

10th Africa Forum

30 October to 3 November 2006
Windhoek, Namibia

Programme-Based Approaches in Agriculture and Rural Development

The Specific Challenges
of Productive Sectors



Proceedings

by Désirée Dietvorst



Hosted by:
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry, Namibia
Ministry of Lands and Resettlement, Namibia

Supported by:



Executive Summary

This year's Africa Forum was held in Windhoek, Namibia, from 30 October to 3 November. A total of 204 people attended, from 25 countries, 18 of which are in Africa. Theme of the forum was Programme Based Approaches in Agriculture and Rural Development: the Specific Challenges of Productive Sectors.

Hosts of the 10th anniversary Africa Forum in Windhoek were the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry and the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement of Namibia. Support was provided by GTZ, IFAD, SIDA and InWent. The Forum was officially opened by the Right Honourable Prime Minister, Nahas Angula, in the presence of Ministers from the host ministries, Honorable Jerry Ekandjo, Minister of Lands and Resettlement and Honorable Nickey Iyambo, Minister of Agriculture, Water and Forestry.

The forum had set itself two main tasks. The first was to explore the opportunities and challenges of applying new aid modalities like the Programme Based Approach (PBA) to the area of agriculture and rural development. The second task was to link up to the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme and to the forthcoming World Development Report 2008 on Agriculture. The forum focused on three main sub-themes: (i) The importance of the private sector (ii) Institutions and capacities and (iii) Performance and impact monitoring.

The importance of the private sector

The most significant roles of the state in agriculture are not concerned with public expenditure but with creating the right environment for private actors to invest and produce. Successful agricultural policy must be based on a sustained commitment to an enabling environment and on a clear understanding of what this entails. The policy then has to be translated into legislation whereby the special challenge is the coordination of many pieces of legislation across several sectors into a coherent legal framework. Secure land tenure systems are of crucial importance to investment as is the legal protection of assets and enforcement of contracts. National agricultural strategies should be better aligned to international trade agreements to make optimum use of the opportunities these provide. Domestic marketing regulations should be improved and a vision developed on how to add value to basic agricultural commodities.

There was a strong consensus that market forces alone are not the answer and that market failure needs to be addressed by the state. Especially for remote areas or non-commercial services the state needs to intervene, but in a way that does not undermine private sector development.

Institutions and capacities

Programmes in agriculture and rural development are often characterised by complex institutional arrangements. Even though agriculture may still be termed a sector, much of what is needed in agriculture is outside the mandate of the Ministry of Agriculture and requires the cooperation of other line ministries: central level policies on exchange rate and interest rates are as important to agricultural growth as any policy under the (sector) ministry's own jurisdiction. Moreover, it has been shown that the success of a programme is directly dependent on the degree and quality of private and civil sector participation. Thus, progress of a productive sector will largely depend on the ability of those in charge to coordinate across sectors and between stakeholders involved.

A pre-requisite is a clear and consistent policy that outlines the roles of the public and the private sector. This in turn needs to be translated into an effective legislation. Cooperation and coordination of different actors would be impossible without such policy and legal frameworks. It is recommended that government restricts itself to public core functions, so as not to cause any distortion of the market. To support the hand-over of tasks, private sector entry plans have to be linked to public sector exist plans. Capacity should be built in areas like community organisation or farmer mobilisation.

Performance and impact monitoring

The need for a closer look at the performance of programmes in agriculture and rural development was an issue proposed at the Africa Forum of 2005 held in Burkina Faso. During the present forum, experience presented from Mozambique, Zambia and Uganda suggests that M&E continues to be weak area. Mozambique's ProAgri-I never translated its policy into adequate indicators and targets but lessons were learned and a monitoring framework is now being developed for phase II. Zambia has been implementing SWAPs in its agricultural sector for a decade and is still struggling with the development of a management information system, at present for its 5th National Development Plan. In Uganda the Secretariat of the national agricultural strategy set about the task of designing a monitoring system for the programme to find that there is hardly any mention of performance monitoring in the strategy document.

Crucial to the development of effective systems is the need for M&E and associated information systems to be seen first and foremost as a management tool. Especially as a consequence of the shift to budget support, the use of indicators is increasingly associated with donor fund disbursements. This has led to damaging consequences where data collection has been biased to satisfy donor needs or worse, where data is being tampered with. Both these effects, reported at the forum, undermine the usefulness of M&E information, a trend that has to be reversed. In addition, monitoring systems need to be kept simple, decentralised and provide information that is relevant for programme management. Capacity for data analysis and utilisation should be developed at the level where data are collected. In as much as possible, monitoring and indicator frameworks should be harmonised; within the country and between governments and development partners.

What does an ideal PBA for a Productive Sector look like?

Central question of the forum was: What does an ideal PBA for a Productive Sector look like? In addressing this, several central issues emerged. These included the following:

The scope of the programme must be the outcome of a careful balance between coherence and manageability. It is useful to bundle components that have a lot of synergy between them and that need to be implemented in tandem. However, trying to capture all into a single programme framework may lead to institutional log jam. A more practical way forward may be to work with a set of complementary programmes, programme-components or programme-pillars that have enough autonomy to be implemented independently of each other and that have enough coherence within themselves to generate momentum and synergy.

The heterogeneous nature of productive sectors requires that policy needs to allow for local tailor made solutions. Policy guides can be used to assess whether interventions are 'policy compliant'. The programme as whole should be sufficiently flexible to allow for incremental implementation, whereby certain (sub) components or geographical regions are able to progress even if other components do not.

A critical component of a productive sector PBA is the coordination between actors. Line or sector ministries that are made responsible for the coordination of such programmes have to be given a clear coordinating mandate that can be enforced. Where central ministries (Finance, Planning) are strong enough, (some of) the coordination mandate may better be placed at their level.

Well-written policies and lots of funding have often failed to translate into improved service provision, increased growth or reduced poverty. A crucial bottleneck is capacity. Capacity development in the context of programme approaches has often been biased towards (i) government (ii) national levels and (iii) public finance management. In productive sectors this bias is especially undesired as sub-national levels and non-state actors are of crucial importance to the programme's success. Productive sector PBAs therefore have to support capacity development among state and non-state actors.

Important to programme implementation is the extent to which fund flows are predictable. On the government side this means a transparent public finance management system and limited in-year budget changes. On the donor side this means that donor fund flows have to be aligned to the budget cycle. Ideally, budget support is meant to do exactly that, but there are too many programmes that have suffered because budget support was either not pledged or disbursed on time for it to be integrated in the budget cycle. Therefore, possibly more important than the funding modality, is the extent to which donor procedures for disbursement can be adapted to the annual budget cycle.

In conclusion, for sectors like agriculture and rural development an insistence on the classical model of the sector programme or a dogmatic pursuit of budget support as if these are ends in themselves is counter-productive. The PBA concept and its founding principles of ownership, coherence, coordination and the use of local systems provide a helpful guide to supporting these sectors. Yet, at the same time, the PBA principles leave enough flexibility to adapt that support to local circumstances.

Governments and donors will have to dare 'thinking out of the box' and come up with coordinated programmes of support that make optimum use of the available instruments by being tailored to specific country and sector needs.

