyisa	Ministry of Agriculture	Snr. Agriculture Economist	veliimbuyisa@gmail.com
Ugan da	Mr. Richard Kabuleta	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	M&E Officer	rnkabuleta@gmail.com
Ugan da	Mr. Fred Mayanja	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	CAADP Focal Person	mayanja_f@yahoo.com
Zamb ia	Mr. Christopher Mbewe	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security	Chief Agricultural Economist	chrismbewe@gmail.com
Zamb ia	Ms. Chilala Mary	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security	Principal Economist	chilalamary@gmail.com
Zimb abwe	Grace N Nicholas	Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement	CAADP FOCAL PERSON	Kachingwedk@yahoo.co.uk ; Grace Nicholas < gracekarambwe@gmail.com >
Ethio pia	Mr. Zena Habteweld	Ministry of Agriculture	CAADP Focal Person	dejeneabesha@yahoo.com
Ethio	Dejene Habesha	Ministry of Agriculture	RED&FS	dejeneabesha@yahoo.com

COU NTR Y	Name	Organization	Designation	Email Address
pia			Secretariat coordinator	
TECHINCAL PARTNERS				
Kenya	Cynthia Mugo	AGRA	Program Officer, Policy and Advocacy	CMugo@agra.org ;
Uganda	Mr. Jean Marie Byakweli	FAO	Senior Policy Officer	JeanMarie.Byakweli@fao.org
Kenya	Njenga, Arshfod	GIZ	Regional Coordinator for East Africa	arshfod.njenga@giz.de
CAADP NON-STATE ACTORS				
Kenya	Kop'ep K. Dabugat	CAADP Non-State Actors Coalition (CNC)	Coordinator	kopdabs@hotmail.com ;
FACILITATORS				
Kenya	Ronald Shako	Africa Lead Consultant	Facilitator	Ronaldshako@gmail.com
Kenya	Lilian Lihasi	Africa Lead Consultant	Rapporteur	llihasi@yahoo.co.uk