Mutual Accountability,

Donor Alignment, Coordination and Aid Effectiveness

# Stocktaking Process

Purpose: to assess the level of mutual accountability related to donor alignment with country programs, donor coordination at the country level and the effectiveness of donor aid to the country. This includes the status of the country’s commitments that donors require before they can commit to supporting NAIP programs.

Task: Review the Guidelines for Donor Support to CAADP Process at a Country Level and rank the level of mutual accountability found in your country for each of the following elements.

Status Rankings

Donor alignment, coordination and aid effectiveness are not improving and/or the country has not met commitments needed by donors in order to provide support

Donor plans, policies and programs have been formulated but not implemented and/or country has agreed to certain commitments but not implemented those agreements

Donor plans, policies and programs have been implemented and progress can be measured and country has implemented certain commitments so that donors can provide support

| **Donor & Country Roles and Responsibilities at a Country Level** | **Status** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| 1. How would you assess the progress that the country and donors have made on **engagement and partnership development?**  The NAIP of Burkina Faso is the result of a large consultation process between multiple stakeholders over more than 2 years: national authorities, donors, private sector actors, farmer organizations, etc. In this way, the NAIP became largely accepted by all stakeholders within the rural sector and represents today the unique planning and implementation framework for the rural sector in Burkina Faso. National actors as well as donors are systematically referring to this jointly elaborated framework when planning rural/agricultural investments. The link of the NAIP with the national development strategy was also established so that accordance of NAIP with overall national development goals has been guaranteed.  Since the NAIP elaboration process was completed and the NAIP adopted by government, policy dialogue around agricultural/rural sector continues to take place within the national dialogue group for the sector (“cadre sectoriel de dialogue CSD”) in order to, at least annually, assess progress and challenges in the sector and give common recommendations.  Nevertheless and despite the existence of a joint basis for rural investments, as national implementation structures for the NAIP are still not in place, in most cases donors continue elaborating (and implementing) their investment programs on a bilateral basis with the government and within a project approach. However, NAIP objectives are usually considered when planning and designing such new engagements.  Further alliances between donors, government and other actors (e.g. private sector) were based on the existing NAIP, eg. G8/New Alliance for Food security and nutrition signed by Burkina’s government in 2012. Additional financing (compared to engagements already part of the NAIP) remained however limited within the New Alliance Partnership.  As for the amounts of investment allocated to the agricultural sector, Burkina Faso has been over the past years one of the few countries investing more than 10% of the national budget in the agricultural sector (engagement of Maputo declaration). Generally, the amount of investment from donor side in the agricultural/rural sector in Burkina Faso has constantly increased in the past years, up to such a high level, that it is even questionable today if national structures are sufficiently strong to implement in time these considerable amounts of donor engagement. |  | | | |
| Narrative:  Types of engagement and partnership development include policy dialogue and consensus building; full integration and harmonisation of CAADP processes with national development planning; engagement with the AU and RECs and other stakeholders to ensure that the continental, regional and country-level dimensions of CAADP agenda are taken into account during planning and implementation; broaden the scope of the ADWG and link to other donor working groups to ensure that donors are able to respond effectively to the comprehensive nature of CAADP; engage country directors and heads of mission to ensure prioritization and to link across other initiatives; support the profile of CAADP and agricultural development across government, especially with the Ministry of Finance; map existing agriculture-related donor assistance and government investments in the country; seek inclusion of non-traditional donors and stakeholders throughout the development planning process: take CAADP processes and agreements (or compacts) into account in strategizing and programming development assistance; participate in CAADP launch events and endorsement of the CAADP road map.  In ranking progress in your mutual accountability efforts, consider programs and policies that you have formulated and implemented, the challenges you have encountered and the success you have had in overcoming those challenges |
| Country Team Comments and Clarifications: |
| **2. How would you assess the progress that the country and donors have made on implementing evidence-based planning?**  Key investment priorities were identified in the course of the NAIP elaboration process and are widely accepted and considered by the different stakeholders in their respective planning processes. However, detailed planning of NAIP is limited and when it comes to implementing the different investment priorities of the NAIP, important efforts remain to be delivered in order to sufficiently detail planning. Evidence needed for detailed planning is often provided by (feasibility) studies financed by donors allowing them to precise their engagements within the NAIP. |  | | | |
| Narrative:  Examples of evidence-based planning include identification of key investment priorities and policy issues for the private and public sectors; necessary capacity is available to support stocktaking, investment analysis and evidence-based planning. For example: by financing additional (to that already provided) technical expertise where needed; by reviewing terms of reference for stocktaking and analytical studies; and by commenting on technical reports; knowledge sharing of research findings to support evidence-based decision-making; support for realistic estimates and assessment of financing available from governments, donors and the private sector within short, medium and long-term time frames; work with HQ level donors to understand how international financial architecture and country level financing will need to be coordinated; disclosure of information about current agricultural financing for and programming with nongovernment partners and assess how these partners can contribute to CAADP goals.  In ranking progress in your mutual accountability efforts, consider programs and policies that you have formulated and implemented, the challenges you have encountered and the success you have had in overcoming those challenges |