Abbreviations and acronyms

ACP	African, Caribbean and Pacific Countries
ADB	African Development Bank
AfrEA	African Evaluators Association
AgSSIP	Agricultural Services Sub-sector Investment Programme (Ghana)
ASCU	Agriculture Sector Coordinating Unit (Kenya)
AU	African Union
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CTA	Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation
DAC	Development Aid Committee
EC	European Commission
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EPA	Economic Partnership Agreement with the EC
ESA	Eastern and Southern Africa trade regime with the EC
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
GDPRD	Global Donor Platform for Rural Development
GTZ	German Technical Cooperation
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
InWent	Internationale Weiterbildung und Entwicklung
LENPA	Learning Network on Programme Based Approaches
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MFI	Micro-Finance Institution
MIS	Management Information System
NAAAdS	National Agricultural Advisory Services (Uganda)
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PBA	Programme-Based Approach
PDS	Private sector Development Sector Programme (Ghana)
PMA	Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture (Uganda)
ProAgri	Agriculture Sector Programme of Mozambique
PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
PS	Permanent Secretary
REC	Regional Economic Committees
RIP	Regional Implementation Planning
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SIP	Sector Investment Programme
SPA	Strategic Partnership with Africa
SRA	Strategy for the Revitalisation of Agriculture (Kenya)
SWAC	Sahel and West Africa Club
SWAP	Sector Wide Approach
WDR	World Development Report

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Abbreviations and acronyms	6
Table of Contents	7
1 Introduction.....	8
2 Background	10
3 Setting the Scene	12
3.1 The importance of leadership	12
3.2 Defining Agriculture and Rural Development.....	13
3.3 The PBA and what's different in agriculture and rural development?.....	13
3.4 New directions for agriculture and rural development	15
4 What needs to be done in agriculture and rural development?	17
4.1 Agriculture and the environment.....	17
4.2 Agricultural pricing, market and trade policies	18
4.3 Private investment and private sector development	19
4.4 Market access and value chains.....	20
4.5 Small-holder farms and transition	21
4.6 Marginal and food insecure areas	22
4.7 Institutional arrangements	23
5 How should agriculture and rural development be supported?	25
5.1 Enabling private growth in agriculture	25
5.2 Institutions and Capacities.....	26
5.3 Performance Monitoring	29
5.4 Development partners	30
6 What does an ideal PBA for a Productive Sector look like?	32
7 Next steps.....	34
7.1 At country, region and donor level.....	34
7.2 Linking up to other initiatives	36
Annex 1 Overview Africa Forum 1997 – 2006	38
Annex 2 Programme of the 10 th Africa Forum, Namibia, 2006	40
Annex 3 List of participants.....	46
Annex 4 Description of Fieldtrips	56
Annex 5 Forum Evaluation.....	58
Annex 6 List of PBAs in Agriculture and Rural Development	61

1 Introduction

This year's Africa Forum was held in Windhoek, Namibia, from 30 October to 3 November. Theme of the forum was *Programme Based Approaches in Agriculture and Rural Development: the Specific Challenges of Productive Sectors*.

Hosts of the 10th anniversary Africa Forum in Windhoek were the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry and the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement of Namibia. Support was provided by GTZ, IFAD, SIDA, CTA and InWent. The Forum was officially opened by the Right Honourable Prime Minister, Nahas Angula, in the presence of Ministers from the host ministries, Honorable Jerry Ekandjo, Minister of Lands and Resettlement and Honorable Nickey Iyambo, Minister of Agriculture, Water and Forestry.

This was already the 10th event in a series that is now known as the Africa Forum. During his speech, Peter Conze, Director General of the Africa Department of GTZ, recalled how it all began: When the first Africa Forum was held in the mid-nineties, it was at a time when a number of countries started to formulate agriculture sector programmes. The Africa Forum developed out of a concern that insufficient information was available to decision makers with respect to these programmes. To help government representatives and donors understand the concept, an international workshop was held early 1997 in Lusaka, Zambia. What started as an ad-hoc initiative soon evolved into an annual event.

Here, issues such as agricultural sector development, programme-based approaches, new aid modalities, or rural poverty are debated by people who are key decision makers and programme implementers. People, who are directly involved in translating policies into practice, who have a more direct link to the field level. The Africa Forum thus can make a valuable contribution to the international (and often donor dominated) debate. It is a forum for South-South exchange but it also connects to the global debate through international platforms like the Learning Network on Programme-based Approaches and the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development.

Africa Forums are hosted by the partner country, usually the Ministry of Agriculture whilst the organisation and financing is a joint effort by GTZ and others that have included the World Bank, IFAD, FAO and several bilateral donors. Participants to one forum propose topics for the next and so ensure that the issues addressed are of common and current concern. This continuity in the discussion, and the growing number of core-participants, has turned these forums into a true regional debate. Annex 1 offers an overview of Africa Forums to date.

Participants to the 10th Africa Forum came from 25 countries, 19 of which are in Africa. A total of 204 people attended; the largest number so far of any Africa Forum. A detailed participant list is attached as annex 3. The table below offers a breakdown by country.

Participants by country

Botswana	2	Niger	4
Burkina Faso	14	Senegal	1
Cameroon	1	South Africa	8
Congo	2	Tanzania	5
Ghana	14	Uganda	4
Ivory Coast	4	Zambia	6
Cameroon	1	Sub-total Africa	183
Kenya	18		
Malawi	6	Europe	20
Mali	1	Canada	1
Mauritania	1	Sub-total non-Africa	21
Mozambique	7		
Namibia	84	Total participants	204

Duration of the forum was five days, as usual. However, this year, it was decided to set aside a full day for the field trips, an increasingly important component of the forum. The forum programme is attached as annex 2, while annex 4 gives an overview of the field trips. Finally, an evaluation of the forum by participants is attached as annex 5.

On the last day of the forum, participants received a CD-Rom containing all the forum presentations, abstracts and background papers, as well as a host of other material on programme approaches including the proceedings of all previous Africa Forums. This material can also be downloaded from the Africa Forum website at www.africaforum.info

This Summary of Findings has been kept brief and provides an overview rather than an in-depth discussion of individual presentations. Basis of these findings were of course the presentations and plenary discussions, but also included here are the cards that were collected after each Round Table session.

2 Background

Africa-wide, and especially in countries with Poverty Reduction Strategies, experience has been gained with the shift from stand-alone projects to Programme-Based Approaches (or PBA). This new way of delivering aid has made most progress in social sectors, where government is the main service provider. The reputation of similar programmes in agriculture and related sectors is often poor and sometimes they are considered outright failures.

Programme-Based Approaches, whether at sector level or below, represent a steadily growing share of total aid and development funds. Since the mid 90s, donor contributions to different forms of programme approaches¹ have nearly doubled for sectors like health, education and transport. In contrast, support to Agricultural Sector Programmes is in decline. Yet, rural growth, which is largely driven by agriculture, is seen as the key towards poverty reduction in most Sub-Saharan countries.

How does this contradiction arise? Is agriculture simply seen as a sector that “takes care of itself” (by private entrepreneurs)? Is the link between public investment in agriculture and growth in agriculture too vague or not understood? Has the aid instrument become more important than the sector and are donors simply focussing on where their aid money works best? Or are we, as rural developers, to blame, because we have not been able to adapt the new programmes to the needs of “our” sector? The current Africa Forum sought to address these issues by asking itself: What makes agriculture, land, water and rural development programmes different from those in social sectors?

The forum had set itself two main tasks. The first was to explore the potential tension of applying new aid modalities like the Programme Based Approach (PBA) to the area of agriculture and rural development. The second task was to link up to the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme and to the forthcoming World Development Report 2008 on Agriculture. The forum output was therefore captured under two main questions: **What** needs to be done to bring agriculture and rural development forward? and **How** best to support agriculture and rural development?

Within this wide spectrum of the ‘what’ and the ‘how’, the forum focused on three main sub-themes: (i) The importance of the private sector (ii) Institutions and capacities and (iii) Performance and impact monitoring. These sub-themes were chosen because they represent classical areas of tension in the application of the concept of the Programme-Based Approach to the sector (the *how?*) and because they represent important areas in need of action (the *what?*). Specifically, the following was discussed:

The importance of the private sector: In contrast to the ‘classic SWAP-sectors’, like health and education, most of the investment and initiative in agriculture and rural development comes not from public but from private sources. The role of the government in these sectors is more about creating an enabling environment for the private sector to grow. But what does an enabling environment look like and how can private actors be supported without creating unfair competition?

Institutions and capacities: In productive sectors like agriculture and rural development, the role of the line ministry is less strong (compared to social sectors) whilst decentralisation and inter-sector coordination is crucial. How can inter- and intra-sectoral coordination be managed and what kind of capacity is needed?

¹ Sector Wide Approaches -SWAPs-; or Sector Investment Programmes -SIPs-

Performance and impact monitoring: The importance of impact monitoring of programmes in agriculture and rural development was a crucial issue that emerged during the 9th Africa Forum held in Burkina Faso in 2005. The questions raised at the end of the Burkina Faso Forum were: To what extent is the notion that programmes in productive sectors are less successful than those in social sectors really true? Did we look at the right indicators? And if an impact is more difficult to realise in these sectors, does our monitoring data provide enough basis for learning-as-we-go?

