



**CAADP Post Compact Review**  
**LIBERIA**

**Technical Review Report**

**Dakar, June 2010**  
**Version date: 13 June 2010**

## CAADP Technical Review Panel

### Key findings for Liberia

Dakar, June 2010

This document reports the findings of the Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Programme (CAADP) Post-compact Technical Review for Liberia. The purpose of the review is to enhance the quality of agricultural development and increase effectiveness of domestic and foreign development assistance for agricultural growth, food security and reduction of hunger and poverty. The review is meant to ensure that every possible action is being taken to achieve the objectives and targets laid out in the plan and defined in the CAADP agenda will be met. The review should be seen and approached as an exercise to lay the groundwork for successful implementation of the strategy approved at the compact roundtable and reflected in the compact and the national agriculture investment plan.

Liberia's Agriculture Sector Investment Program (LASIP) outlines the broader aspects of the country's economy, the structure and performance of the agricultural sector and later provides the roadmap towards achieving the vision for the agricultural sector. The LASIP is a comprehensive five-year investment plan, which outlines and provides indicative costs for the activities necessary for Liberia to achieve their target of, contributing to the required 9.4% non-agricultural sector annual growth rate and rate and 6.1% annual GDP growth as was agreed and set out in Liberia's CAADP Compact.

As part of the broader CAADP agenda, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) developed an Agricultural Policy (ECOWAP), which was later adopted as a regional Compact for the Regional Economic Community. The process developing the regional policy involved all stakeholders in the region to embrace the principle of inclusiveness in the development process. To translate this policy into action to implement CAADP in West Africa, strategies have been developed that lay the foundation for a regional investment plan and national agriculture and food security investment plans to implement the strategy.

CAADP represents a social transformation agenda with wide-reaching influence on development aid architecture and development planning. CAADP seeks to support African governments prepare quality strategies and investment plans, ensure enabling policy environments to implement the plans, and translate these plans into programmes that are efficient at stimulating growth and reducing poverty. The post compact technical review is a critical step in the operational implementation of the country compacts and investment plans.

The statement of the Technical Review Panel's findings and recommendations for improving implementation of Liberia's Plan are outlined below.

#### **Component 1: Alignment with CAADP vision, principles and strategy elements**

The LASIP document shows that great attention has been paid to aligning to and embracing the CAADP principles and values. The LASIP programs clearly respond to the current foundational challenges and constraints identified through the stocktaking analysis. The investment plan recognizes the importance of focusing on critical infrastructure and institutional capacity needs as the plan's top priority investment. Liberia acknowledges that investments responding to supply-side constraints by increasing production is not sufficient for guaranteeing food security and, therefore, proposes food security programs. However, the plan does not give adequate attention to ensuring that programme implementation does not raise policy contradictions.

CAADP principles require that attention is paid to inter-sectoral considerations in ensuring comprehensive and integrated approaches. Failure to provide sufficient or corresponding inter-sectoral linkages may compromise the attainment of LASIP objectives. The LASIP programs have broadly dealt with this issue and touches on almost all key issues beyond traditional Ministries of Agriculture. The analysis of gaps, challenges

and opportunities in LASIP is comprehensive and addresses constraints beyond the mainstream agricultural sector considerations that could inhibit Liberia's agricultural growth. However, the programs, do not adequately deal with the cross-sectoral concerns of inter-ministerial coordination and collaboration to address concerns such as rural energy for agro-processing and value addition.

It is indicated that the LASIP was subjected to a series of validation meetings and therefore it is assumed that there has been consultations and engagement with non-state and state actors in the process. The LASIP also mentions Country Development Steering Committees that will coordinate implementation in each of the Liberia counties. However, the coordination mechanisms to guarantee stakeholder engagement are not articulated as part of the implementation of LASIP. No regular sector and cross-sectoral mechanisms for dialogue and consultations and joint review and planning are proposed. LASIP recognizes the need to support individual farmers, FBOs and other private sector entities in the acquisition and use of technologies throughout the value chain. However, the LASIP does not clarify how government will engage the private sector of investment in and provision of agricultural services.

#### Recommendations:

- A. The plan should consider expanding the section on investing in policy review and improvement to strengthen implementation, including policy considerations to best enable foreign direct investments;
- B. The plan should elaborate on cross-sectoral collaboration, dialogue and planning to ensure that linkages among sectors are enhanced, especially among the private sector;
- C. LASIP should articulate the plans for ensuring that there will be stakeholder involvement in the implementation and review of LASIP outcomes;
- D. The plan should call for reinforcing links with other ministries for implementation and should be strengthened through the involvement of key ministries who might not have fully participated in the design of the LASIP;
- E. Effective donor engagement mechanisms need to be set out in the plan;
- F. Systematic and cost-effective M&E mechanisms for dialogue, learning, decision making and transparency and accountability need to be established and described. The CAADP M&E Framework should be used as a resource.

### **Component 2: Consistency with long term growth and poverty reduction options**

The long term growth and poverty outcome targets underlying Liberia's compact assumed a scenario under which the country would reduce its 1990 poverty level by 33% by 2025. Faster progress towards MDG1 would require growth rates that are impossible to achieve. Due to the rise in poverty rates in the decade of the 1990s, achieving the above goal would translate into a reduction of the 2007 poverty level by 50% by 2025. Such an outcome would require a 9.4% agricultural growth rate over the period. The LASIP-induced agricultural growth rate would be higher than the benchmark growth rate under the scenario of reducing the 1990 poverty rate by one third by 2025. In general, the assumption of triple digit growth rates for several crops under LASIP raises questions, despite the relatively low level of yields and the significant catching up potential following many years of civil war. The cost of LASIP appears extremely elevated when compared to the level of agricultural expenditures in 2008, which were USD 5.2 million. On the other hand, the MDG 2025 scenario assumes an annual growth rate of agricultural expenditures of 33%, which is close to the actual rate over the period 2006-2008. Judging from the technical, institutional, as well as funding point of view, it would be more realistic to align LASIP's targets with that of the scenario seeking to reduce poverty by 30% in 2025. The implementation challenges might be more tractable and the chances of success much higher.

#### Recommendation:

- A. The feasibility of LASIP's sub-sectoral growth targets need to be carefully examined, in particular with respect to the related labour, institutional, and infrastructure requirements. This is imperative in the absence of developed value chains and in the face of weak services delivery institutions

### **Component 3: Adoption of best practices and inclusion of core programme elements**

Liberia's Agriculture Sector Investment Program is comprehensive and covers all the necessary elements of CAADP's four Pillars and related cross-cutting issues. The full review report sets out detailed technical recommendations on the programmes contained in the LASIP with regard to the four Pillars of CAADP and related cross-cutting issues.

Despite high levels of food insecurity and dilapidated infrastructure due to the war, Liberia's production potential is high for both high-value export (rubber, cocoa, palm oil and coffee) and domestic staple crops. To this end, the plan presents a very frank and honest self-assessment of the current situation and weaknesses and how these will be addressed within the agricultural sector. Within this context, the plan understandably places focus on rehabilitation of the agriculture sector and related technology and infrastructure.

The plan recognizes that agriculture is the most likely driver of economic development in Liberia. Clear production programmes are outlined for crops, livestock and agro-forestry, with a special programme to target women and the youth. Programmes on enterprise development and rural finance are also included. However, LASIP programs do not explicitly link farmers and other stakeholders along the value chain or show how an enabling policy environment for agribusiness will be established. The Liberian Government is commended for establishing a Land Commission to propose policies to address pertinent land issues. Institutional development is the focus of one sub-program and includes rehabilitation of the Ministry of Agriculture and extension and research. Yet, the plan also overlooks an important element of institutional reform required to assure the effectiveness of the country's agricultural system, which is necessary in enabling innovation in the sector. However, the plan does not set out the institutional arrangements for production and market information sharing for farmers.

Risk aversion strategies for food crises are well designed and target vulnerable groups. The proposed food security information system and regular vulnerability analysis are important elements for comprehensive monitoring and evaluation. A multi-sector, pro-poor nutrition program is proposed to address malnutrition, child growth and HIV-related nutrition support. However, while distribution of free food and farm inputs may well be necessary emergency measures and could be required to initiate long-term growth, such subsidies must be part of a sustainable plan for managed social protection. The design (targeting, distribution, conditionality etc.), of such programs determines the long-term impact on growth and development. If used strategically and carefully, social protection can be an effective investment of private and/or public funding in growth-positive and pro-poor ways.

#### **Recommendations:**

- A. A clear plan of action to anticipate and mitigate the potential impacts of climate change should be included in the plan;
- B. Considerable capacity strengthening and scaling up is required to provide the support for implementation, production, extension, research and monitoring and evaluation;
- C. Clear institutional arrangements (including partnerships with farmers, the private sector and civil society) are required for value chain development, rural finance and market and food security information; and
- D. A carefully designed and targeted social protection programme plan is needed to ensure that food and input subsidies will benefit, stimulate agricultural production and promote sustainable livelihoods.

### **Component 4: Alignment with country commitments**

The LASIP programs, sub-programs and activities are linked to targets and outcomes so are broadly prioritized along results areas. LASIP has included explicit prioritization of programmes based on cost benefit and SWOT analysis, which is presented as a core part of the LASIP document. While cost-benefit analysis has been used to prioritize investments, it is prudent to acknowledge the importance of institutional capacity building as a component that will lead to enhanced productivity especially because capacity is very weak in Liberia.

While the program and sub-programs are relatively well described and there is a degree of prioritization within each of the four programs, there may be scope for further prioritization at the activity level. Existing sector programs and projects have been mapped to LASIP programs and sub-programs areas with indications provided in some cases where LASIP builds or fills the gaps in the new programs proposed. Areas where there are opportunities to achieve immediate impact may also be useful mechanisms to prioritize specific activities within LASIP.

