

## Financial Landscape of CAADP support

### Donors Contribution

#### *Background information*

It is common understanding amongst CAADP stakeholders, that a better knowledge of the flows of support to the agricultural sector in Africa and more specifically those directed at CAADP is urgently needed.

A first step to present the support flows to CAADP at the continental and regional level had been done under the former DPTT chair EU KOM by the study *Catching the picture of CAADP support flows* (Hubert Cathala, April 2015).

The basic objective of the *Catching the picture*-study was to list existing flows of support to CAADP at the continental and regional level according to a set of criteria so as to obtain a global view of support, clarify who is doing what and acquire knowledge of which thematic areas other DPs are working on, where, for how long and how. The core systematic methodology and basic outcomes of the above mentioned study should serve to feed the next phase of the display of a comprehensive financial landscape for CAADP. Ultimately, it is hoped that the system will be appropriated by African counterparts who are in a better position to solicit the participation of a wider set of CAADP supporters to the picture.

To make this exercise a base for a common dialogue with the African Partners, it is therefore important to know the needs and the gaps identified from the African partner institutions<sup>1</sup>. A (mid-term) needs analysis from the African side should be the base for a sound configuration of support flows from Donors and Development Partners. Both exercises have to be complementary and should refer to one another.

Against this background, the *Catching the Picture* study should be taken into account of any further work, with the following amendments:

1. **Harmonise the criteria with those of the African Partners as to make them comparable and matchable with their needs**  
The matrix with criteria has been send out to the African partners on order to be considered in their own planning and monitoring system. Further work has to be done on this.
2. **Screen the criteria in regard to their feasibility and operational relevance**  
Generally an equilibrium will have to be found between the effort that each contributing institution is ready to invest in the system and what it can obtain from it.
3. **Include future commitments as criterion**

---

<sup>1</sup> Sources: Bienniel Review, Roadmap CAADP implantation (Kigali 2016), Business Plan NPCA, AUC-plans, PoW etc: a stocktaking of existing documents should be done by African Partners.

## Criteria to be sampled for the display of the landscape

### Technical information

1. Name of donor
2. Name of action/project
3. Amount (EUR/USD/any other)
4. Period of funding (start and end)
5. Support instrument (TA, grant, loan)
6. Support origin: Bilateral, multilateral, basket
7. Name partner institution/beneficiary
8. Category partner institution (public-political, research, capacity development, civil society, Farmers' organisation, other private sector, finance)
9. Level (continental, regional, national, all)
10. Geographical focus (see information below)
11. Pilot countries, if applicable
12. CAADP alignment (see information below)
13. Thematic area corresponding to CAADP Results Framework, level 2 (agric. production/productivity, markets/trade, agro-industry/value-chains, environment/natural resources)
14. Institutional support according to CAADP Results Framework, level 3 (yes/no): no subdivision has been made here, because sub-topics are very interdependent and therefore not easily separated one from another.

### Alignment to CAADP:

The *Catching the Picture* study differed between 4 different categories (A-C) depending on the alignment to CAADP<sup>2</sup>. This categorisation is a first step to deal systematically with not clearly defined system borders of CAADP. This definition has nevertheless been adapted in regard to their operational relevance, feasibility and in regard to new system boundaries under the Malabo declaration. Common denominator for both categories A and B should be, that support is clearly aligned with CAADP in terms of building on identified CAADP processes at the country or regional level.

CAADP core institutions should be named those institutions, which have the explicit mandate and task to support the CAADP policy framework. They refer their activities to the CAADP policy and results framework. Institutions which act in agricultural development but which do not refer their activities to CAADP and to CAADP related processes (resulting eventually in effective NAIP implementation) will not be considered as CAADP core institutions.

Adapted alignment categories for the financial mapping are:

**Category A: direct support to core CAADP institutions (continental and regional level/RF level 3 outputs)** as AUC-DREA, NPCA, REC

<sup>2</sup> **Category A:** direct support to core CAADP institutions (RF level 3 outputs);

**Category B:** Technical programmes implemented through core CAADP institutions or

contributing to an enabling regional or continental environment for CAADP in support of RF level 2 outputs

**Category C:** Agricultural programmes not focused on core CAADP institutions or providing most of its support at the country level;

**Category B: Technical programmes in support of RF level 2 outputs (NAIP implementation).**

Draft

### Regional distribution of support flows

The *Catching the Picture* study stated already, that some regions and thematic areas receive greater attention than others. West and East African countries are more in the focus than other parts of the continent. Two outstanding countries of support have been Ghana and Eritrea.

The aspect of high concentration of ODA in a small number of beneficiary countries has also been highlighted in the *2016 Development Cooperation Forum Policy Briefs* (ECOSOC, March 2016, No. 16). Therefore, the “geographical focus” and “Pilot countries” have been added to the sheet.

Draft