Prior to addressing these three 'bottleneck areas', a foundation for the forum discussions was laid out by an introduction to the concept of the Programme-Based Approach and by a review of past and present policy regarding agriculture and rural development. This discussion is summarised in the next chapter titled *Setting the Scene*.

Chapters 4 and 5 offer an analysis of findings from two perspectives; (i) *what* needs to be done? and (ii) *how* should it be supported? Chapter 6 represents a kind of overall conclusion in the form of an answer to the central question of the forum: What does an ideal PBA for a productive sector look like?

On the last day of the forum, participants divided themselves into groups to discuss *next steps*, at country level, at regional level or at the level of the development partners. Their ideas are summarised in the last chapter of this report.

3 Setting the Scene

'Where have they gone, those great African leaders?'

3.1 The importance of leadership

Joseph Diescho gave the forum a startling and sobering beginning by his eloquent discourse on leadership. He reminded us that Africa has produced an impressive array of leaders: People of humble disposition and great moral stature. People like Julius Nyere and Nelson Mandela. People who inspired not only Africa, but the world beyond.

Diescho posed some uncomfortable but very necessary questions: "In emerging as an independent continent, in getting up from under the colonial yolk, have we replicated the wrong parts of leadership from our erstwhile masters? Have we focussed on the decorum, rather than the 'core' of what it means to be a leader? Africa seems to have copied the trappings that are associated with leadership but less of the essence. The pomp and protocol is there alright: Mile-long motorcades, a flurry of honorary titles and what can be called 'the rituals' of leadership consisting sometimes of costly and time-consuming practices that serve no other purpose than to underline 'who is who' in the hierarchy.

However, acting the leader is not the same as leading the way. To lead the way, one has to have a purpose, a vision, a dream and an obstinate commitment to get there, if necessary by making personal sacrifices along the road.

Africa has shown that it can produce such people and it needs them still. Where there is a 'leadership-vacuum' others will step in. These may be development or trading partners, political allies or political foes. But wherever they come from and whatever their intentions, they will all bring their own agenda to the table. Diescho reminded us that Africa needs to pull up its socks and pay its own bills, because 'whoever pays your bills sets the agenda' or, in other words; 'he who pays the piper, plays the tune'.

This leadership-question became a recurrent theme throughout the forum. It was realised that, much as we can identify what needs to be done and how to do it, such technocratic solutions have little influence on issues like political commitment and courageous leadership. Yet, these are pre-conditions for success and any programme of development will fail without them.

But how is leadership fostered? Several ideas were floated during the forum: The development of leadership skills aimed at policy and decision makers; A widespread publication of political and policy commitments so that leaders can be held accountable by their citizenry; Strengthening the parliamentary and the budget process; using regional agreements and African based peer review mechanisms to ensure that these are adhered to; and finally, a more proactive role by strong African economies to advance development in the weaker ones.

Nevertheless, useful as these suggestions may be, there was widespread consensus that this issue was not sufficiently addressed and that it warrants more attention, at country and international level and possibly as a major theme in a next Africa Forum.

3.2 Defining Agriculture and Rural Development

During the forum agriculture and rural development have not been addressed separately. In theory, this is not right, as they are two different things. Agriculture can still be called a sector, has a clearer institutional context linked to the Ministry of Agriculture and can be addressed through a more 'vertical' set-up of a classical sector programme. Rural development, by contrast, is not a sector, but a cross-sectoral concern. Its institutional base is more likely to be with local authorities than with a sector ministry. Agriculture tends to be seen as a part of rural development, along with infrastructure, education, health and whatever else is needed to develop the rural parts of the country.

Although participants felt that it was important to define the boundaries between agriculture and rural development, it was also acknowledged that this is often a theoretic debate. Even if it were possible to draw a clear line between agriculture and rural development per se, this delineation immediately blurs when we look at the *programmes* in these sectors. In practice, it appears difficult to distinguish between programmes in agriculture and programmes in rural development, as many of them operate on the interface between the two:

On one side of the spectrum are the programmes with a more narrow agriculture focus: ProAgri in Mozambique and the Agricultural Services Sub-Sector Investment Programme (AgSSIP) in Ghana are concerned predominantly with service provision and institutional development under the Ministry of Agriculture. Examples of programmes 'in the middle' are the Kenyan Strategy for the Revitalisation of Agriculture (SRA) and Uganda's Programme for the Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA): Both these programmes emphasise agricultural growth but include many rural development components. Programmes on the rural development end of the spectrum include the Rural Development Strategies of Niger and Burkina Faso; both are rural development programmes in the widest sense, involving a great many actors and incorporating a strong element of decentralisation. Annex 6 presents an overview of PBAs in agriculture and rural development in Africa.

In conclusion, rather than there being a clear dividing line between programmes in agriculture and those in rural development, it seems to be more of a sliding scale with few agriculture programmes on one side and few rural development programmes on the other, whilst the majority of programmes are hovering somewhere in between. However, although the sector-scope of these programmes may differ, they share certain challenges based on the fact that they are concerned not with social sectors but with productive sectors, and within that, with **sectors where people make economic use of natural resources**. This is a more pragmatic delineation, but one that may help as a basis and a demarcation of the discussion.

3.3 The PBA and what's different in agriculture and rural development?

There continues to be some misunderstanding regarding the terms Programme-Based Approach (PBA) and Sector Wide Approach (SWAP) with many people assuming that the PBA *replaced* the SWAP. However, in fact, a SWAP is a *kind of* PBA. The **PBA is a collective term that includes SWAPs and 'SWAP-like' interventions** such as Poverty Reduction Strategies. The PBA concept is more flexible than that of the SWAP and includes different kinds of programme support, as long as

these adhere to certain principles². A PBA can be sector-wide (as in the SWAP) but doesn't have to be; it can be at national level (as a Poverty Reduction Strategy or PRS) but it can also be based at sub-national level. It can focus on the government (as most SWAPs and PRS do) but it can also be in support of an NGO or other private sector actor.

Of the three main PBA funding modalities (budget support; basket funding and project support) the project modality raises most questions. Project support is a perfectly legitimate way of supporting a PBA, but there are important differences between this kind of support and the classical stand-alone project. **Project support as part of a PBA** is coordinated under a national (or sub-national) programme that is implemented under leadership of the host country or organisation. Project support as part of such a wider programme is often used to provide targeted (and sometimes temporary) support to capacity and systems development. It has proven useful as a pilot for potential interventions under a programme prior to these being institutionalised or up-scaled. Project support is also used when supporting non-state actors in the context of a national strategy. Essentially, project support as part of a PBA means support that is 'non-pooled', i.e. provided not through a basket or through the treasury but as a separate fund flow.

Sadly, there continues to be a ***mix-up of means and ends*** or *instruments* and *objectives*. The ultimate objective behind the shift from projects to programmes is to make development aid more effective and to improve overall development impact. Intermediate objectives towards this are increased ownership and coherence as well as reduced transaction costs of aid. Budget support and donor harmonisation are *instruments* towards these objectives but they are not an end in themselves. They are important only to the extent that they contribute to objectives of ownership, coherence and reduced transaction costs. The Paris Declaration is a declaration on *Aid Effectiveness* and not a declaration on budget support³ and although budget support would be a quick way to meet some of the indicators, it should not become an objective in its own right; instead, budget support should be treated (and evaluated) as an instrument of making aid more effective.

Productive sectors like agriculture and rural development pose specific challenges to the programme approach. The role of the public sector is more limited than in social sectors like health and education. The need for decentralisation, inter- and cross-sectoral coordination is greater and private investment is much more important than public investment. Agriculture may still be termed a 'sector' (albeit a very extensive one), but any attempt to capture rural development in a single 'sector-wide' approach would probably result in a programme that is so wide as to become unmanageable. What is needed in these sectors is an innovative use of the PBA concept including the notion of a set of complementary PBAs all working towards the rural development objective, possibly under a single policy or strategy framework. A well judged use of available funding modalities should ensure that support to state and non-state actors is balanced in accordance with strategic objectives.

² The PBA is 'a way of engaging in development cooperation based on coordinated support for a locally owned programme of development, with four main principles: (i) leadership by the host country or organisation; (ii) a single programme and budget framework; (iii) donor coordination & harmonisation of procedures and (iv) increased use of local procedures over time

³ In fact, the phrase 'budget support' does not occur in the Paris Declaration document.