CAADP calls for embracing regional complementarities and cooperation as a means to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of agricultural development. The Liberia Plan has a portfolio and set of programs consistent with the ECOWAP that provide the opportunity to link with and build on the efforts and lessons of other countries. However, it is not clear in the LASIP what coordination mechanisms are in place which will allow Liberia to maximize benefits from regional integration.

#### Recommendations:

- A. When financing commitments become clearer, further prioritization should be done at the activity level;
- B. The plan should better define and cost out an approach to support institutional capacity building to enable effective implementation of LASIP;
- C. The plan does not clearly articulate the policy implications and outstanding policy issues implicit in changing the thrust of agriculture sector development. An assessment of the difficulty and time required to achieve the change and which entity is responsible for leading the change should be included in the plan;
- D. Given the strategic importance of regional trade and integration for long term growth, the plan needs to show more explicitly, how the country intends to exploit the opportunities of regional trade, and what activities will be carried out to promote trade across border corridors and Analysis of the benefits and multiplier effects from regional cooperation is needed;
- E. The plan's section on overall monitoring and evaluation mechanisms needs to be strengthened. The plan should better describe how the M&E system will build upon existing capacity and how it intends to strengthen and utilize statistical information and geographical information systems to establish baselines from which progress will be tracked. The proposed results framework should be revisited and indicators chosen that will effectively track not only outputs but outcomes and higher level impacts; and
- F. The plan needs to more clearly describe the organization and effectiveness of the agricultural sector working group (ASWG) including a description of representatives/stakeholders, the regularity of meeting, level of genuine ownership by stakeholders, and progress made to date of harmonized external assistance.

#### **Component 5: Operational realism**

LASIP presents a comprehensive implementation arrangement for coordination and implementation. Institutional coordination takes place at various levels including at the highest level (presidential) and also includes strong linkages across sectors and stakeholder groups. LASIP presents an implementation timeframe that has made adequate provision for initial assessments, policy work to implement later activities. The implementation of LASIP will rely on the Project Management Unit (PMU) structure which has been created to fill the capacity gap within the MoA. It is important however for the government to address the exit strategy of the PMU as this arrangement is only acceptable for the medium-term plan of the implementation of LASIP. The inclusion of institutional development as one of the four programs within LASIP is an important measure to address the capacity deficiencies in the MoA.

The budget provided for LASIP provides costing data at the sub-program level and presents costs per program/sub-program in three categories: already funded/on-going; new investments (with feasibility studies but no funding); and financing gap. There is lack of clarity between "new investments" and "financing gap" since both categories are not financed at this time. These costs are lump sums per subprogram for the full 5 years of implementation. It is not clear with this costing presentation what activities are funded with public funds and what activities are funded with donor financing. The development of a financing strategy to

assist in identifying additional public and outside financing sources should be considered as a top priority task going forward.

The breakdown of the budget for the LASIP overtime (annual allocation) and the breakdown of public expenditure between recurrent and new spending, and breakdown of on-going donor financed activities and new donor investment (secured) is missing. This is a vital component that should be included as it will show valid financing gap projections.

Recommendations:

- A. Although Liberia has increased the budget allocation to the agricultural sector from less than 1% in FY 2005/2006 to 2.5% in FY 2009/2010, there is still an urgent need for the government of Liberia to pay special attention to the national budget which falls well below the recommended 10% of the Maputo Declaration;
- B. The plan needs to include a more exhaustive overview of incremental financing. A financing plan should present a breakdown of costs by capital and recurrent expenditure. The breakdown of existing expenditures and incremental expenditures should be as accurate as possible. The financing plan should be comprehensive so that it covers both on- and off-budget financing sources, both core sector and related sector budgets, and traditional and non-traditional donors including potential private sector contributions. To the extent possible future commitments should be listed;
- C. The plan needs to better demonstrate that sequencing of investments have been properly considered and include a clear explanation of why the particular level of priority has been assigned to an investment area;
- D. The plan needs to include the results of a public financial management assessment that acknowledges adequate capacities exist within the main institutions identified to implement specific programs/sub-programmes of the investment plan. Systemic weaknesses or gaps in proposed implementing entities should be highlighted and a capacity building plan built into the investment or explanation of implementation options that are being considered such as inter-ministerial collaboration mechanisms and proposals to contract out service delivery; and
- E. The government is strongly encouraged to conduct a risk assessment and use outcomes to adjust the implementation plan and program costs as necessary.

### **A “Road Map” towards Investment Plan Refinement and Readiness for Effective Implementation**

Taking these recommendations forward will require a well coordinated effort between the country and the development community to help advance the plan. We are providing a road map that is intended to help bring clarity to the next steps including actions, timelines and responsibilities for addressing the key outstanding issues for the investment plan. We encourage Liberia to include specific actions related to capacity building needs to prepare for implementation, further project design and integration of best practices into project approaches, developing stronger inter-agency coordination and donor partnerships, and a proactive financing strategy - including approaching GASFP for critical infrastructure financing needs.

**Contents**

**CAADP Technical Review Panel..... ii**  
**Key findings for Liberia ..... ii**  
**1. Introduction ..... 1**  
**2. Review Context ..... 3**  
**3. The Components, Methodology, Criteria, and Tools of the Review ..... 5**  
**4. AUC/NEPAD Review of the Liberia Investment Plan ..... 6**  
    **Component 1: Alignment with CAADP vision, principles and strategy elements ..... 7**  
    Component 2: Consistency with long terms growth and poverty reduction options ..... 10  
    Component 3: Adoption of best practices and inclusion of core programme elements ..... 11  
    Component 4: Alignment with country commitments..... 22  
    Component 5: Operational realism ..... 25  
**Annexure 1: CAADP Post-Compact Guide..... 28**  
**Annexure 2: ECOWAS’s 13 points from Cotonou for investment plans ..... 28**  
**Annexure 3: Post Review Road Map Template ..... 29**

# 1. Introduction

This report documents the findings of the AUC-NEPAD review of Liberia's Agriculture Sector Investment Program. The key documents used in the review were:

- i. Review of Liberia's agricultural development efforts;
- ii. Liberia's agricultural growth, poverty reduction and food security: *past performance and prospective outcomes*;
- iii. Liberia's Long-term funding for agricultural growth, poverty and reduction and Food security;
- iv. Strategic options for long-term growth, poverty reduction, and food security;
- v. 2010 Liberia Agriculture Sector Investment Program (LASIP).

The report focuses on the degree of alignment with CAADP principles and frameworks (CAADP Framework and Guide, Pillar Frameworks and the proposed Measurement and Evaluation Framework), implementation modalities (institutions, implementation, policy), and suggests ways of strengthening elements that could contribute more strongly to attaining the CAADP goals and outcomes in Liberia. The core questions asked in reviewing the Plan are found in the inter-pillar guide for CAADP implementation that is informed by the more detailed Pillar Frameworks.

Liberia's Agriculture Sector Investment Program outlines the broader aspects of the countries' economy, the structure and performance of the agricultural sector and later provides the roadmap towards achieving the vision for the agricultural sector. The LASIP is a comprehensive five-year investment plan, which outlines and provides indicative costs for the activities necessary for Liberia to achieve their target of 4.1% annual agricultural growth rate, contributing to the required 9.4% non-agricultural sector annual growth rate and rate and 6.1% annual GDP growth as was agreed and set out in Liberia's CAADP Compact. The required growth to achieve Liberia poverty reduction targets is less than the target set in the NEPAD-CAADP targets.

The LASIP has four broad programs:

- i) Program 1 is on **Food and Nutrition Security** with 6 sub programs which include:
  - Food Crops production and Productivity Enhancement;
  - Improved nutrition Status and management of Food emergencies;
  - Small-holder tree crops and agro-forestry development;
  - Fisheries development;
  - Livestock development and promotion; and
  - Special women and youth initiatives.
- ii) Program 2 is on **Competitive Value Chains and Market Linkages** with 4 sub programs which include:
  - Rehabilitation and expansion of rural roads;
  - Rural agricultural infrastructure and energy, labour-saving –devices and technologies;
  - Market and enterprise development; and
  - Rural financial services.



- iii) Program 3 is on **Institutional Development** and has 6 sub-programs which include:
  - Rebuilding the Ministry of Agriculture and selected and selected Agricultural Parastatals and improved coordination;
  - Rebuilding extension and technology dissemination and adoption a well as promotion and strengthening of farm based organisations;
  - Revitalisation of agricultural research;
  - Reviewing agricultural education and training;
  - Promoting and strengthening farm-based organisations; and
  - Improving coordination and management.
  
- iv) Program 4 is on **Land and Water Development** and has 4 sub programs which are:
  - Land policy reform and capacity building;
  - Expansion of irrigable land;
  - Enhanced land husbandry; and
  - Improved wet and degraded land management.

The Investment Plan also considers key crosscutting issues of gender and environment.

These key intervention areas are drawn from the major and broad challenges of weak land management and land control systems; limited market access and linkages for agricultural outputs; rudimentary food value chains and inconsistencies in supply due to outdated agriculture research and technology dissemination and weak institutions for coordination and management of sector interventions.

The Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Programme (CAADP) was endorsed by the African Heads of State at the Maputo Summit in 2003 as a strategy to transform African agriculture and address poverty and food insecurity in sustainable ways. CAADP represents a new era in international development and is transforming not only the largely neglected agricultural sector but creating innovative and unique development partnerships. The comprehensive and inclusive agenda has seen an unprecedented involvement of:

- (i) Inter-Ministerial formulation of inter-sectoral strategies and investment plans that are country-driven and country-owned;
- (ii) The private sector, civil society, and farmers' organizations in identifying the priorities for agriculture-driven growth;
- (iii) Technical expertise across the continent in establishing policy frameworks, implementation guides and tools that provide a sound base and guide for evidence-based planning; and
- (iv) Development Partners and Bilateral Agencies in common dialogue and planning.

