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?** |  |
| **Country Team Comments and Clarifications:**   1. There has been a very close working relationship between the government and the Donor group. The prioritization of issues is usually participatory and there is an existing dialogue framework. This framework existed under the **ASDP1** and CAADP only found this arrangement already in place. The framework is on-going |  |
| 2. How would you assess the progress that the country and donors have made on implementing **evidence-based planning**? |  |
| **Country Team Comments and Clarifications:**   1. Under the ASDP framework there are 25 prioritized indicators 2. There is a national sample census, which is conducted **e**very five years. 3. There is an ongoing initiative between the government and the donors to establish an Agricultural Statistics Strategic Plan 4. The government and DPs are also in the process of introducing an annual sample survey for core agricultural and livestock products. 5. An Agricultural Rooting Data System has also been introduced. Through this system information which is fed by the village extension officer moves up through the district agricultural offices to the national statistics office at the MAFC 6. Since 2006/7, there has been an Agriculture Sector Review (ASR – referred to as **Joint Sector Implementation Review**)/ Public Expenditure Review **conducted annually** 7. A number of studies have also been conducted on pertinent issues like the maize ban, irrigation, extension services, risk management and the current introduction of the BRN. These have significantly informed some key policy changes and introduction of major programs in the sector. 8. In the 2012 national population census, 5 agriculture-related questions were included in the questionnaire. It was important to know where the farmers were and how many they were. This will provide good benchmark during the design of the sample census and the annual sample surveys 9. **Investment mapping exercise which is ongoing jointly between MAFC and BMG would also provide information on different players against where they are for future planning and guidance on development assistance framework.** 10. **common priorities/targets coordination and M & E frameworks are jointly agreed btm Donors and Government in ASDP II**   **Some existing Gaps:**   1. There is still a capacity gap in the data collection analysis and dissemination. This is also compounded by the challenge of inadequate funds to finance these exercises. 2. The results of the national sample census are released late (an example is the 2007 census whose results were released in 2012). This undermines the real evidence-based planning 3. JSR should first focus on strengthening the existing ASR looking at the same targets and providing training on identified capacity gaps |  |
| 3. How would you assess the progress that the country and donors have made on **building alliances for investment?** |  |
| **Country Team Comments and Clarifications:**   1. Operationalization of PPP Policy and strategy is on-going. Through Kilimo Kwanza, implementation of SAGCOT and introduction of private sector investments through commercial farms complemented by BRN priorities .   There have been ongoing deliberations on how such commercial farms can include smallholders through out grower schemes   1. SAGCOT Ltd has been formed as a private institution with support from some DPs through the catalytic fund 2. Several Development Partners are also supporting projects in the SACGOT area through infrastructural projects like rural roads and electricity 3. In deliberations of agricultural development between the government and the development partners, inclusive financing has been discussed to target farmers for enhancing their capacities to access financing/credit. |  |
| 4. How would you assess the progress that the country and donors have made on **program implementation, M&E and peer review system?** |  |
| **Country Team Comments and Clarifications:**   1. The peer review mechanism exists for all sector ministries under the APRM Secretariat, coordinated by the Prime Minister’s Office. Under ASDP I the Joint Implementation Review has helped in the review of the sector development 2. Tanzania also participates in the APRM under NEPAD 3. In the ASDP II, which is in its formulation process, the M & E Working group will be expanded to include more stakeholders from the private sector, CAADP Country team and the civil society 4. Under the ASDP II it is expected that there will be more funding other than the basket fund. Other initiatives will be part of ASDP II. 5. In Zanzibar, under the Agriculture Sector Program (ASP) M & E exist but need capacity strengthening   **Challenge:**   1. Inadequate institutional capacities and financial flow affects timely delivery of results |  |
| **Donor Roles and Responsibilities at the International Level** |  |
| Country Team Comments and Clarifications:   1. If AU agree that something should be done at the JSR, then there should be common targets and indicators which are shared by all countries 2. Since CAADP is not a new agenda, it should strengthen existing systems and not introduce new frameworks 3. On 10% budget allocation as per Maputo declaration is still a challenge esp to what the composition of the agriculture sector is. Countries have different configuration. Guidance should be given and uniformity adhered to for comparison and follow up. 4. There is need for package support rather than partial support. 5. There is need for more coordination of country programs even if it is commodity-wise. Regional initiatives should shape into these coordination 6. Donors at international level meet, plan and decide the level of support to their cooperating countries. Before they meet, there should be a consultative process btw them and AU. 7. Also when donor AU related information is not discussed in the sector stakeholder deliberations. It is usually not introduced to the stakeholders through the government but by some independent or donor related actors. E.g. the concept of JSR has been introduced through IFPRI without prior consultations with member countries. There is need for involving and strengthening the CAADP country team. |  |