3.4 New directions for agriculture and rural development

During recent decennia, funding to the agricultural sector has been in sharp decline. The Prime Minister of Namibia, in his opening speech, reminded participants that annual global financial assistance for African agriculture shrank from of US\$ 6.2 billion to 2.3 billion between 1980 and 2002. Multilateral spending on agricultural development went from 35% in 1980-81 to only 7% of total aid in 2000-2001. Similarly, public funding by governments themselves went down, though aggregate figures are difficult to obtain. The reasons for this downward trend include: (i) Disappointing results from public investment in agriculture and rural development (ii) An emphasis on social spending after the devastating effects of the Structural Adjustment Programmes on education and health services and (iii) the shift to modalities like SWAP and budget support which, in turn, introduced a bias towards 'SWAP-able' sectors such as health and education.

Fortunately, in recent years there are encouraging signs of a **renewed focus on agriculture** in the international development agenda. Three important initiatives were presented at the forum: (i) The Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP); (ii) The World Development Report 2008 on Agriculture for Development and (iii) the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development (GDPRD).

The Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme provides a pan-African policy framework that seeks alignment with national agricultural strategies (existing and planned). During the Forum there was consensus around the need for regional strategies as a way for national agricultural economies to access regional opportunities, especially in areas like marketing and trade. However, questions were raised regarding *the way* in which CAADP seeks alignment, worrying that alignment may be imposed from the top, with national strategies having to align to CAADP rather than the other way round. Two key aims of the CAADP policy are (i) to achieve a 6% growth rate for agriculture and (ii) to devote 10% of the public budget to the agricultural sector. It is expected that these objectives will be reflected in national agricultural strategies across Africa (see box 1).

The World Development Report (WDR) 2008 on Agriculture for Development is more an analytical than a policy framework. The report examines in what way agriculture can be an instrument for economic development, especially development that favours the poor. Interested individuals can comment on a draft version which will be published on the website (www.worldbank.org). The Africa Forum will feed into the WDR process via the **Global Donor Platform on Rural Development** which has been asked to provide practical experience on when and how agriculture can help drive poverty reduction. A first occasion for presenting Africa Forum findings is the Donor Consultation Workshop on 8th of December 2006 in Washington organized by the Global Donor Platform (www.donorplatform.org).

The way forward in agriculture and rural development is based on a reflection of experiences from the past. One such review is the *Sector Wide Approaches in Agriculture and Rural Development* supported by the GDPRD. This study is based on 15 SWAP or SWAP-like frameworks in Agriculture and Rural Development worldwide⁴. Whereas positive achievements include an improved dialogue between government and donors; increased government leadership and a harmonisation of donor procedures, it remains difficult to show results on the ground. Most of these SWAPs are still biased

⁴ Of these ten are in Africa: Benin, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Senegal, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia.

towards public spending and are confined to the government's institutional structure instead of being truly sector-wide. In short "the SWAP tends to be shaped by what the Ministry of Agriculture does rather than by what the agricultural and rural sector needs" ⁵. This comparative analysis also immediately shows the wide variety in scope among such programmes in Africa; from the sub-sectoral (e.g. Ghana) via sectoral (e.g. Mozambique) to multi-sectoral programmes (e.g. Uganda).

In case of the latter, the Ugandan Plan for the Modernization of Agriculture (PMA) not only has a multi-sectoral rural development orientation, it also appears to be one of the most successful programmes of its kind. A closer look reveals a carefully phased approach with a varying mix of funding modalities using project support to kick-start PMA pillars, gradually moving to budget support for established components but retaining project support for Public-Private-Partnership components. In contrast to the classical SWAP, the PMA does not have a single budget framework but instead is embedded in different sectoral Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks. A crucial ingredient in the success of the PMA has been the strong leadership by the host country.

Box 1 The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme

The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme, or CAADP, was launched by NEPAD in July 2003. It is directed at Africa's policymakers in NEPAD itself; at national policy makers, both in public and private sectors, at relevant NGOs and academic circles and at development partners. The CAADP offers a broad frame of priorities, and expects that at country level more precise strategies and programmes are derived from it for implementation. The CAADP does not seek to be a parallel policy framework, but instead will build on existing strategies. In Malawi, the Agricultural Sector Programme has been merged with the CAADP process already. CAADP implementation will be via the Regional Economic Communities (RECs) and their member countries. To support the implementation, National Focal Points for CAADP have been identified in each country. A Round Table process has been started, with CAADP Regional Implementation Planning (RIP) meetings held in Rwanda, Zambia and Uganda already and a further meeting in Kenya before the end of 2006. Purpose of these meetings is to review the relevance of CAADP priorities, to obtain national commitment for CAADP's goal of 10% of the public budget to agriculture and agricultural strategies aiming for a 6% growth rate. Finally, these meetings aim to identify investment plans at country level. This also has to be the platform where existing national strategies are aligned to the CAADP framework. For more information on CAADP and the CAADP process visit www.nepad.org

⁵ *Sector Wide Approaches in Agriculture and Rural Development. Phase I: A desk review of experiences, issues and challenges.* April 2006, Alison Evans, Lidia Cabral and Dan Vadnjaj

4 What needs to be done in agriculture and rural development?

'The government is criticized for over-regulation and it is criticized for under-regulation.
Can anyone tell us what ideal regulation is?'

For this part, the forum findings were summarised, in as much as possible, in line with the sub-topics of the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP) and the World Development Report (WDR) 2008 on Agriculture and Development. The table below gives an overview of categories under each.

WDR 2008	CAADP	Africa Forum 2006
Agriculture and the environment	Sustainable land and water management	Agriculture and the environment
Agricultural pricing policies and trade	Improved rural infrastructure and trade related market access	Agricultural pricing, market and trade policies
Private investments and market development		Private investment and private sector development
Supply chains		Market access and value chains
Smallholder farms and transition		Smallholder farms and transition
Modern science and skills for pro-poor growth	Research, technology distribution and assimilation	
Agricultural growth and poverty reduction	Food security, poverty reduction and dealing with food crises	Marginal and food insecure areas
Marginal and food insecure areas		
New institutional arrangements		Institutional arrangements
	Capacity development of NEPAD, Regional Economic Committees and countries	
	Development partners	Development partners (see 5.4)

4.1 Agriculture and the environment

Environment or the management of natural resources was not a sub-topic of this Africa Forum and therefore much less was said on this than on any of the other topics. Nevertheless, it was pointed out that environmental degradation is a growing problem in Africa and one that hasn't been tackled sufficiently and is in need of urgent attention. Other points made included:

Secure land tenure systems are of crucial importance to tackling degradation. Where people don't own the land they work, or where their user-rights are not sufficiently protected, land-use practices are characterised by short-term gain, rather than long term sustainability. From Uganda, it was reported that the land tenure system is very fragile with land titles only existing for some urban areas. In

general, in Africa, weak land tenure is a real problem and contributes to environmental degradation, as well as to productivity and equity problems.

If the pursuit of growth is to have no damaging effects on the environment, then it is important that **energy resources are developed**. There is a lot of untapped potential in Africa with respect to hydro- and solar energy. These renewable energy resources should be developed, not only with the aim to halt environmental degradation, but at the same time to make energy cheaper for small producers thereby creating an enabling environment for pro-poor growth.

For the sake of durability, **production systems should be adapted to local environmental conditions**, especially considering soil and water regimes. In the past, agricultural policies have led to the emergence of production systems that are based on government incentives (e.g. subsidised inputs and prices). Now that government is withdrawing from areas like input provision and marketing, producers have to be helped to re-orient their production system to what is feasible (with regard to available resources) and what is marketable (with regard to available demand).

More attention should be given to **forestry and re-forestation**. International initiatives with a regional perspective, such as the Congo Basin Forestry Sector Programme, may be effective vehicles to develop this resource in ecological regions that transcend national boundaries.