Today CAADP represents a social transformation agenda with wide-reaching influence on the transformation of development aid architecture and development planning. CAADP provides numerous opportunities for value addition, offering support in the development of comprehensive agriculture investment plans and monitoring and evaluation systems; independent political, technical and financial review of investment plans; peer review; and capacity development.

CAADP is gaining momentum, creating positive peer pressure among African governments to prepare quality strategies, translated into investment plans; ensure enabling policy environments to implement the plans; and translate these plans into programmes that are efficient at stimulating growth and reducing poverty. As a result of a process involving all stakeholders in the region, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) developed an Agricultural Policy (ECOWAP) as the means of implementing CAADP in West Africa. The ECOWAP was adopted on 19<sup>th</sup> January 2005 in Accra by the Heads of State and governments of the region. The ECOWAP is based on a vision to build "a modern and sustainable agriculture, founded on effective and efficient family farms and the promotion of agricultural enterprises through private sector involvement. It aims at ensuring that agriculture is not only productive and competitive within markets in the Community and internationally, but also guarantees food security and serves as a source of decent income for its operators".

ECOWAS's Regional Agricultural Investment Programme (RAIPs) and National Agricultural Investment Programmes (NAIPs) focus on six thematic areas that combine three ECOWAP thematic areas and the four CAADP Pillars:

- (i) improved water management;
- (ii) sustainable farm development;
- (iii) improved management of the other natural resources;
- (iv) development of agricultural chains and market promotion;
- (v) institution building; and
- (vi) reduction of food insecurity.

The outcomes of these plans have been validated and the modalities governing their implementation are contained in the Compact among technical and financial partners, civil society stakeholders and socio-professional farmers' organizations signed at national conferences on the financing of agriculture.

This report documents the findings of the AUC-NEPAD review of Liberia's 5-year National Agriculture Sector Investment Program (LASIP). The report focuses on the degree of alignment with CAADP principles and frameworks as contained in the broader CAADP Guide and Pillar Framework documents. The review commends the efforts of the Liberia Government of putting in place a comprehensive plan to respond to poverty, hunger and nutritional demands for her own people in the context of CAADP. The review proposes areas for strengthening of the LASIP so as to contribute more strongly to attaining the CAADP goals and outcomes in the country. The core questions asked in reviewing the Plan are found in the CAADP Implementation Guide, Post Compact review Guide, and Inter-pillar guide for CAADP implementation that is informed by the more detailed Pillar Frameworks and Companion Document on Livestock, Fisheries and Forestry, among others.

## **2. Review Context**

ECOWAS and its member countries have taken a strong leadership role in advancing the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP), an initiative of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), which is a program of the African Union. Twelve of the fifteen ECOWAS member states, plus the ECOWAS regional economic community itself, have signed their compacts. Through these compacts, member States commit to scale up and work towards attaining or surpassing 10% of their national budget for agricultural development to

establish an enabling environment to attain a minimum of 6% annual agricultural sector growth and reduce hunger and poverty.

Following the signing of their strategies, countries have developed their CAADP country investment plans. The investment plans then undergo technical review led by the African Union Commission, the NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency (NPCA), REC and CAADP Pillar Institutions. This post-compact technical review is a critical step in the operational implementation of the country strategies and investment plans. The primary objective is collectively to evaluate for:

- (i) the likelihood for the investment programs to realize the growth and poverty reduction prospects laid out in the different strategy scenarios carried out for the roundtable and summarized in the different roundtable brochures;
- (ii) the use of best practices and other technical guidance in the pillar framework documents in designing the above investment programs to increase efficiency;
- (iii) the technical realism (alignment of resources with results) and adequacy of institutional arrangements of the programs;
- (iv) the integration of CAADP principles of inclusive review and dialogue;
- (v) the consistency with budgetary and development assistance commitments and principles agreed in the compact;
- (vi) adequacy of institutional arrangements for effective and efficient “delivery” including information and knowledge support, M&E and on-going evaluation and learning;
- (vii) coherence and/or consistency between policies, implementation arrangements and delivery mechanisms and investments areas, priorities or programme objectives;
- (viii) appropriateness and feasibility of the indicators for impact and system or capacity improvement and accountability; and
- (ix) extent and quality of dialogue, (peer) review and mutual accountability system potential to contribute and link to regional integration objectives.

The purpose of the technical review is to enhance the quality of agricultural development and increase effectiveness of domestic and foreign development assistance for agricultural growth, food security and reduction of hunger and poverty. This review is to ensure that every possible action is being taken to achieve the objectives and targets laid out in the Plan and defined in the CAADP agenda will be met. The review should be seen and approached as an exercise to lay the groundwork for successful implementation of the strategy approved at the compact roundtable and reflected in the compact and LASIP.

As key outcomes of the Business Meeting, there should be clear set of concrete implementable actions to:

- (i) immediately mobilize the required expertise, capacities, and partnerships for immediate on-the-ground implementation;
- (ii) establishing a mechanism to facilitate joint donor commitment to financing and thereby release the resources required to meet the funding needs of the plans within a reasonable time;
- (iii) streamlining of review and appraisal processes and standards to speed up individual donor processing; and
- (iv) establish the knowledge systems for an inclusive review, M&E, mutual accountability, learning and impact assessment including on-going consultations and dialogue to enhance implementation as well as development and design of new programmes.

Once reviewed and adjusted, the investment plans are presented to the international community at a Business Meeting for endorsement and mobilising of resources for financing the funding gaps. As CAADP is the continentally agreed-on benchmark for quality investment strategies, existing and new development partners, the private sector, and emerging funding architectures respect the recommendations and endorsements of CAADP.

Under the leadership of the Country Teams, the investment plans and related programmes will be implemented along with:

- (i) detailed project design and costing;
- (ii) establishment or strengthening of monitoring and evaluation systems;
- (iii) building the necessary capacity for implementation;
- (iv) policy change to ensure an enabling environment;
- (v) establishment or strengthening of the necessary institutional elements for an enabling environment; and
- (vi) alignment of long-term reforms in related other agricultural strategies, Poverty Reduction Strategies, SWAPs and related sector programmes.

### **3. The Components, Methodology, Criteria, and Tools of the Review**

The basic approach of the review consists of assessing proposed actions and outcomes in the programmes against CAADP principles and country specific targets, objectives, practices, and approaches defined and agreed in the country CAADP compact. The criteria are measures of the consistency or lack thereof of the programs with the above indicators. The main components and tools for the review include the following:

- (i) Alignment with the NEPAD-CAADP principles, values and targets: The CAADP Implementation Guide setting out the vision, principles, core strategy elements, and impact expectations;
- (ii) Coherence and consistency with long-term growth and poverty reduction objectives and targets: The roundtable brochures and technical background documents defining the long-term agricultural productivity, growth, and trade performance, and the related poverty outcomes;
- (iii) Embodiment of technical best practices and CAADP priority areas/issues: The Pillar Framework Documents laying out the key strategic issues, core program elements, and best practices;
- (iv) Operational quality and implementation readiness and alignment with compact commitments: The CAADP compact specifying the policy, budgetary, development assistance, review, and dialogue commitments;
- (v) Detailed investment programs showing inputs, outputs, outcomes, and institutional arrangements;
- (vi) The donor coordination guidelines for CAADP support at a country level outlining modalities for engagement between local development partner agencies, government and other stakeholders.

The review is conducted along five broader components, namely:

**Component 1** reviews alignment with CAADP vision, principles, and strategy elements to ensure that all key vision elements, principles, and strategy core elements, as defined in Annex I of the CAADP Post Compact Guide are reflected in the country's programs and, where there are gaps, to help identify these in order to ensure full alignment.

*Tool: CAADP Implementation Guide*

**Component 2** looks at the consistency of the investment plan and the potential impact on long term growth and poverty reduction options. This section evaluates whether:

- (i) the overall growth targets that are specified or implied in the plans, in general, and
- (ii) the changes in individual sub-sectors and related targets, in particular, diverge from the sector-wide performance and poverty reduction outcomes underlying the long term strategic scenarios. For instance, each of these scenarios is linked to required changes in sub-sector growth rates, trade performance, overall public expenditure levels, and assumptions about the efficiency of sector policies.

This component also presents a comparative country profile, based on the nearly two dozen CAADP indicators being tracked by ReSAKSS for all African countries, to show the current standing of each country with respect to its peers, and thereby identify gaps to be bridged.

*Tools: Brochures, technical background documents, investment program documents*

**Component 3** seeks to establish whether the investment plan includes the adoption of best practices and inclusion of core program elements. The aim of this assessment is to find out where clearer definition and understanding of the strategic issues is required and where better integration of best practices can help improve the design of the plans and maximize benefits of growth. The CAADP Post Compact Guide Annexes II to IV present a set of specific guides and tools, prepared by the Pillar lead institutions as part of the Pillar framework documents, which provide criteria and step-by-step approaches to designing high quality plans.

*Tool: Pillar Framework Documents and Pillar Implementation Guides and Tools*

**Component 4** focuses on alignment with compact commitments and its objective is to agree on: (i) a joint action plan to meet the policy, budgetary, and assistance commitments and (ii) identify and confirm modalities for mutual review, including dialogue fora and supporting knowledge systems to track and report on such commitments.

*Tools: CAADP Compact, Brochure 5, and Donor Guidelines for CAADP support at country level*

**Component 5** reviews the operational realism of investment programs and seeks to verify and confirm the adequacy of the content, cost and institutional arrangements, and where necessary, to identify the operational and design improvement to be carried out to ensure successful implementation. The task in this section is to verify the extent to which the key elements and features listed in Table 1 of the CAADP Post Compact Review Guide are reflected in the investment plans.

*Tools: Detailed investment programs*

#### **4. AUC/NEPAD Review of the Liberia Investment Plan**

Following are broad outcomes of the review clustered along key review issues and covering commendations, gaps and recommendations for improving the quality of the investment plan. Some of the recommendations may require response during the implementation of the Plan and they should be treated as so.

