



## Performance Assessment Frameworks to Guide the Implementation of the CAADP Malabo Declaration

### Background and Context

The *Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods*, adapted by African Heads of State and Government at the 23<sup>rd</sup> African Union (AU) Summit in 2014, repositioned agriculture as a priority on the continental development agenda. The Declaration contains seven key commitments that guide the implementation of the *Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme* (CAADP).

Performance assessments are linked to commitment number 7 of the Malabo Declaration: *Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results*. They are also linked to the biennial reporting on progress, which is tracked against the general CAADP Results Framework (see *Knowledge Note: Biennial Review*). The Framework recognises the importance of evidence-based planning and implementation in the pursuit of agricultural transformation. It also recognises the importance of benchmarking and review as a means of strengthening monitoring, evaluation and mutual accountability for actions and results. In the context of formulating the second generation of National Agricultural Investment Plans (NAIPs), Performance Assessment Frameworks are seen as tools that ensure mutual accountability for policy actions by state and non-state players and a solid basis for M&E systems.

### Main Challenges Related to Performance Assessments

One of the main challenges faced by countries during the first ten years of CAADP was to ensure that NAIPs were firmly embedded in country planning and budgeting systems, as well as to ensure that they were effectively implemented and regularly reviewed.

### KEY MESSAGES

Implementing NAIP activities requires good management, implementation and regular monitoring of progress using appropriate sectoral Performance Assessments Frameworks. These frameworks will facilitate cross talk and discussions between levels – vision, operations, tactics etc. – and between stakeholders (such as decision makers and implementers, public and private stakeholders, national and grassroots levels, fund providers and users, services provider and users. Strong M&E and mutual accountability systems as part of this framework will enhance the likelihood of NAIP activities being implemented as planned by stakeholders.

In most countries, the policy framework starts with a long-term vision which is broken down into a sequence of medium-term multi-sectoral plans; these, in turn, give rise to the timeframe, the orientation and the targets for all medium-term sectoral plans. Examples are Malawi Vision 2020<sup>1</sup>, Zambia Vision 2030<sup>2</sup>, Uganda Vision 2040<sup>3</sup>. In case the overall policy framework does not provide a coherent plan for agriculture, it becomes problematic to effectively coordinate, implement and monitor activities in the sector, especially since achievement of Malabo Declaration targets depend on various agriculture-related programmes.

Furthermore, if the planning framework does not offer a comprehensive base for M&E, it becomes difficult to use a clear matrix of outcome indicators with which to assess the

<sup>1</sup> Malawi National Economic Council, March 1998.

<sup>2</sup> Government of Zambia, December 2006.

<sup>3</sup> Uganda National Planning Authority, April 2013.



sector's performance, as well as to link plans with budgets to allow the NAIP implementation be part and parcel of the national budgeting process. This prevents government funding for NAIP implementation from being reflected in the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF)<sup>4</sup> and being part of the regular annual budget process.

A second challenge noted during the first era of CAADP is that countries struggled to create an environment that enabled private sector development, and NAIPs were hardly perceived as engines to increase volumes of private investment in the sector<sup>5</sup>. Performance assessments could help track and address this gap.

Countries were also found to have limited capacity for data and knowledge management to support the M&E and mutual accountability systems. Developing a data and knowledge management system, together with targeted capacity strengthening activities, will ensure that the information and knowledge generated are considered during the formulation and policy dialogue concerning the successful implementation of second-generation NAIPs.

## Recommendations for Anchoring Performance Assessment Frameworks within NAIPs

In order that Malabo commitments can be achieved, countries must ensure that National Agricultural Investment Plans (NAIPs) are aligned to the Malabo Declaration, are part and parcel of the planning and budgeting frameworks for the agriculture sector and are implemented on time in line with their plans. Regular progress reviews can be instrumental in this pursuit.

Successful formulation of NAIPs requires an incremental policy framework. This includes a long-term vision which captures the big picture. The vision is implemented through a series of realistic medium-term plans (MTP or MTEF) in which priorities are addressed and financed in sequence, addressing Malabo goals and targets rather than spreading available resources too wide and too thinly.

It is recommended that the agriculture plan (or NAIP) that is developed in line with national priorities and global frameworks emerges as a single plan that presents a clear agenda to stakeholders (including development partners), both within the sector and across sectors. This plan is the foundation for resource mobilisation and efficient utilisation. Where this agriculture plan is clearly articulated with a consensus around prioritised programmes, coordination towards achieving Malabo goals becomes feasible even beyond the scope of the Ministry of Agriculture and beyond activities of the NAIP, since other ministries and partners relevant to Malabo are included.

It is recommended that NAIPs have the exact same timeframe as the MTEF. This is likely to make financial planning of NAIPs more comprehensive, predictable and reliable in terms of public funding mechanisms.

In addition to the considerations suggested above, good NAIPs should also strive for the following:

- NAIPs should facilitate private-sector engagement and thriving by advocating sound laws, policies, legislative and administrative procedures. The enabling the environment for the private sector investment is paramount to achieving Malabo goals and targets. The level of organisation within the private sector,

<sup>4</sup> The MTEF is a process of rolling, annual three year-expenditure planning. It sets out the medium-term expenditure priorities and hard-budget constraints against which sector plans can be developed and refined.