4.2 Agricultural pricing, market and trade policies

A summary of findings from the 8th Africa Forum (held in Nairobi in 2004) recalled the fact that policy discussions often focus on international rather than regional trade and tend to be concerned with international rather than domestic market regulations. Because of this, opportunities may be missed, for example where governments can boost marketing by improving domestic trade regulations. The 10th Africa Forum made concrete suggestions as to what government 'can do at home':

First, **national agricultural policy needs to be aligned to regional and international trade agreements**. According to a study presented at last year's forum, out of 12 PBAs in agriculture and rural development, only four considered the opportunities offered by the Economic Partnership Agreements⁶ (i.e. Kenya, Tanzania, Zambia and Cameroon)⁷. Where there is no or only a weak link between national strategies and international agreements, there is a risk that hard-earned trade deals at international level are not been made use of domestically, thus implying a waste of opportunity.

The existence of a transparent system of **recognised grades and standards** is a key requirement for private investment and a core function of government to ensure. Only when grades and standards are set and enforced, can innovative ideas, such as Uganda's Warehouse Receipt System, take place. In

⁶ Overall objectives of these EPAs are; (i) to promote sustainable development of ACP countries; (ii) to gradually integrate them into the global economy; (iii) to increase their production capacity and diversification; (iv) to support African regional integration.

⁷ *PBAs in agriculture and rural development: A synthesis of key findings from across Africa*. Draft Report of October 2005 by Helmut Albert and Elke Peiler, GTZ Eschborn.

Uganda, certified warehouses throughout the country can issue a receipt of commodity held in storage which can be used as collateral against a loan or even as currency in a market transaction.

Although agricultural growth is largely a private sector affair, it is a government responsibility to ensure that growth is pro-poor. For that reason, the forum advises to **balance agricultural policies with regard to price liberalisation and price stabilisation**. Although it is agreed that an encouragement of non-economically viable production systems should be avoided; some price predictability and a buffer to risks is justified, especially where it concerns remote areas and resource-poor producers.

4.3 Private investment and private sector development

By now, most policies and programmes acknowledge the fact that, in agriculture, the government's role is not about realising growth, but about providing the *determinants* for growth. Therefore, much of the discussion in the forum revolved around what an enabling environment for private sector investment and development looks like and how it is established. Main findings were:

A pre-requisite is political stability in terms of **protection of persons and property**. Laws and legal agreements are part of this but these are valuable only when they are (i) being enforced and (ii) not subject to ad-hoc change. Ensuring the protection of assets is predominantly a national government responsibility. However, regional bodies such as COMESA, ECOWAS and SADC or even NEPAD need to play a role. The reason for this is that insufficient or unstable political protection in one country has a negative ripple-effect in neighbouring countries also⁸.

Of special importance within this protection of property is **a secure land tenure system**. Presentations from Burkina Faso and Uganda emphasised that land tenure security is the responsibility of government and is critically examined by would-be investors, both domestic and international. If land-tenure is weak or not clear and fair, investors will go elsewhere or invest in sectors judged less risky than agriculture.

Government needs to formulate and be committed to **a clear and unambiguous policy with regard to the different roles and responsibilities of the public and the private sector**. The policy has to be translated into (i) a strategic framework with clear objectives, targets and indicators (see box 2) and (ii) into a legal framework that allows the implementation of the policy. Often, even where functions are handed over from government to the private sector, the existing laws and regulations make it difficult (sometimes impossible) for these actors to take on their role.

A **conducive legal and regulatory framework** should further enable contracts being enforced where necessary and should address the practical difficulties of developing business arrangements with large numbers of small-scale farmers.

Other major stumbling blocks to investment in many African countries are cumbersome tax-systems or, in some cases, corrupt tax administrations. It is a matter of priority that **inefficient and non-transparent tax-systems are repaired**. During the 8th Africa Forum in Nairobi, the stifling effect of taxes and levies on production was illustrated, as was the fact that often the Ministry of Agriculture has no reliable figures on what proportion of earnings from agricultural produce is taken, mainly because

⁸ An example is the effect on the value of the South African Rand as a result of the situation in Zimbabwe.

taxes are levied also by actors outside the ministry (e.g. Local Government). At country level, a worthwhile first step towards a tax review is to look at each of the major commodities and determine how many taxes and levies are paid, from production to marketing, to whom and for what purpose.

With respect to private sector development, the government has to make clear **strategic choices on how support to the private sector can help make growth pro-poor**. This involves getting an overview of private sector actors (subsistence farmers, SME, large industries), their potential role to poverty reduction and the types of support that can help them fulfil this role. An unbalanced support to large businesses may lead to growth in the short term, but may aggravate poverty levels thus representing a net loss in the long term.

Box 2 Ghana's Private Sector Development Strategy

In July 2004, the Private sector Development Strategy (PDS) was launched by the President of Ghana. Several years had gone into the formulation of this programme, which took its cue from national policy frameworks and was based on an analysis of constraints to private sector development. In addition, the PDS pulled together existing private sector development initiatives into a single programme framework. The programme is supported by a mix of modalities with a large part of funds disbursed as sector budget support or in the form of basket funds. Complementary support is provided in the form of project modalities. Implementation of the PDS is coordinated by the Ministry of Private Sector Development, but there is strong private sector involvement too; the Programme Oversight Committee is chaired by a private sector person and as part of the programme formulation, representatives of participating ministries were taken on a retreat by the private sector. The programme is monitored by an elaborate set of targets and indicators. In part these are drawn from existing databases such as the Growth Competitiveness Index; the World Bank's Doing Business Database and the Business Competitiveness Index. Additional data is collected to reflect customer satisfaction with public service provision as well as time and cost to start a business, to enforce contracts and to register land and property. Challenges have included getting all of the private sector on board and not just its big players. Determinants of success have been the close cooperation with the private sector and the clear and comprehensive targets and indicators guiding the process.

4.4 Market access and value chains

These two issues are combined, as market access has to be negotiated along the value chain, sometimes within the country itself between areas of production and consumption and sometimes between domestic production and world markets. There is a growing market in products from developing countries through initiatives like Fair Trade⁹ or for certain premium products like high quality coffee. However, not enough is done by governments to make use of such opportunities.

Participants to the forum appeared quite frustrated about the fact that so few governments have a strategy for adding value to crops or other agricultural products. One participant lamented the fact that

⁹ The Fair Trade initiative offers marginalised producers from developing countries equitable opportunities to participate in global markets through a consumer driven trade and development agenda. Fair trade labels now cover close to 900 products, including bananas, cocoa, tea, sugar, rice, fruit, wine, crafts and even tourism.

his country produced coffee for centuries, but only erected a factory for instant coffee when prompted by foreign investors. A **policy vision on how to add value to basic crops or other produce** is a first necessary step to amend this situation. To come up with such a vision and strategy, government needs to develop relations with agricultural businesses at the commercial end of the supply chain.

Market access should be improved both with respect to international and domestic markets. Often there is a lot of scope to improve access to domestic markets by investment in **rural and market infrastructure** (e.g. feeder roads but also market stalls and storage, water and slaughter facilities at market places) and by support to **Market Information Systems**. The latter can be in the form of a public-private partnership such as the Foodnet initiative on marketing and post-harvest research that operates in ten countries in East and Central Africa (www.foodnet.cgiar.org).

To access international market opportunities, governments should **use regional economic communities** like COMESA, ECOWAS and SADC, to set regional standards, bundle supply and demand across countries, to relax regional trade barriers, negotiate trade agreements and in general to defend common interests such as resolving the thorny issue of international subsidies and their effect on African export markets.

4.5 Small-holder farms and transition

Whereas the first generation of agricultural programmes still emphasised food security as the main objective, most of the current programmes aim for agricultural growth. The transition that is envisaged in these programmes is from 'farming as a way of life' to 'farming as a business'. Experience presented at the forum showed some encouraging results:

In Uganda the Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture was accompanied by a **widespread public awareness** campaign which informed farmers of what it means to be producers in a commercial market. Farmers learnt to think about marketing not as an afterthought when the crop is in the field, but right at the start in deciding what to plant. A similar process took place in Mozambique, but whilst in Mozambique higher production was achieved largely by an increase in the area under cultivation, in Uganda also the yield per unit of land went up.

In Kenya, as in several other countries, agricultural extension has been rethought. Rather than being provided by government, extension today is by public-private partnerships. In addition, the content of **extension reflects the fact that farmers need business skills** not only to prosper, but even to survive. Similarly, agricultural extension in Uganda is funded by the public sector, but disseminated entirely through the private sector along a structure called the National Agricultural Advisory Services (see box 3).