## **Component 1: Alignment with CAADP vision, principles and strategy elements**

### **C1.1 Alignment with CAADP vision, principles and strategy**

The Liberia Agriculture Sector Investment Program (LASIP) was formulated within the broader context of the country's Poverty Reduction Strategy, the Liberia Poverty Reduction Strategy; the Food and Agriculture Policy and Strategy; and the Integrated Water Resource Management Policy. The detailed elements within these policy strategies are consistent and align with vision, goals and objectives of CAADP.

The LASIP document shows that great attention has been paid to ECOWAS, CAADP and Pillar documents, the CAADP Implementation Guide, and their inputs and principle have been carefully assimilated by the country team, to produce the best possible plan. All the main components of the LASIP document are structured as recommended by ECOWAS and in line with Post Compact Review Guide. The detailed programs in the LASIP reflect the national priorities and programs areas articulated in the Liberia's CAADP Compact.

The LASIP proposes four major programs with detailed subprograms and activities defined for each. The programs clearly respond to the challenges and constraints identified in stocktaking analysis. The 4 programs and subprograms are aligned to the known challenges of agricultural sectors in Africa focusing on the entire value chain.

The programs have interventions that relate to supply-side constraints of increasing agricultural production and productivity and which relate to CAADP Pillar 4. The other programs relate to issues of markets and value chain development, which are critical issues for CAADP Pillar 4. These programs are also cognizant of the environment and natural resources especially issues to deal with water and land management, which also relate to CAADP Pillar 1. The investment plan recognizes that responding to supply side constraints by increasing production is not sufficient for guaranteeing food security and therefore proposes food security programs. The details of the adequacy of how these respond to details of CAADP Pillar specific issues are articulated in section seven.

However, the Plan does not appreciate that implementation of different programs may result into policy contradictions. Although some activities in the program under institutional development relate to formulation of policies, this assumes that there are no policies at all that would require review rather than formulating new ones. This could be true since Liberia is emerging from a conflict period.

#### **Recommendation:**

- a) The Plan could consider expanding the section on investing in review and improving existing policies to strengthen the LASIP implementation. This recommendation is aimed at strengthening the activities of policy formulation identified in Program 3 on Institutional Development.

### **C1.2 Inter-ministerial collaboration and coordination**

Linking the agricultural sector with other key sectors in any given economy is a critical component of CAADP. Agricultural sector objectives are only attained if there are corresponding investments for example: road and energy infrastructure; investments in education targeting improving skills of agricultural labor force; trade and market policies and information; and/or investing in natural resources management. CAADP principles require that attention is paid to such sectors so as to complete the cycle and guarantee that sector objectives will be achieved. Failure to provide sufficient or corresponding linkages may compromise the attainment of LASIP objectives. The LASIP programs have dealt with this issue broadly and touch almost on all key issues beyond traditional Ministries of Agriculture.

The analysis of gaps, challenges and opportunities in LASIP is comprehensive and captures those constraints that can inhibit the growth of Liberia's agricultural sectors and concerns cross beyond those in the mainstream agricultural sector. For example, the LASIP appreciates that management of water control systems; market and market infrastructure such as rehabilitation and expansion of rural roads; agricultural education and training; are critical issues for attainment of sector outcomes.

The programs, however, do not mention or appreciate the cross-sectoral concerns of inter-ministerial coordination and collaboration to address concerns such as those of rural energy for agro-processing and value addition. The activities on value addition seem not well articulated in the Plan to support off-farm employment and therefore hasten sectoral growth.

***Recommendations:***

- a) The Investment plan could elaborate on the section and work towards enhancing cross-sectoral collaboration and linkages. The LASIP should demonstrate that there is going to be cross-sectoral dialogue and planning for ensuring that the linkages among sectors are enhanced. Possible instruments of cross-sectoral coordination may already be embedded within the Ministries of Financing and through the budget process but these elements are not sufficiently captured or articulated in the LASIP. The program on value chain development could also detail out investments in value addition.

**C1.3 Stakeholder consultation**

Related to peer review, dialogue is the engagement of sector stakeholders and consultation as a fundamental element of CAADP principles. This engagement is critical that the non-state actors should participate in the articulation of key constraints affecting the agriculture. They should also be part of proposing solutions to the key constraints and therefore can dictate the public sector interventions outlined in the LASIP as way of ensuring that public sector choices will respond to private and farmer concerns.

The LASIP articulates how non-state actors have been involved and consulted not only in the formulation of policies and broad strategies but also in articulation the interventions in the LASIP. It is indicated that the LASIP was subjected to a series of validation meetings and therefore it is assumed that there has been consultations and engagement of non-state and state actors in the process. The LASIP also mentions that there are Country Development Steering Committees, which will coordinate each of the Liberia counties.

However, the LASIP does not articulate the coordination mechanisms that guarantee that stakeholder engagements will be part of the implementation of LASIP. It is, for example, not clear on the composition of the country development committee. It would be envisaged that such a committee would be composed of different and diverse actors to ensure that there are no compromises in monitoring the implementation of LASIP. The Plan does not articulate and propose any regular sector and cross-sectoral meetings working groups as critical measures for ensuring cross-sectoral dialogue for effective implementation of LASIP.

**Recommendations:**

- a) LASIP should articulate the plans for ensuring that there will be stakeholder involvement in the implementation and review of the outcomes of LASIP. Proposals should include regular joint sector review. Section 1.3 for example should be expanded to include the broad plans for how stakeholders will be engaged in the implementation and monitoring of the LASIP outcomes;
- b) Reinforcing the links with other ministries for the implementation as some activities designed in the LASIP will require their involvement (such as main road infrastructure, Ministry of Gender in the implementation of seed distribution programs for women). This link and endorsement could be strengthened through the involvement of key ministries who might not have sufficiently taken part in the design of the LASIP; and
- c) The Plan need to articulate the need for increasing information links with all private sector, entrepreneurs and farmers whose representation is not sufficiently well articulated in the LASIP to gain their support and confidence. Regular stakeholder forums should be an integral part of the implementation of LASIP.

#### **1.4 Incorporation of private sector**

LASIP recognises the need to support individual farmers, FBOs and other private sector entities in the acquisition and utilization of technologies throughout the value chain. Further, it intends to build capacity of FBOs to enhance their abilities to deliver on their mandate. Further, the programme prescribes measures to support individual farmers, FBOs and other private sector entities in the acquisition and utilization of technologies throughout the value chain, and capacity building of FBOs to enhance their abilities to deliver on their mandate.

The LASIP does not clarify how they will engage the private sector in the investment and provision of agricultural services.

**Recommendations:**

- a) One aspect that could be enhanced in the Plan is an explanation of factors such as policy considerations to best enable foreign direct investments; and
- b) Develop partnerships with the private sector to expand business provision of services, value addition, out grower schemes, contract farming, access to credit, etc. - specially targeting smallholder farmers.

#### **1.5 Donor Working Group coordination, harmonization and alignment measures**

Among the key CAADP principles is that of ensuring that there is mutual dialogue and



discussions with development partner communities to enable countries understand and appreciate donor concerns and commitments, mutual accountability and commitment. This also enables dialogue for enhancing development partner coordination in the way that provides assistance to avoid duplication of efforts; alignment to country priorities and also to ensure harmonisation all targeting for delivering aid for impact. Regular interaction with government and non-state actors is a key as a way of entrenching these values and creating mutual trust.

While the interaction with Liberia stakeholders indicate that there is effective stakeholder and donor interactions between, the Agricultural Coordination Committee and the Donors Forum the LASIP does not comprehensively articulate how regular this interaction will be enhanced and for which objectives will this be enhanced. The LASIP could include the strengthening of donor interaction for effective implementation and monitoring the LASIP.

**Recommendation:**

- a) While the interaction may exist in reality, this should be documented with clear indication of why there is dialogue of with DP community, how regular the interaction will be happening and which objectives are intended to be achieved. The investment program could articulate further donor coordination mechanisms in the LASIP.

## **Component 2: Consistency with long terms growth and poverty reduction options**

### **C2.1 Agriculture within the economy**

The Plan recognizes the role of agricultural sector in achieving the country's growth potential. The LASIP intends to promote agricultural development through an inclusive, private sector growth, while it concentrates on providing infrastructure for the functioning of the market system and supporting vulnerable farmers, and improve food security for the entire population.

Most rural people in Liberia do not have the confidence that they are capable of becoming major supply chain actors in the agricultural sector. They are unable to look beyond subsistence farming to being an agribusiness - this is critical to achieve on the outcomes envisaged in the Plan.

Agricultural development programmes should incorporate social dimensions into the set of indicators to track progress so as to monitor that significant social implications associated with improved agricultural productivity.

**Recommendations:**

- a) Define the roles, enhance private sector involvement and partnerships into the implementation of LASIP;
- b) Incorporate and implement social science elements, which will change the mindset of the communities into the implementation of LASIP;
- c) The country will need to build the capacities and to invest more in opportunities in the regional markets.

## **C2.1 Growth targets under LASIP compared to outcomes under alternative scenarios**

The long term growth and poverty outcome targets underlying Liberia's compact assumed a scenario under which the country would reduce its 1990 poverty level by 33% by 2025. Faster progress towards MDG1 would require growth rates that are impossible to achieve. Due to the rise in poverty rates in the decade of the 1990s, achieving the above goal would translate into a reduction of the 2007 poverty level by 50% by 2025. Such an outcome would require a 9.4% agricultural growth rate over the period. LASIP was designed in the context of the Liberia Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) and the CAADP agenda and thus seeks to achieve the CAADP as well as MDG targets. If effectively implemented, LASIP would maintain the overall GDP and agricultural growth rates close to their very high levels of 2007 and 2008 of 9.2% and 9.9% through 2015. The non-agricultural sector would grow at 7.8%. The LASIP-induced agricultural growth rate would be higher than the benchmark growth rate under the scenario of reducing the 1990 poverty rate by one third by 2025. In general, the assumption of triple digit growth rates for several crops under LASIP raises questions, despite the relatively low level of yields and the significant catching up potential following many years of civil war.