<sup>5</sup> Continental Agribusiness Strategy Framework Document, May 2017.

and its capacity to influence policy, planning and implementation processes should also be enhanced.

- ▶ Mainstreaming gender concerns (recognising the crucial role of women and young people in rural development) will ensure that all agricultural indicators that can be gender disaggregated are also gender sensitive. Furthermore, all NAIP programmes and sub-programmes should be reviewed with consideration for their recognition of gender issues. Legal and regulatory gaps should be identified, corrected, and strategies formulated across priority value chains. A gender budget statement should also be prepared and attached to every NAIP annual budget (see *Knowledge Note: Women Empowerment*).
- ▶ Countries should have their own instruments for monitoring NAIP implementation and deepening mutual accountability amongst stakeholders. Some of the mechanisms for this include:
  - ▷ Conducting Joint Sector Reviews (JSR) and JSR-like forums which engage all stakeholders in policy dialogue and ensure ownership, accountability and transparency of the NAIP implementation and monitoring process.
  - ▷ Institutionalising a mutual accountability framework as a tool for the government and its partners (including development partners) to hold each other accountable for results. An example of this would be a mutual framework between the government and development partners which is based on both the Government Performance Assessment Framework and the Donor Performance Assessment Framework, as follows:
    - ▶ A Government Performance Assessment Framework may be a matrix of selected outcome indicators which is used by development partners to assess the government's performance for budget support conditionality. Development partners use these agreed indicators as a basis for their own M&E purposes. The framework

sets the agenda for the work of the Agriculture Sector Working Group.

- ▶ A Donor Performance Assessment Framework may be the government's framework for assessing and discussing the progress of donors relative to their commitments. The framework reviews the performance of bilateral and multilateral donors against a set of established indicators on the quality and volume of development assistance to countries.
- ▷ Institutionalising performance contract schemes at the sector level. In Rwanda, for instance, one exemplary practice is the use of performance contracts as tools for monitoring programme indicators. This can lead to adjustments in strategies, as well as the monitoring of individual performance indicators which may lead to personnel changes. In order to support effective implementation of the NAIP, performance contracts, both at individual and multi-sectoral levels, could be linked to the sectoral plan and the MTEF and made result-oriented, such that:
  - ▶ Both kinds of contracts are broken down to the task level and hold each ministry responsible for its tasks in relation to the target indicator agreed upon for given activities.
  - ▶ The ministry responsible for monitoring should receive reports on ministerial and joint performance contracts on a regular basis so that gaps can be identified early and corrective action taken when necessary. Ministries that perform well can negotiate for more resources, while poor performance can interrupt fund flow.
- ▷ Institutionalising transparent channels of communication of progress and challenges in order to facilitate the fine tuning of NAIP agenda and strategies.



## Measuring Progress in the Malabo Biennial Review

The Malabo Biennial Review measures how well a country is putting in place reliable mutual accountability systems under category 7, as follows:

Malabo Commitment	Commitment Performance Category	Objectives	Indicator	Target value
Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results	7.1 Country capacity for evidence-based planning, implementation and M&E	Countries to increase capacity to generate, analyse and use data, information, knowledge and innovations.	7.1 Index of capacity to generate and use agriculture statistical data and information.	63
	7.2 Peer review and mutual accountability	Put in place mechanisms and systems to recognise and appreciate Member States' achievement of commitments.	7.2 Existence of inclusive institutionalised mechanisms and platforms for mutual accountability and peer review.	100%
	7.3 Biennial agriculture review process	Institutionalise the use of the Biennial Review to serve mutual accountability platforms, facilitate experience sharing among African countries on agricultural development issues and promote lessons learned regarding performance and the Malabo Declaration.	7.3 Country Biennial Report submission.	100%

### Further Information

- ▶ AUC and NPCA (2016). *Country CAADP Implementation Guidelines under the Malabo Declaration*. African Union Commission and NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency. - [View](#)
- ▶ AUC (2017). *Continental Agribusiness Strategy Framework Document: Driving Africa's Inclusive Growth*. African Union Commission: Addis Ababa. - [View](#)
- ▶ AUC (2018). *Inaugural Biennial Review Report of the African Union Commission on the Implementation of the Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods*. African Union Commission: Addis Ababa. - [View](#)
- ▶ AUC and NPCA (2018). *AU NAIP Toolkit for Malabo Domestication*. African Union Commission and NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency. - [View](#)
- ▶ ReSAKSS (2014). *Agriculture Joint Sector Review Assessment Reports in the Economic Community of West African States*. Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System. - [View](#)

**Published by:** African Union Commission - Department for Rural Economy and Agriculture (AUC-DREA) and African Union Development Agency – NEPAD

**Prepared by:** Claude Bizimana

**Designed by:** Twaai Design

**Supported by:** Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

**ISBN-Number:** 978-1-928527-07-7

**Date:** June 2019