Support to micro-finance continues to be necessary. Wherever possible, *existing* Micro-Finance Institutions should be supported, rather than establishing new ones. These can take many forms and are found in the informal and formal sectors. Any support to micro-finance should start with some investigation of where and from whom small farmers obtain credit and loans at present. Viable models can then be supported or even replicated, exploitative practices can then be weeded out.

Finally, the forum felt that a word of warning was necessary: **don't jeopardize livelihoods in pursuit of the market**. Smallholder farming continues to be a livelihood and not just a production system, whatever the rhetoric about 'farming as a business'. It is worthwhile to connect farmers to markets, but a smallholder system is also about social safety nets, flexibility to respond to local circumstances and the ability to be self-sufficient in food and other basic needs. During a period of transition, it is important that existing strengths are not sacrificed, but retained instead.

Box 3 Making extension demand driven

Agricultural extension today is much less about crop science and cultivation practices, but instead it is about how to survive and be profitable in a market economy. This shift calls for two main changes: first, extension workers themselves need business skills and second, extension workers are expected to provide tailored and demand driven advice rather than dish out standard technical packages. In Kenya, the agricultural extension services responded by linking up to the objectives and targets of the national Strategy for the Revitalisation of Agriculture. Public-Private-Partnerships were sought to provide extension and at field level stakeholder forums, managed by the private sector, further helped tailor extension to demand.

In Uganda, National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAAdS) were set up; these are publicly funded, but provided entirely through the private sector, with farmers contributing 2% towards the cost of the service. The NAAdS is a farmer-driven system that is commercially focussed. It offers both agronomic and economic advice. An example is the assessment of farm budgets by NAAdS officers, a service that, so far, already 25.000 farmer groups have benefited from. The NAAdS is seen as one of the most successful components of Uganda's Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture.

4.6 Marginal and food insecure areas

One of the more worrying experiences with the implementation of agricultural programmes is the finding that these often have a different impact on remote or marginal areas versus better connected areas. Whereas commercially viable areas have benefited from a liberalised market and access to private services, remote areas have suffered a 'service gap' as government withdrew but the private sector was reluctant to take over. Therefore, contrary to the objectives, agriculture programme implementation has led, in several countries, to a widening of the regional gap, instead of to increased equity. This problem is not easily overcome, but its increased recognition helps. The forum came up with the following recommendations:

Decision makers need to **take account of the potential spatial impact of agricultural policies**. Agriculture and rural development policies need to have a geographical dimension based upon agro-climate and socio-economic characteristics. One such case presented at the forum was the Ugandan zoning system that helps decision making about, for example, where feeder roads are needed.

A promising approach is to **explore the potential comparative advantages of remote or marginal areas** for example with respect to „niche“ products that are labour intensive or need unspoilt environments such as organic produce, essential oils, wild harvests (e.g. honey, medicinal herbs and plants). High value–low volume crops, like spices or certain vegetables, can justify increased transportation costs even from remote areas. Not enough research is done to explore the comparative

advantages of marginal areas and supporting such initiatives is a government role as part of the responsibility towards equal opportunities.

The potential **role of commercial operators as partners towards poverty relief** should be assessed and developed. Especially in marginal areas, commercial producers are often an important entry point to credit, inputs, information, technology and markets. Government should help ensure that contracts between such operators and smallholders are transparent, fair and are being enforced. Smallholders should be protected against exploitation, but commercial producers should be protected against contract defaulting in order to retain private sector investment confidence.

Finally, participants felt that although attention to markets and market development is useful, the **focus on marketable surplus should not come at the expense of food security**, especially with respect to marginal areas. In view of the fact that these areas possess much less buffer against risks (be it climatic, economical, political or otherwise), a level of self-sufficiency in food security should remain a prime objective.

4.7 Institutional arrangements

Agriculture and rural development are characterised not only by complex, but also by changing institutional arrangements. Because of the need for locally adapted solutions, decentralised institutions are very important. In addition, the role of the Ministry of Agriculture has altered in recent decades along with the changed challenges that face agriculture today. Consequently, a review of roles between public and private sectors is a part of nearly all agriculture policies and one that is marred by conflicts of interests. Nevertheless, there appear to be some key lessons from experience:

Government needs to restrict itself to public core functions. Direct service delivery is justified only in cases where the market fails. This can relate to (i) non-commercial services, such as certain types of research, extension and education (i.e. the agricultural knowledge triangle); (ii) in case of non-commercially viable (marginal) areas that fail to attract business or (iii) in the form of targeted support to poor people (e.g. smart credit, cash for work, cash-transfer schemes). Care has to be taken to avoid distortion of markets through direct service delivery in other fields.

Most agricultural policies foresee a reduction of the government role (e.g. the dismantling of parastatals) and the associated institutional reforms often results in a loss of jobs. To facilitate the process and at the same time reduce its social (and economic) cost, **public sector exit plans should be linked to private sector entry plans**, and vice versa. Unless government clears the way, the private sector will continue to be 'crowded out'. On the other hand, where public jobs are lost, private jobs are likely to be created, and people that loose on one side, may be helped to use their skills and experience to gain employment on the other, through government contracts or capacity building of (emerging) private entrepreneurs. However, at all times the distinction between public and private should be kept clear, as a blurring of the boundary is not easily corrected.

Agricultural **policy should be turned into meaningful legislation** that incorporates consultation and seeks consensus with all line ministries and organisations that will ultimately make use of the legislation. This will enable non-state actors take on their roles; it will help governments regulate and monitor the private sector and it will strengthen domestic accountability.

There was general consensus that **support to community organisation and mobilisation** is crucial. In recent years, African smallholders have had to transform from passive recipients of government services into active players in a free market economy. Farmer unions, producer organisations, commodity associations and non-governmental organisations have proven to be essential in meeting these challenges. Unfortunately, in some cases governments undermine, rather than strengthen this kind of (grassroots) organisation¹⁰.

Rural development needs strong local government, something that is often not a given. In many countries, local governments are regarded as overstaffed and under-funded structures, with some being forced to levy and tax local trade as a means to cover their own overhead-costs. To become the intended driving force of local economy and development, **local authorities need to be strengthened** and sometimes re-structured. Or as one forum participant put it: “we now want them to be development oriented, but they used to be tax collectors”.

¹⁰ In the late 90s farmer organisation boomed in Zambia, until the government increased the registration fee nearly a hundred-fold overnight. In Uganda, NGOs have been firmly established and active for many years. However, recently, the government introduced legislation that now requires NGOs to renew their registration on an annual basis (rather than the one-off registration hitherto).

5 How should agriculture and rural development be supported?

'The experience with VIPs in our country is that it takes them only five minutes to pass a law raising their own salaries, but a law to facilitate agriculture takes three years, four years and then there are elections'

The findings in this part revolve around the three main topics of the forum namely (i) enabling private growth (ii) institutions and capacities and (iii) performance monitoring. These findings form the basis of the conclusion of the forum: *What does an ideal PBA for productive sector look like?*

5.1 Enabling private growth in agriculture

The most significant roles of the state in agriculture are not concerned with public expenditure but with creating the right environment for private actors to invest and produce. Successful agricultural policy must be based on a sustained commitment to an enabling environment and on a clear understanding of what this entails. The policy then has to be translated into legislation whereby the special challenge is the coordination of many pieces of legislation across several sectors into a coherent legal framework. Secure land tenure systems are of crucial importance to investment, as is the legal protection of assets and enforcement of contracts.

In agriculture, the role of the state may be limited, but is of vital importance. Apart from responsibilities in areas of policy, regulation and legislation, there was a strong consensus that market forces alone are not the answer and that market failure needs to be addressed by the state. Especially in the case of remote areas or non-commercially viable services the state needs to intervene, but in a way that does not undermine (but preferably strengthens) private sector development. Attention should be given to possibilities of 'smart' subsidies and 'smart' rural finance interventions. An example may be the Warehouse Receipt System in Uganda.

A first step towards effective support to the private sector is ***getting an overview of the many actors and their varied needs.*** In phrases like 'the need to consult the private sector' there is often an implicit assumption that the private sector speaks with one voice. However, the wide spectrum of input sellers, producers, manufactures, buyers, traders and service providers does not talk with one voice, but represents a host of different and sometimes conflicting interests (see box 4). A constructive way of supporting these actors may be to classify the different needs and interests along a supply or value-added chain.