## **C2.2 Agricultural sector spending under NAIP and alternative growth scenarios**

The level of required funding for the scenario seeking to reduce poverty rates by 30% in 2025 was estimated to be USD 150 million for the period 2011-2015. This scenario assumes an overall agricultural rate of growth that is similar to that of LASIP, yet the estimated cost of the latter (USD 950 million) is more than 6 times higher. The cost of LASIP appears extremely elevated when compared to the level of agricultural expenditures in 2008, which were USD 5.2 million. On the other hand, the MDG 2025 scenario assumes an annual growth rate of agricultural expenditures of 33%, which is close to the actual rate over the period 2006-2008.

## **C2.3 Conclusions and recommendations**

It will be critical that the feasibility of LASIP's sub-sectoral growth targets be carefully examined, in particular with respect to the related labour, institutional, and infrastructure requirements. This is imperative in the absence of developed value chains and in the face of weak services delivery institutions. Judging from the technical, institutional, as well as funding point of view, it would be more realistic to align LASIP's targets with that of the scenario seeking to reduce poverty by 30% in 2025. The implementation challenges might be more tractable and the chances of success much higher.

# **Component 3: Adoption of best practices and inclusion of core programme elements**

## **Technical viability of major programmes**

### **C3.1 Pillar 1**

#### **C3.1.1 Land Management**

The Liberia Agriculture Strategic Investment Programme (LASIP) is well written and congruent with CAADP agenda. It recognizes the sustainable land and water management strategies as key to food security and poverty reduction and is relevant to the situation of Liberia in a post-conflict era.

LASIP does not address the risks associated with free fertilizer distribution to ensure attainment of intended food security, and soil fertility recapitalization. The programme intends to increase livestock production; however there seem to be no linkage to integrated soil fertility management (ISFM).

**Recommendations:**

- a) Formulate activities to prevent reliance of farmers on free fertilizer;
- b) A voucher system should be introduced to monitor who gets the fertilizer and that it is put to the intended use;
- c) To establish appropriate fertilizer requirements for each crop, they must establish a systematic fertilizer recommendation approach through, for instance, soil testing; and
- d) Formulate a programme to monitor soil degradation under increased livestock production.

**C3.1.2 Water Management**

The LASIP recognizes the importance of irrigated agriculture and water management, and the importance of conducting an inventory of national water resources. But there are no strategies for the use of inland river and groundwater resources.

**Recommendations:**

- a) Explore and articulate the potential of inland rivers and groundwater resources as additional sources of water for agriculture;
- b) Dam construction activities must be brought upfront so that these dams can support agricultural production in the high productivity inland areas.

**C3.1.3 Land Policy/Administration**

LASIP recognizes the importance of land policies and the strengthening of land administration as catalyst for increased access to land and security of tenure. In this regard, the Liberian Government has established a Land Commission to propose, advocate and coordinate reforms of land policy, laws and programmes to reduce conflicts arising between communities and the unresolved land rights for women, especially under customary law.

**Recommendations:**

- a) The policy must incorporate land rights that ensure equitable access, acquisition and distribution of farmland especially to local Liberians, and especially women.

**C3.1.4 Climate Change**

Though LASIP recognizes the impact of climate change on agricultural production and food security, there is an urgent need to put in place mitigation and adaptation measures.

In addition to there being no specific activities in the document to address climate change

issues, the Liberian Government does not take advantage of the global compensation initiatives on mitigation and adaptation measures on climate change (carbon credit).

**Recommendation:**

- a) The government must implement capacity building programmes on climate change to enable it execute climate change programmes and benefit from global compensation initiatives on its mitigation and adaptation measures.

**C3.2 Pillar 2**

**C3.2.1 Raise the competitiveness and seize opportunities in domestic, regional and international markets**

Liberia identified market opportunities both on the international market and also in the domestic market where a large share of the population is food insecure. The programmes recognise the needs for improved food quality management; development and respect of hygiene and standards in market places, and the need for improved capacities in trade policy and export promotion. Specific activities are mentioned in the LASIP to develop and improve knowledge of market information systems; knowledge of quality control measures and standards; and weak capacity trade policy analysis to seize on opportunities available in the regional markets.

However, some of the weaknesses and challenges indentified in the document include lack of focus on access to regional markets; weak trade infrastructure to effectively participate in regional and international markets; measures to develop markets for inputs and outputs; and market information system.

**Recommendations:**

- a) Liberia should pursue a strong institutional, regulatory, and policy framework that would facilitate access to regional markets, etc. to minimize cost of doing business;
- b) Streamline trade and development policy in response to local and global trade needs;
- c) Capacity building for policy analysts to better articulate Liberia agriculture and trade needs in regional and international negotiations; and
- d) Developing quality management and trade certification service systems to facilitate compliance with international trade agreements and overcome nontechnical barriers affecting the growth of Liberia's exports.

**C3.2.2 Invest in commercial and trade infrastructure to lower cost of supplying domestic, regional and international markets**

LASIP articulates the constraints to market access citing significant inefficiencies as well as failures in Liberia's market structure. Rural infrastructure to facilitate efficient marketing is "mostly nonexistent", collaboration among public and private sectors, including farmers' organizations is rare, and farmers' access to market information to make profitable marketing decisions is lacking. The Plan also highlights the importance of taking advantage of opportunities presented by regional and international markets to achieve significant agricultural growth and emphasizes the need to focus on improving productivity, rural infrastructure (roads, power and telecommunications) and weak institutional capacities

such as trade policy, fragmented export promotion responsibilities and SPS controls. Improvement in all these areas is critical to enabling access to regional markets.

**Recommendations:**

- a) Regional agricultural markets can play a key role in the development of agriculture and trade. Moreover, efforts to promote regional trade and integration within the framework of inward-looking industrialization and development strategies are likely to fail given the impact of the latter strategies on the potential of integrating countries to maintain export competitiveness and expand demand in regional markets; and
- b) There is an urgent need to streamline the country's trade and development policy in response to local and global trade needs.

### 3.2.3 Develop value chains and access to financial markets

The Liberian agricultural investment plan (LASIP) mentions programs that will link farmers and other stakeholders along the value chain to the markets. Further, LASIP clearly enhances the role of private sector, while providing an enabling policy and infrastructural environment for market efficiency. In addition, the Plan recognizes the need to build the capacities of its private sector. But, it fails to translate it into real policy to support the emergence of a domestic pool of entrepreneurs.

LASIP does not indicate how programmes will be linked to farmers and other stakeholders along the value chain. Further, there is a weak discussion on value chains and the investment plan does not show how they will be made profitable. Although the Plan recognizes the need to build the capacities of its private sector, it fails to translate it into real policy to support the emergence of a domestic pool of entrepreneurs.

**Recommendations:**

- a) Create a platform for entrepreneurs to build cooperation, interaction, partnerships, alliances, trading networks and market linkages with regional countries. There is a need to engage the private sector and pursue Public-Private Partnerships for investments and delivery of services to the agricultural sector; provide an enabling environment and facilitate business development & private sector competence; forums for exchange of information;
- b) Invest in rural trade infrastructure through development of cold storage and processing facilities for fisheries and livestock. Create business incubators close to rural infrastructure hubs and link them to market research, research and extension services so as to provide potential entrepreneurs with necessary technical information and support services; also, link these incubators with commercial banks and support the emergence of this sector through guarantee schemes; and
- c) Warehouse development to develop innovative credit provision schemes to farmer. The aim is to greatly expand the physical availability of warehousing services, while making warehouse receipts a prime tool of trade and trade financing. It will allow banks to improve the quality of their lending portfolio, and enhance their interest in the agricultural sector. All this will result in higher returns to farmers, better service to consumers (involving lower prices, better quality and greater variety) and macro-economic benefits through a more healthy trade balance in agricultural commodities.

### **C3.2.4 Strengthen the commercial and technical capabilities of farmer organisations and trade associations**

The program pays specific attention to the inclusion of small scale farmers into value chains through development of out-grower schemes in particular in forestry where large scale and private concessions exist; building of capacities of FBOs through extension services for food crops livestock and forestry; and strengthening of cooperative development agency capacities.

#### **Recommendations:**

- a) Build the capacities of FO/TAs to apply effective governance and management practices that ensure transparency and accountability;
- b) Enabling the FO/TAs to act more like economic agents with greater business orientation and focus on service delivery to members as well as partnerships with other actors along the supply chain. Provide technical training in agribusiness, for example, training in the poultry industry value chain would provide skills in various modules that strengthen the pursuit of livelihoods. Training offered to FBOs should include management, marketing etc.;
- c) Create the necessary legal and regulatory framework to allow the registration and effective operation of FO/TAs as business entities.

### **C3.3 Pillar 3: Improving food security**

#### **C3.3.1 Improved risk management**

LASIP's Program 1 "Food and Nutrition Security" includes risk management components under its Sub-Program 2 stated as "Management of Food Emergencies". This component aims to maintain national grain reserves; maintain appropriate humanitarian programmes; collect food security information; conduct regular vulnerability analysis; and support the very poor with productive cash or food safety nets such as food- or cash-for-work, vouchers and school feeding initiatives.

The Plan exhaustively spells out the areas for averting food insecurity risks at household and national levels (i.e. natural and man-made hazards). Appropriate strategies include collecting food security information and conducting regular vulnerability analysis.

However, in as far as the CAADP's Framework for African Food Security (FAFS) first objective is concerned the above stated five focus areas are "over-lumped" and indeed fall short of meeting the non-specificity aspect of the SMART (i.e. "Specific", "Measurable", "Achievable" "Realistic" and "Time-bound") principle of planning. Each of these focus areas is broad and can entail a number of strategies and outcomes.