| Country Team Comments and Clarifications: |
| **3. How would you assess the progress that the country and donors have made on building alliances for investment?**  NAIP has become the unique planning and implementation framework for investments in agriculture and rural development in Burkina Faso to which all stakeholders in the rural sector refer today. However, although NAIP’s structure theoretically is appropriate to jointly finance different sub-programs of NAIP, most donors still design and implement projects bilaterally (on the basis of NAIP objectives). This is probably due on the one hand to the fact that implementation structures of NAIP at national level are still not established which prevents effective piloting of different finance opportunities within NAIP. On the other hand, it should not be forgotten that donors mostly have their particular procedures which often keeps them from entering into joint finance/programs with other donors. |  | | | |
| Narrative:  Building alliances for investment includes review and discussion of results of stocktaking and investment analysis with CAADP stakeholders; review and discussion of the priorities set out in the CAADP Compact; government and donor support for the involvement of multiple stakeholders in planning processes e.g. smallholders, private sector, farmer organizations. Those stakeholders with weak voices (e.g. women and smallholders) may require additional support to effectively participate; transparency about expectations for the quality required of the compact and its associated investment plans to access donor finance during implementation including jointly established, clear performance criteria and milestones required for establishing and scaling up investment; participation in the CAADP Roundtable Conference and, where appropriate, endorse the process, commit to supporting implementation and sign the compact; and advocating for policy coherence with CAADP priorities across related sector working groups.  In ranking progress in your mutual accountability efforts, consider programs and policies that you have formulated and implemented, the challenges you have encountered and the success you have had in overcoming those challenges |
| Country Team Comments and Clarifications: |
| **4. How would you assess the progress that the country and donors have made on program implementation, M&E and peer review system?**  The NAIP of Burkina Faso was adopted in 2012 after a long consultation process between lots of different stakeholders. Implementation structures at national level are still lacking in 2014 though. Nevertheless, the elaboration of an M&E system for the NAIP is currently ongoing. This study is financed by donors. |  | | | |
| Narrative:  Opportunities for collaboration between donors and the country on program implementation, M&E and peer review system include establishment of harmonised processes to support programme design and policy reform; identification of actions and resources to help implement immediate priorities highlighted at the roundtable and agree on a clear timeline for delivery of these; review and alignment of current donor (and government and other investment) programmes with CAADP priorities and identification of financing gaps and additional support opportunities; work with CAADP stakeholders to support development of detailed costed investment programmes; identification of opportunities to use donor (public) funds to leverage private sector funding for agriculture through public private partnerships and improving the business climate; development of a mechanism to coordinate predictable, multi-year donor and government financing for CAADP investment programmes; support for the CAADP peer review process to track progress;  In ranking your progress in program implementation, M&E and peer review system development, consider programs and policies that you have formulated and implemented, the challenges you have encountered and the success you have had in overcoming those challenges. |
| Country Team Comments and Clarifications: |
| **Donor Roles and Responsibilities at the International Level** |  | | | |
| Narrative:  Donors based at headquarters will work with country-based donors to support the CAADP process at country level. They will coordinate their support for African agricultural development plans through actions that improve the current informal coordination mechanism (the CAADP Development Partner Task  Team of the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development); ensure regular communication between headquarters and country offices regarding CAADP and other global initiatives for agriculture and food security which have significance for CAADP; support and encourage staff at country offices to work proactively with national governments and other stakeholders in the CAADP process; build the capacity of country offices to engage with CAADP (e.g. providing information, best practice case studies, contacts, training, and staff resources where possible); promote cross-sector working at regional and headquarter levels to ensure policy coherence e.g. between nutrition, food security, private sector development, trade, and infrastructure programmes; advocate for increased financial support for countries with CAADP compacts and corresponding investment plans and support in-country donors in their engagement with CAADP during the  early stages of compact development; work with country-level donors to ensure that international aid instruments designed to finance CAADP investment programmes are transparent, useful and reinforce the national governance of agriculture and food security strategies; provide financial and technical support to governments, AUC/NEPAD, pillar lead institutions and RECs to manage the CAADP process which is primarily through the Multi-Donor Trust Fund, managed by the World Bank; provide financial support to continent-wide and regional CAADP programmes and projects; support the development of Regional CAADP compacts and improve donor coordination around these; enhance links to CAADP stakeholders at the international level (international agencies, foundations, farmers organization platforms, private sector actors etc.); help raise the profile of CAADP in the international policy environment and promote agricultural development as a key strategy to reduce poverty and hunger and improve nutrition; improve global policy coherence in support of African agriculture and food security; develop and participate in a mutual accountability framework to track donor commitments to CAADP country and regional plans, and review performance of agriculture and food  In ranking donor progress at the international level, consider examples of what has been done, the challenges encountered and the success in overcoming those challenges |
| Country Team Comments and Clarifications: |