A true pioneer is Ghana's Private Sector Development Strategy: It concerns a PBA that has stepped away from the traditional sector-boundaries to embrace the cross-cutting issue of private sector development into one comprehensive multi-sector programme. Also interesting is the fact that this private sector programme is coordinated by the government (Ministry of Private Sector Development). A close look at this programme may help answer the question: ***Can the private sector be strengthened through budget support to government?*** Success factors so far are the close involvement of the private sector and a framework of detailed targets and specific indicators (box 2).

Nearly every programme in a productive sector will be dogged by widespread conflict of interests; be it within the different government departments, between government and the private sector, or within the private sector itself. **Reaching a consensus on sector policy and on the roles of different players** tends to be much more daunting in productive than in social sectors. Technical assistance may be able to play a role as broker in this process by supporting dialogue and by networking among the range of stakeholders involved. Financial assistance can help to provide government with budgets that can be used in the outsourcing of contracts to the private sector in line with the policy.

Box 4 Designing the Rural Development Strategy in Niger

Niger is a poor country, where 80% of the population lives in rural areas. A Rural Development Strategy was adopted in November 2003, with the aim of reducing rural poverty from 66% to 52% by 2015. The design of the strategy took several years and involved a great many stakeholders. The formulation process itself was very informative; decision makers agreed that by the end of it, they understood the predicament of the rural poor much better and had a good overview of the different private actors involved. Due to the widespread stakeholder consultation, the programme also gathered a lot of public awareness and political momentum and was eventually sanctioned by a Presidential Decree, which means that there now is a legal obligation to fulfil this commitment. Many challenges remain however, not least because of the enormous size of the programme with 14 sub-programmes, involving seven ministries. Coordination is likely going to be challenging and that is why four priority programmes have been identified, that can be implemented relatively independently from each other (i.e. food security; pastoral development; reforestation and regeneration of the Niger River Basin ecosystem). This is a programme that needs a phased and flexible implementation process for it to succeed.

5.2 Institutions and Capacities

Programmes in agriculture and rural development are often characterised by complex institutional arrangements. Even though agriculture may still be termed a sector, much of what is needed in agriculture is outside the mandate of the Ministry of Agriculture and requires the cooperation of other line ministries. Similarly, central level policies on exchange rate, interest rates and the control of inflation may often be more important to agricultural growth than any policy under the (sector) ministry's own jurisdiction. In addition, experience has shown that the performance of productive sector programmes is directly dependent on the degree and quality of private sector participation. This means that the success of a programme in a productive sector will largely depend on the ability of those in charge to coordinate across sectors and between institutions and stakeholders involved.

To fulfil this function, most programmes in agriculture or rural development have special 'coordinating units' attached to them. These come under different names, but whether they are called Secretariat (Uganda), Executive Secretariat (Burkina Faso, Niger), Desk (Malawi, Ghana), Advisory Group (Zambia) or Coordinating Unit (Kenya) their role is essentially the same: to advise and coordinate programme implementation. Experiences at the forum made it clear that this task is far from easy, but useful lessons have been learned on the way:

The programme does not need to be as wide as the policy: In classic Sector Programmes or SWAPs, there tends to be a policy (where do we go), translated into a strategy (how do we get there), turned into an implementation-programme (what will we do) which is supported by a budget (how much does it cost). However, trying to translate a productive sector policy into a single implementation framework would create a programme of such institutional dimensions that it may become unmanageable. If, because of this, in productive sectors we can't have a 1:1 translation of policy into programme, we need to **opt for a complement of (sub) programmes that operate in synergy** and are coordinated under a single policy framework.

Need to balance flexibility and control: With agriculture and rural development being as wide as they are, it is probably impossible to capture all that is needed and all that is being done in these sectors in a single programme or budget framework. Maybe this is not even necessary; but what *is* needed is that different efforts, whether by government, donors or NGOs, do not undermine each other. Thus, in Uganda the PMA set out a series of principles and guidelines that any intervention in rural development was asked to abide by; only those that were PMA 'compliant' were allowed. After hearing of this during the Africa Forum of 2005, Kenya decided to do likewise and now checks interventions in agriculture and rural development against their Strategy for the Revitalisation of Agriculture to establish if these are 'SRA compliant'. **Ensuring policy compliance** allows for a coordination of interventions under a sector strategy whilst at the same time maintaining flexibility to allow interventions to adapt to local circumstances..

Effective programme coordination needs a **clear coordinating mandate** as the lack of this has often dogged programme implementation. Experience teaches two main lessons: (i) coordination cannot be the responsibility only of sector ministries, but needs a strong commitment from central level also, by Ministries of Finance and/or Planning; and (ii) Technical coordination alone is not enough, political coordination is needed also (see box 5).

Capacity should be developed in and outside the public sector. Strengthening the capacity of stakeholders outside the government has to be part of a productive sector strategy. Interventions at farmer level can be general (such as literacy training) or specific such as extension that reflects the fact that producers now operate in a commercial environment and have to adjust production to the market. Widespread popular and media campaigns have shown to be effective in helping farmers transform from subsistence to commercial production systems. Also, often lacking but dearly needed, is that representatives in stakeholder-platforms at national and sub-national levels receive capacity development support to enable them become active partners to the government in programme design, implementation and monitoring.

Box 5 Programme coordination: the technical and the political dimension

The Ugandan Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture has a rural development orientation with a multi-sectoral scope. Apart from eight different ministries, it actively involves the private sector, civil society, farmers and development partners. Coordination of all these actors is challenging, but the PMA has made real progress. Two important coordination bodies are the PMA Steering Committee (chaired by the PS of the Ministry of Finance) and the PMA Secretariat, which advises the Steering Committee. All activities in the rural sector are asked to be 'PMA compliant' whether these are government or donor funded. On average 30 to 40% of all activities proposed to the Steering Committee are rejected at the first sitting. For example, if an activity proposes to spend most of its funds at headquarters and hardly involves the private sector, then it is sent back to the drawing table. A particular strength of the PMA coordination is the strong involvement of the central level; for administrative purposes, the PMA Secretariat reports to the PS of Agriculture but for policy purposes it reports to the PS of Finance and Planning. Without this strong arm of political coordination, the PMA would not have been as successful as it is today.

The situation in Burkina Faso is special in that both an Agriculture Sector Programme *and* a Rural Development Strategy exist. Both these programmes are coordinated by the same Coordination Secretariat. Coordination is anchored at national level but with a strong sub-national dimension; Burkina Faso has 13 regions and in each of these a coordinating committee has been formed, headed by the Regional Governor. These 13 Governors also form part of the national coordinating committee, along with representatives of the 13 (!!) participating ministries. An achievement in the coordination process is that although it was first driven by development partners, it is now fully owned and managed by the government.

Kenya's Agriculture Sector Coordinating Unit (ASCU) supports the implementation of the Strategy for the Revitalisation of Agriculture (SRA). There are many similarities between the ASCU and the Ugandan PMA Secretariat. However, there are important differences too: The Ugandan PMA Secretariat has a purely advisory function, it consists only of four people and depends on technical experts from other government departments; finally it has no executive power, which is vested only in the PMA Steering Committee. The ASCU in Kenya effectively combines the roles of the PMA Secretariat and the PMA Steering Committee. The ASCU does have an implementation responsibility; it has technical sub-committees and seeks to influence resource allocation based on SRA priorities. However, ASCU battles to sustain political support for the recommendations by its committees. The appointment of political representatives to ASCU did not help, as these tended to act as MPs for the ministries that had appointed them and simply fought for their own interests. In general, ASCU's experience shows that technical agenda's suffer each time the PS for Agriculture (or any of the other ministries involved) changes. Possibly, ASCU needs the support of a second, more political structure based at central level, with a vested executive mandate and a commitment to act upon ASCU's advice.