Institutional setups for emergency preparedness and management are not pronounced in the document. A country with a very large population of poor and vulnerable populations makes it a necessity to put in place a unit for emergency response and famine monitoring. Subsuming emergency response under the activities of the Food Security and Nutrition Committee is not enough and might render management of a food and hunger crisis to be an extremely difficult task. Moreover, the LASIP does not seem to address clearly the implications of Liberia's high vulnerability situation, especially its post-conflict context and

high poverty rates and food insecurity prevalence. For example, the non-clarity of setups for and early warning system (EWS) could lead to a situation when tasked institutions and individuals only work part time resources are not committed fully, information not made use of at the right time and decisions delayed. Furthermore, the Plan appears to be silent regarding on existing capacities in the public sector for risk management that are commensurate with a high vulnerability situation. Similarly, it is not clear as to how early warning system data can be gathered and by whom. An imperative answer to this question seems that international humanitarian organisations such as the USAID-funded Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWSNET), the United Nations World Food Programme and UN-FAO fill the gap. Needless to mention however, the public institutions need to take over this responsibility for sustainability reasons and given the high turnover of expatriates.

#### **Recommendations:**

- a) In view of the afore-mentioned trap of “over-lumping” or “overloading” the program, it is recommended that the “Management of Food Emergencies” response be stated as a separate programme rather than appearing under Sub-Program 2 of Program 1. It should be spelled out as a separate programme with five sub-programmes with related activities. This will enable intervention to become easier and costing of the activities may become a non-daunting task;
- b) There is also need to specify and describe institutional setups for risk management and EWS objectives. The necessary steps to be considered may be:
  - (i) Specification of the mandate of an emergency preparedness and response office
  - (ii) Outlining and description of an organizational structure in tandem with the mandate of the organization
  - (iii) Arrangement for funding and budgetary allocation for a robust emergency preparedness and response system
  - (iv) Establishment of offices and development of monitoring systems
- c) In order to attract funding for the emergency programme, there is need to describe where and how information for an early warning system will be obtained and how it is going to be used;
- d) The measuring and monitoring indicators must be included in the indicators of risk management and early warning for emergencies.

### **3.3.2 Increasing food supply through market linkages**

The programs and activities for increased food supply are well laid out, are appropriate, realistic and comprehensive.

In addition, given the population dynamics of Liberia, targeting of women and youth with food security interventions is commendable especially as the country’s population is predominantly youth. Furthermore, the outlined indicators and targets for increasing food supply are comprehensive and well stated.

Although the PRS and LASIP have underscored the need “to revitalize the food and agricultural sector to contribute to shared, inclusive, and sustainable economic growth and development”, there appears to be no formidable program that should be formulated with practicable and realistic strategies. It is understood that prior to the war, Liberia was on the right course of implementing both upland and lowland agricultural and staple crop programs that could have benefited a lot of smallholder and large scale farmers. Therefore,

the original plans of these projects could be revisited, updated and implemented.

The Plan does not seem to clearly state the linkages between Program 1 and Program 2. For instance, there could be a need for mechanisms for attracting the urban poor to agricultural value chain activities and investment demand creation (e.g. ongoing entrepreneurship development).

Finally, the Plan does not seem to include special programs addressing the post-conflict context of Liberia. For example, there should be programs for encouraging the urban poor to return to their rural communities of origin and participate in development of their communities and improve their livelihoods rather than squatting in unhygienic urban centres. Further, under Program 2 considerations of road rehabilitation for market accessibility, there could be a special program to establish market points along strategic road points.

Liberia is determined to have a great potential for agricultural investment through extending the arable land under cultivation. Given a relatively long rainy period and abundant surface and ground water resources, the country offers a good opportunity to attract agricultural investors both local and international. However, there seems to be lack of agro-geological information on which types of crops are suitable for which areas. Use of geographical information systems can provide the right platform for potential investors and donor organizations.

#### **Recommendations:**

Therefore, there is need for a special activity for mapping Liberia's food production potential. Other considerations for inclusion in the plan are:

- a) Establish an agricultural information repository such "Liberia Agricultural Potential Directory" or database;
- b) Develop strategies for revitalisation of upland and lowland pre-conflict food production schemes; and
- c) Develop a program for showcasing investment opportunities in all food value chain stages through a series of structured entrepreneurship training workshops and establishment of lending facilities. This is with a view to widen the scope of investment in food production and create many players in the food production and processing industry.

#### **C3.3.3 Increased economic opportunities for the vulnerable**

The LASIP has come out strong in identifying economic opportunities for its vulnerable and poor population for improving their livelihoods. The program specifically addresses well specified special program for women and youth (Sub-Program 6 of Program 2). Other such programmes include special fertilizer distribution and utilization program for poor farmers for increasing resilience and extreme poverty and hunger (Activity iv of 2.1.1); strategies for providing smallholder investors with opportunities and widen the scope (Sub-Program 3 of Program 1); and prioritisation of the rural infrastructure for improving the livelihoods of potential rural farmers (Sub-Program 1 and 2 of Program 2).

However, the Plan does not seem to succinctly elaborate the available opportunities and



potential for increased production especially by smallholder farmers. The types of economic opportunities that could be available for women as experienced in other countries could be outlined in the Plan.

The Plan does not seem to specify institutional arrangements for agricultural investment and market information sharing to inform potential farmers of available opportunities. This being a multi-sector approach, a layout of potential opportunities by category by sector by potential facilitating institution (public or private) and target beneficiary populations could help put the strategies in context and help in targeting vulnerable populations with programmes with equitably distributed livelihoods improvement programs.

**Recommendations:**

- a) Given the post-conflict context of Liberia, a number of special social protection exit strategies could include promoting increased invest in market oriented farming by the rural subsistence farmers;
- b) Agricultural information generated, processed and presented on regular basis, may provide potential rural and smallholder farmers with an opportunity to indulge in farming of crops in high demand or shifting locations, say, from uplands to lowlands. Therefore, it is recommended that there should be a separate Sub-Program under Program 3 for establishment, production and dissemination of agricultural information system and dissemination;
- c) The Plan should include an activity for mapping and targeting of the most vulnerable population with livelihoods improvement programs. This should be a joint activity of the concerned food security partners, line ministries and the donor fraternity.

**C3.3.4 Improving dietary quality through dietary diversification**

The Plan has demonstrated overt commitment to develop and implement a multi-sector, pro-poor nutrition program. The Plan has targeted malnutrition, child growth and HIV-affected people. This will provide an opportunity for the various sectors to identify where and how they can intervene.

The Plan has also stated clearly the need to promote appropriate globally recommended nutrition actions such as dietary diversity and micronutrient fortified foods. A salient aspect of the Plan under its Program 1 is allocation of 29% of budgeted funds to the Nutrition Program. As many children have been determined to be malnourished, the provision will help the concerned government departments, civil society organizations and community-based organizations to provide services to a wider number of target population groups prevent stunting and debilitating effects of malnutrition.

However, lack of baseline indicators for target setting such as the Dietary Diversity Score, under-five anthropometric indicators, especially if not specified in the M&E framework, might not enable programs to monitor progress, intervene appropriately and create impact.

The Plan seems to fall short of specifying collaborative linkages between the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare regarding delivery of nutrition program. Specification of roles and allocation of tasks could help such a multi-sector, multi-partner response program to be coordinated better and implemented for meeting the global indicators for averting hunger and food insecurity.

**Recommendations:**

- a) A robust nutrition program needs to be well monitored and coordinated. This will entail results-based planning of national interventions or projects based on baseline indicators. Therefore, it is recommended that a baseline survey be carried out or results of any latest national survey be used to produce the necessary baseline indicators. As this has not been mentioned in LASIP, there is need for an exclusive activity under Sub-Program 2 Program 1 to precede the conceptualization, development and implementation of the national multi-sector nutrition program;
- b) As the need for a collaborative intervention in nutrition activities by the lead ministries of Agriculture and Health cannot be over-emphasized, the Nutrition Programme Framework needs to include a conceptual implementation framework specifying and describing the various roles with coordination mechanisms. All these aspects could be included in the Plan.

**Pillar 4:****C3.4 Agricultural Research, Technology Dissemination and Adoption**

The LASIP captures most of the elements of Pillar 4 within its Programme 3: Institutional Development (section 2.3), and covers the main elements of Pillar 4, especially those pertaining to the evolution and reform of agricultural institutions and services. While most of Pillar 4 activities are organized within Programme 3 (Institutional Development), all the other Programmes (each of which is aligned to a separate CAADP pillar) contain activities that contribute to Pillar 4 agenda. In this way, the programme demonstrates inter-pillar integration.

The Plan covers the key requirements for a well functioning agricultural research for development system, including the essential first step for priority setting; alignment of the research and extension objectives to the national food security and nutrition strategy; and mobilisation of the factors of production, improving markets, strengthening human and institutional capacities and enhancing access to knowledge. Finally, the Plan proposes to adopt the principle of subsidiary in some aspects of its implementation, primarily in M&E

However, the LASIP overlooks an important element of institutional reform required to assure the effectiveness of the country's agricultural system, namely the integration of agricultural research with extension services, farmer organisations, the private sector and capacity strengthening. Such integration is required to enable the various actors to respond in a holistic manner to the needs and opportunities for innovation in the sector.

While the Plan recognizes the role of the private sector and proposes that private sector-led growth will be predicated on a private-public-partnership approach, it does not go beyond expressing this intent and describe the elements of the PPP.

The absence of activities aimed at mobilizing resources for enhancing agricultural productivity coupled with the absence of indicators for tracking resources mobilised are significant omissions, especially in light of the enormity of the Plan's funding gap-US\$772 million compared to only US\$172 million that has been secured. A further omission is the absence of activities aimed at assuring effective and efficient use of the mobilized resources in terms of aligning them to the LASIP's priorities and managing them in a

coordinated/harmonised fashion.

