Mutual Accountability,

Donor Alignment, Coordination and Aid Effectiveness

# Mozambique

# 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?** |  |
| 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:   * CAADP built on the basis of broad consultation and partnership being developed around PNISA * Evidence based analysis was also important with inputs from ReSAKSS, COMESA and NPCA * Roadmap of PNISA is being implemented, this including M&E and policy matrix * Structure and content of the dialogue agreed and being implemented. * Challenge: limited involvement in the dialogue process and difficulties of tracing budget allocation to PNISA by of other ministries. |  |
| 2. How would you assess the progress that the country and donors have made on implementing **evidence-based planning**? |  |
| 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:   * Evidence-based studies have supported policy formulation but not yet planning process * Monitoring and evaluation framework for PNISA needs to be finalized * There is need to harmonize PNISA with Government annual planning system, known as PES (Socio-Economic Plan), which follows a different structure and is not linked with budgetary allocation. * ReSAKSS, MAFAP of FAO, CEPPAG (Research Center for Agrifood Policies) of University Eduardo Mondlane, MSU and IFPRI are expected to develop studies that will feed policy formulation, strategic planning and evaluation of the agriculture sector performance. |  |
| 3. How would you assess the progress that the country and donors have made on **building alliances for investment?** |  |
| 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:   * Too early to assess as PNISA was launched in April 2013 * Government is supporting initiatives that empower farmers (ex: projects financed by AGRA, G8, IFAD, EU and others) * Government participates in different forums where information is shared * Government and Donors share information on specific forums (Joint review meetings, Technical group discussions) * High Level Business meeting was important venue for donors to make pledges. * Challenge: Mechanisms to report off budget activities supported by donors |  |
| 4. How would you assess the progress that the country and donors have made on **program implementation, M&E and peer review system?** |  |
| 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:   * Initial stages of the process and much progress needed to develop a result oriented system * A Coordination Committee for the Agriculture Sector (CCSA) is being established * Matrix of interventions for 2013 and 2014 agreed * Need to finalize M&E framework, governance system and programmatic indicators that goes beyond Ministry of Agriculture * Need to develop a coordinated disbursement mechanism. |  |
| **5. 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:   * Donors need to report their off budget financial support to International NGOs * Donor support should mainly focus on single treasury account thus, avoiding off budget financing * Resource mobilization, particularly of foreign private investment to the agriculture sector |  |