The LASIP recognizes that human capacity constraints are a major impediment to the ability of the country's agricultural organizations to fulfil their responsibilities. It further acknowledges the inadequacy in the quality of agricultural training and extension services. However, the projections (indicators) proposed for the number of agricultural graduates and the number of MoA staff trained do not appear to take into account the scale of the human capacity development required to address the existing human capacity challenges. Given the human capacity challenges highlighted above it is doubtful that the human capacity required to implement this programme can be mobilised locally. This is likely to open the programme's implementation to the challenges associated with having a high degree of external influence.

The M&E framework does not provide indicators for tracking progress towards key Pillar 4 targets, namely agricultural productivity and investments in agricultural research and extension. As highlighted above the indicators for training lack essential details in terms of level of competence and field of expertise.

### **Recommendations:**

- (a) Regarding the elements of institutional reform for assuring effectiveness of a well functioning national agricultural research for development system, the LASIP should indicate in clear terms how the reforms will increase accountability and integration of agricultural research with extension services, farmer organisations and the private sector. The reforms should be designed to develop appropriate partnerships and mechanisms for innovation pathways that can translate research outputs into development outcomes for impact. The reformed institutions should facilitate the rapid generation of innovations in support of the spread of knowledge and technologies to smallholders and the identification of improvements needed in the delivery of services that will both involve and reach the poor;
- (b) Regarding the Public-Private sector-Partnership approach—the Plan should articulate in clear terms how the Liberian specific constraints, challenges and opportunities will determine the elements of the PPPs. The approach should emphasize the opportunities to achieve: (i) synergies, (ii) explore possibilities for access to improved technologies held by the private sector; (iii) cost-sharing mechanisms for cost-effective transfer of technology; and (iv) to increase smallholder prospects for access to markets.
- (c) Regarding the mobilisation of resources to increase the investment in support of the LASIP, it should articulate a strategy to increase investments prospects and close the funding gap between what is required for the Plan's implementation and the funding already secured. The strategy should assess the risks and benefits of specific resource mobilization activities. It shall make provision for resource mobilization teams with skills and capacity to:
  - (i) advocate and leverage support for agricultural research and development at the political and decision making levels;
  - (ii) develop a resource mobilization Operational Plans;
  - (iii) identify, reach and engage the appropriate targets and processes with communications material and messages tailored to the needs of the specific end-users that will influence investment decisions; and
  - (iv) develop appropriate resource mobilization monitoring and evaluation performance indicators.

- (d) Regarding alignment and coordination of resources for their effective utilisation a strategy should be developed. This strategy should clearly indicate concrete steps to:
  - (i) Move from “project” mode (under which donors support specific activities) to programmatic support
  - (ii) Adopt common processes for strategic dialogue and for planning the activities to be supported from external sources — these should be made consistent with the institutional schedules and time horizons of the programmes.
  - (iii) For donors to adopt common financial management procedures, monitoring and evaluation, reporting and review systems—consistent with those of Liberia.
- (e) Regarding the current low institutional capacity, which evidently will not be adequate for the Plan’s implementation, a survey of existing human resource capacity and projected requirements to implement the LASIP should be undertaken. This will provide an indication of the scale of the capacity gaps. It will also inform the Programme’s capacity strengthening plans. The capacity strengthening activities and associated indicators should be broken down into the key component categories.
- (f) Regarding M&E indicators, the LASIP should make provision for tracking progress towards key Pillar IV targets.
- (g) Concerning gender, the title of the section referring to this cross cutting issue (2.5.2) should be expanded to reflect that it also covers the youth. Related to this, it is recommended that the mainstreaming of gender issues should start with a provision for mandatory literacy training. Further, the support to women participation should go beyond agribusiness to include activities across the entire value chain (production, post-harvest, processing and marketing).
- (h) The LASIP should include an economic analysis of the returns expected from the projected investments
- (i) The LASIP should present an identification of the risk, risk analysis and a plan for risk management
- (j) Regarding actions to respond to environmental challenges and opportunities, the LASIP should be more specific on the actions it proposes for climate change mitigation, adaptation and coping strategies. Furthermore, the support to sustainable agriculture production proposed under the environment should be broadened from a focus on cropping system to include animal production systems.

### **C3.5 Cross-cutting issues**

See sections **C3.1.3** and **C3.1.4**

### **C3.6 Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework**

The LASIP outlines a full M&E framework that is comprehensive in scope covering district, county, national level with good descriptions of roles and responsibilities at each level. Activities within the programs and sub-programs are generally results-oriented with specific indicators and targets that also capture the results expected of activities/programmes. The primary indicators within the results framework are focused on changes on farmer income and production with baselines and targets by year over the full five-year period. An agricultural census exercise is proposed in year 2-4 of the five-year timeframe.

The M&E Framework as described in the LASIP is comprehensive with a great deal of institutional depth; however the current status of implementation is not described. Are all

structures and processes currently functioning? Alternatively, is the operationalization of the M&E framework to take place as part of LASIP implementation? If not fully in place, more detail may be required on how it will be implemented and measures required for its launching (training, awareness raising, and allocation of staff).

The framework also acknowledges gaps in data availability and capacity but may not contain sufficient measures to address them. Although an agricultural census is planned as part of LASIP implementation, other data collection measures may be required, particularly as they relate to specific sub-programs not well covered by typical agricultural census data.

The realism of targets may also require re-assessment as they currently include ambitious targets for expanding area under production, increasing input use and infrastructure development within the five-year period of LASIP. In general, the indicators and targets in the results framework are impact oriented and may benefit from additional lower level intermediate outcomes to measure implementation progress over time. This could include qualitative indicators that capture some of the specific sub-program objectives.

#### **Recommendations:**

- a) Greater description on needed capacity development for implementation of the M&E framework needs to be included;
- b) Reassessment of indicator targets and definition of intermediate outcome indicators over time – particularly for institutional development – which may also include some qualitative indicators;
- c) In order to ensure a robust M&E system, adequate financial and human resources need to be allocated towards data collection, surveys, capacity building, Management Information Systems (MIS), reporting, communicating and disseminating information. This needs to be further defined in the Plan; and
- d) It is critical to have dynamic feedback loops so that results of the M&E system inform decision-making on an iterative basis so that interventions can be adjusted as necessary. This aspect of a functioning M&E system should be considered.

## **Component 4: Alignment with country commitments**

### **C4.1 Prioritisation within the investment plan**

LASIP programs, sub-programs and activities are linked to targets and outcomes so are broadly prioritized along results areas. LASIP has included explicit prioritization of programmes based on cost benefit and SWOT analysis, which is presented as a core part of the LASIP document. Program 1 emerges as the highest priority program based on cost benefit analysis followed by program 2. LASIP includes measures to screen investments based on cost benefit analysis as a criteria for further funding.

While the program and sub-programs are relatively well described and there is a degree of prioritization within each of the four programs, there may be scope for further prioritization at the activity level. Within each sub-program, some activities are broadly described and could involve a range of different activities – for example improving institutional environment and infrastructure for livestock. Greater prioritization at a lower level may still be required for some activities that are described in general terms.

Areas where there are opportunities to achieve immediate impact may also be useful mechanisms to prioritize specific activities within LASIP. For example, agroforestry products provide immediate income to farmers in Liberia especially those in Nimba, Sinoe, Grand Gedeh, and Lofa Counties. It will be important to the investment plan to take advantage of immediate products and market opportunities in Liberia on agroforestry products, which could address some of the food security issues. References to these opportunities can be obtained from ARD/ASNAPP.

While cost-benefit analysis has been used to prioritize investments, it is important to acknowledge the importance of institutional capacity building as a building block that will lead to enhanced productivity. Institutional capacity building is not amenable to cost benefit analysis and because capacity is very weak in Liberia it should remain an investment priority. It may have the potential for equally far reaching benefits as both the food security and value chain programmes.

**Recommendations:**

- a) When financing commitments become clearer, further prioritization should be done at the activity level;
- b) Identification of “low hanging fruit” and specific market opportunities that are of high priority is required; and
- c) Better define and cost out approach to support institutional capacity building to enable effective implementation of LASIP.

#### **C4.2 Links with existing sector programmes/projects**

Existing sector programmes and projects have been mapped to LASIP programs and sub-programs areas with indications provided in some cases where LASIP build or fills gaps. In addition, related non-agricultural sector programs, e.g. health and energy, are also linked to proposed LASIP interventions.

While LASIP has taken a relatively comprehensive approach, it is not always clear in the presentation of sub-programs, which activities are covered by the existing programs or projects and which are incremental and require new financing.

Links to all relevant existing sectors may be needed in further detail. For instance, linkages to private sector initiatives are not mentioned and could be elaborated in the document. Specific programs that have not been identified including livelihood projects such as the Land Right Community Forest Project.

**Recommendations:**

- a) At the activity level, more clearly indicate what is covered by existing programs (and financing) and where gaps exist or where new activities are being defined.

#### **C4.3 Links to regional agriculture sector development plans**

CAADP calls for embracing regional complementarities and cooperation as a means to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of agricultural development. This calls for regional cooperation and recognising regional complementarities. The Liberia Plan has a portfolio and set of programs consistent with the ECOWAP, that provide the opportunity to link with

and build on the efforts and lessons of other countries. However, there are several gaps in the proposed investment plan that will limit the ability of Liberia to take advantage of the regional opportunities if not addressed.

The Liberia Plan does not describe the links with other countries (markets, knowledge, and science, regulatory, capacity) that they are interested in cultivating to implement the Plan.

There is no description of the expected contribution or targets of regional programs in terms of types of programs, value chains, contributions to the national goals.

It is not clear what Liberia would do to focus, improve coordination with, or benefit from regional integration. e.g., in setting priorities for road development, how will they impact on Liberia's ability to participate and be competitive in markets of other countries? What corridors are most beneficial for Liberia to improve access to markets – regionally or globally?

**Recommendations:**

- a) The country needs to set out what it expects and what it could gain from regional integration e.g. trade, technical cooperation in science and technology, resource management, early warning and emergency response;
- b) Given the strategic importance of regional trade and integration for long term growth, the Plan needs to show more explicitly how the country intends to exploit the opportunities of regional trade, and what activities will be carried out to promote trade across border corridors; and
- c) Analysis of the benefits and multiplier effects from regional cooperation is needed.

#### **C4.4 Identification of policy issues and steps required to resolve them**

LASIP presents a brief diagnostic on policy reform agenda particularly for parastatals and for some areas related to markets. The need for some policy reforms are identified and the policy formulation process has been explicitly catered for in some sub-program activities and are included as outputs –one such example is policy formulation rural infrastructure maintenance and development.

LASIP presents a detailed diagnostic in the in opening sections of document but it is not always followed by identification of the underlying policy reforms needed to implement proposed activities within programs and sub-programs. Some policy reform areas are touched on but do not seem to be fully articulated. For example, the linkage between agricultural policy and trade policy is not there. Whereas most West African countries provide incentives for non-traditional exports, Liberia imposes a tax. It is important for the Ministry of Agriculture to dialogue with the Ministry of Trade in its effort to increase production and export. There may be a greater need to identify the key reforms that would allow achievement of LASIP objectives within specific sub-program areas including the identification of non-sectoral policies that also impact agriculture.

**Recommendations:**

- a) Identify tentative areas for policy reform and the specific reform elements required within LASIP – articulating key policy reforms in the description of program or sub-programs; and

b) Where possible and as sub-programs are elaborated, flesh out policy agenda.

## **Component 5: Operational realism**

### **C5.1 Viability of implementation arrangements**

LASIP presents a comprehensive implementation arrangement for coordination and implementation. Institutional coordination takes place at various levels including at the highest level (presidential) and also include strong linkages across sectors and stakeholder groups. LASIP presents an implementation time frame that shows broad timing on an activity-by-activity basis and has made adequate provision for initial assessments, policy work to implement later activities.

Implementation builds on existing structures and roles and responsibilities of various actors are well articulated.

Because of the relatively weak capacity that exists at the ministerial levels, LASIP will rely on a project management unit (PMU) structure. While this is realistic in the immediate short term given severe capacity constraints within Liberia, it would be expected that this option is not considered preferable over the long term. LASIP presents no exit strategy to the PMU arrangement – in theory capacity of ministry should be strengthened to take on these functions eventually in order to build sustainability and ownership. Development of an exit strategy may be useful to facilitate this.

While roles and responsibilities of various actors are well described, they could be further detailed at lower levels at the sub-program level, once these programs are fully developed. Because of identified capacity constraints, linkages to other expertise within the ECOWAS region may be useful - including the exchange at both the technical and farmer level.

#### **Recommendations:**

- a) Greater detail on institutional and implementation arrangements at lower (decentralised) levels should be added as part of further development of sub-programs;
- b) Further detail on how to exit from PMU arrangements and what triggers would be needed to move to integrated and systemic implementation arrangements; and
- c) Intensify on seminars and other measures to orientation of the mindset of the people (farmers and rural folks) on opportunities and responsibilities to advance their livelihoods through increased agriculture productivity. Farmer exchange programmes with neighbouring countries are recommended.

### **C5.2 Institutional assessment**

LASIP's diagnostic of institutional constraints within MOA and the sector is well articulated and provides a good context for interventions proposed in institutional development. In general, institutional capacity will be a major constraint to implementation of the program and the ability to scale up activities beyond current levels – which already represent a dramatic increase in comparison to activities and budgets of 2005. The inclusion of institutional development as one of the four programs within LASIP is an important measure to address this. LASIP is strongly embedded in Government institutional structure and priorities –showing strong ownership and potential for success.



Liberia presents an extremely challenging institutional environment due to low capacity and availability of human resources. Overcoming these will be important –one key question for LASIP is whether the activities described the institutional development program are sufficient to meet the demand generated by implementation of programmes 1,2 and 4. It is also important to note that some of the outcomes of institutional development programme may only occur over the long term. For example, the lack of fully trained staff cannot be immediately remedied and will take several years to address. Are there sufficient interim measures identified in LASIP to deal with capacity constraints and gaps while institutional development takes place?

The proposed program would dramatically scale up activities in the sector and the full set of activities may exceed available human resources. More institutional assessment may be required as the sub-programs are more fully developed. The private sector and civil society are both identified as key actors in implementation and who play an important role in filling capacity gaps that exist within the public sector. Capacities of the private sector will have to be assessed and more explicitly addressed. Capacity building programmes in the investment plan focuses more on public sector institutions and farmer based organizations. It will be important to also build the capacity of the private sector in entrepreneurship development and business management.

**Recommendations:**

- a) Reassess human resource and institutional capacity requirements as sub-programs are more fully developed; and
- b) Identify possible interim measures to address capacity constraints while longer term measures take effect including how the civil society and private sector capacity can be harnessed and aligned to supporting implementation of the investment programme.

### **C5.3 Indicative financing plan**

The budget provided for LASIP provides costing data at the sub-program level and presents costs per program/sub-program in three categories: already funded/on-going; new investments (with feasibility studies but no funding); and financing gap. It is not clear the difference between “new investments” and “financing gap” since both categories are not financed at this time. These costs are lump sums per subprogram for the full 5 years of implementation. It is not clear with this costing presentation what activities are funded with public funds and what activities are funded with donor financing.

The cost section of the Plan is missing the necessary presentation of budget breakdown over time (annual allocations) and breakdown public expenditure between recurrent and new spending, and breakdown of on-going donor financed activities and new donor investment (secured). This is necessary to present a valid financing gap projection.

**Recommendations:**

- (a) The Liberia team that is developing the CAADP proposal needs to create a comprehensive portfolio and program budget (sources and uses of funds) and an indicative financing plan, down to the level of unit costs at the activity level, and according to the CAADP guidelines and templates;
- (b) The Liberia LASIP must provide information about recurrent expenditures;

- (c) The existing or anticipated contribution for the programs should be more detailed showing the participation of each actor.

#### **C5.4 Agriculture Sector Public Expenditure Review**

A table is included in the LASIP showing the allocation of the national budget for the years 2006 through 2009.

10% of the national budget is not allocated to agriculture sector; however an increase of the agriculture budget from less than 1% in FY 2005/2006 to 2.5% in FY 2009/2010 is noticed.

##### **Recommendations:**

- a) The LASIP should explain when the GoL anticipates that it could meet the Maputo Principle of 10% contribution of the national budget to the LASIP.

#### **C5.5 Public financial management capacity**

The macro sector review included in the LASIP is well developed. The LASIP also provides a comprehensive discussion of the framework for management of public finances.

However, an evaluation of the strengths, weaknesses, and capacity would be helpful.

##### **Recommendations:**

- a) This section of the LASIP needs to be expanded, both in terms of a discussion of the existing situation and proposals for improvements.

#### **C5.6 Risk assessment, financial and economic assessment and private sector investment**

No risk assessment is provided. Because estimated costs are underestimated, it is likely that expected rates of return are overestimated. The contribution of the private sector is not provided.

##### **Recommendations:**

- a) The government needs to conduct a risk assessment and provide the outcomes.  
b) Estimated costs need to be re-assessed to reflect realistic rates of return are overestimated.  
c) The contribution of the private sector needs to be provided.

## **Annexure 1: CAADP Post-Compact Guide**

## **Annexure 2: ECOWAS's 13 points from Cotonou for investment plans**

NAIPS are to be set out to present:

1. Origins of the investment plan (history)
2. Areas to be covered
3. Detailed description of the programmes and how they relate to ECOWAP
4. Overview of the intervention strategy
5. Evaluation of costs and financing
6. Economic and financial analysis
7. Implementation strategy
8. Synergies between programmes
9. Implications for regional public programmes
10. Safeguard for monitoring
11. Institutional evaluation
12. Monitoring and evaluation
13. Risk assessment

### Annexure 3: Post Review Road Map Template

National Agriculture Investment Plans	Activities and Benchmarks	Point	June 2010	July 2010	August 2010	Sept. 2010	Oct. 2010	Nov. 2010	Dec. 2010	Follow-on Comments
<b><u>Component 1: Alignment with CAADP vision, principles and strategy elements</u></b>										
[Identify issue]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[bullet out specific actions]</li> <li></li> </ul>	[list who is responsible]	[insert due dates]							
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> <li></li> </ul>									
<b><u>Component 2: Consistency with long terms growth and poverty reduction options</u></b>										
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> <li></li> </ul>									
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>									
<b><u>Component 3: Adoption of best practices and inclusion of core programme elements</u></b>										
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> <li></li> </ul>									
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> <li></li> </ul>									
<b><u>Component 4: Alignment with country commitments</u></b>										

	•				
	•				
<b>Component 5: Operational realism (including institutional and capacity building)</b>					
	•				
	•				
<b>ACCOUNTABILITY</b>					
<b>Monitoring and Evaluation/Policy Analysis</b>	•				
	•				
<b>IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS</b>					
<b>GAFSP (Global Hunger &amp; Food Security Program)</b>	•				
	•				
<b>OUTSTANDING COSTING ISSUES</b>					
<b>Costing of Program areas</b>	•				
	•				
<b>Financing Plan Presentation</b>	•				
	•				
<b>GAFSP CONCEPT PAPER</b>					

<b>Concept Paper Development</b>	• •				
<b>ANALYSIS NEEDS</b>					
<b>Beneficiary Analysis</b>	• •				
<b>Cost Benefit Analysis</b>	• •				
<b>Prioritizing Programs</b>	• •				
<b>Alignment with other Agricultural strategies and programs</b>	•				
<b>Policy Analysis</b>	• •				
<b>Environmental Assessments as Needed</b>	• •				
<b>Gender Analysis</b>	• •				
<b>ACCOUNTABILITY</b>					
<b>Monitoring and Evaluation/Policy Analysis</b>	• •				