5.3 Performance Monitoring

Performance monitoring was put forward as a central theme for this forum by its predecessor, the 9th Africa Forum in Burkina Faso. However, during the preparation of the present forum it became clear how difficult it is to get information on either programme impact or performance monitoring. It has to be assumed that monitoring and evaluation (M&E) continues to be a weak area: A view corroborated by presentations to this forum (see box 6). Nevertheless, participants to the forum managed to come up with several straightforward recommendations:

M&E and associated information systems are first and foremost a management tool: Especially as a consequence of the shift to budget support, the use of indicators is increasingly associated with donor fund disbursements. This has led to damaging consequences where data collection has been biased to satisfy donor needs or worse, where data is being tampered with. Both these effects undermine the usefulness of M&E information, a trend that has to be reversed. Doing so requires that governments reclaim their M&E as a *management* tool rather than viewing it a donor's control instrument.

Policy has to be translated into indicators and targets: To know whether a policy is implemented and to know whether it is right, it has to be linked to measurable indicators and clear targets. However, as implementation is a step-by-step process, indicators have to reflect that: Too great a focus on impact indicators (poverty reduced by x%, food security increased by y%) will not be useful in yielding management information. Process indicators are needed especially in cases of institutional reform. Output and outcome indicators will allow a step-by-step measurement towards programme objectives.

Avoid getting into an 'Indicator Frenzy': It seems that when government and donors get around the table to discuss indicators, there soon develops a kind of indicator-frenzy. Or how else can one explain that so many performance assessment frameworks are groaning under the weight of 100-plus indicators?

To avoid wasting resources, **monitoring systems should be kept simple** designed with few, well spaced indicators that are statistically conclusive¹¹. In as much as possible, the distance between data collection and data analysis should be kept short; which means that data analysis capacity has to be developed at the level where data are collected. This will help reduce the time between collection and analysis and it will increase the uptake of the monitoring information in programme implementation.

In as much as possible, **monitoring frameworks should be harmonised** between the sector level (PBA), the national level (e.g. Poverty Reduction Strategy) and the international level (e.g. Millennium Development Goals).

¹¹ Well spaced indicators are those that don't overlap by effectively measuring the same thing. Statistically conclusive means that the margin of error is not so great as to make the indicator meaningless. When data are poor or difficult to obtain the margin of error can be greater than the difference the indicator attempts to measure (e.g. poverty to be reduced by 1% per year, with a Statistical Error of $\pm 2\%$).

Box 6 The sting is in the tail

Mozambique's ProAgri-Phase I (1999-2004) never translated its policy into indicators and targets. This of course made monitoring very difficult and little effort was made to establish such a system. ProAgri II (2004-2009) represents the agricultural pillar of Mozambique's PRSP and as such is monitored as part of the PRSP according to sector specific indicators. This monitoring process struggled with an indicator overload; the PRSP-II had identified 130 indicators, of which nine were from agriculture. This number was brought down to 40, with three from agriculture. However, all three indicators relate to outcomes, such as yield and land titles, but are less useful in evaluating the quality of ProAgri as a policy. There is an annual report by the Ministry of Agriculture that presents indicators on the ministry's performance but it remains difficult to establish a causality link between public investment/expenditure and changes at outcome and impact levels.

While there may have been an indicator overload in Mozambique, colleagues in Uganda struggled with the opposite: The PMA Secretariat set about the task of designing an M&E system with optimism; only to find that in the entire PMA document there is only one clear target (reduction of poverty to below 10% by 2017) and hardly any mention of M&E at all. The first attempt at creating an M&E framework had over 100 indicators; this was brought down to 89 and is at 34 at present. The design of the PMA M&E has tried to offer a framework for existing M&E systems, rather than becoming a parallel system itself. In general, it has been easier to obtain performance data, than data on outcomes or impact.

Zambia has been implementing SWAPs in its agricultural sector for a decade and is still struggling with the development of an MIS / M&E system. During this time agricultural policy always favoured growth while the constraints to growth largely remained the same these ten years. What changed was the strategy: Government attempted to stimulate growth first by public investment and service delivery, then by direct interventions to support to private sector, and presently by focussing on an enabling environment and a withdrawal of government to core-functions only. With respect to programme monitoring: Early MIS were too ambitious, collapsed or were abandoned. The quarterly Poverty Conferences and Sector Advisory Groups set up under the PRSP suffered from poor and ad-hoc reporting. Experience in Zambia has shown that MIS have to be simple, decentralised and provide information relevant for programme management. They further need incentive systems (such as quality-based payment for submitted reports) and stakeholder involvement.

5.4 Development partners

The role of donors came up throughout the discussion, both as part of the solution and as part of the problem. A summary of recommendations to donors is the following:

Donors should first **help strengthen domestic data collection and analysis systems** before embarking on any other parallel interventions. Under the new programme approach huge amounts of money have been devoted to public finance management systems, but so far very little to support institutions such as central offices of statistics. Rather than waiting for this long-haul process of strengthening domestic capacity, donors have engaged in ad-hoc data collections (as and when data were needed) which has resulted in an accumulation of successive but separate data-sets that can neither be compiled nor projected against a baseline over time.

Donors should **'buy into' common indicator frameworks** rather than tacking-on their own 'indicator sub-sets'. Common Performance Assessment Frameworks (PAF), either at national or sector level, are a good step in this direction, but these PAFs overshoot their goal when 'common' is translated into a 'cumulative' indicator overload. The regular measuring of a large number of indicators may not only tie-up or over-stretch capacities, but it may also represent an unacceptable level of transaction costs.

In order to be able to tailor support to national programmes, donors need a high degree of **decentralised decision making autonomy** to enable donor country teams to respond to country needs. In the absence of this, the size and form of support to country strategies tends to be determined more by donor headquarter policies and procedures, then by local country circumstances.

In the interest of transparency, predictability and effective planning, donors have to aim for a **synchronisation of donor fund flows to annual or multi-year budget cycles** of the country concerned. Irrespective of the funding modality (be it budget, basket or project support), only where financial pledges are made in time for these to be reflected in the budget, can policy priorities be effectively linked to available resources.

An oft quoted objective of programme support is the foreseen reduction of the transaction costs of delivering aid. Yet, there is scant evidence to support the claim that this is happening and information from the small number of studies that does address this issue tends to point in the direction of an increase in transaction costs. This could still be justified, if seen as a consequence of institutional and capacity development during the early stages of the programme with a clear reduction of transaction costs once systems are built and procedures are made more efficient. What seems to be needed is a **long-term assessment of transaction costs of the programme approach** to find out whether an initial peak is indeed followed by a later reduction and how this can be achieved.

6 What does an ideal PBA for a Productive Sector look like?

'Are donors flexible enough to make true ownership a reality?'

Don't expect a big-bang impact on rural poverty: You can do very little in five years'

In returning to the main question of the forum the challenges addressed are those related to the design and implementation of programmes in productive sectors, characterised by the economic use of natural resources. Thus, as is the case throughout the report, the agriculture and rural development sectors are looked at from the perspective of *shared challenges* and are not treated separately. A second reason for this is that the majority of programmes in these sectors cannot be clearly categorised as either an agricultural programme or a rural development programme since most contain elements of both.

The **scope of the programme** must be the outcome of a careful balance between the wish for a coherent programme and the need for a programme that is manageable. It is useful to bundle components that have a lot of synergy between them and that need to be implemented in tandem. However, trying to capture all into a single programme framework may lead to institutional log jam.

A more practical way forward may be to work with a set of complementary programmes, programme-pillars or **programme-components that have sufficient autonomy to be implemented independently and enough internal coherence to generate synergy**. Coordination between these different programmes could still come from a single policy framework.

If the above is ensured, then **programme implementation can be incremental**, whereby certain sub-components or certain geographical regions that have built up more momentum can be allowed to progress and be used as stepping stones in the process. If, on the contrary, one component or region cannot move forward as long as others stay behind, the programme as a whole will suffer.

With the shift from food security towards a production growth objective, most agricultural programmes now focus on the 'the economically active poor': But what about the rest of the rural poor? The possible **synergy between agriculture and rural development programmes should be explored** to see whether rural development strategies can support the poorest to become economically active, for them to then be able to access the opportunities offered under agriculture development initiatives.

Programmes in productive sectors can only move forward if the **policy and legislative frameworks are clear and consistent** about the roles of the different stakeholders. Often the policy refers to an important private sector role, but the legislation has not been adjusted and continues to make it difficult for private actors to actually assume their foreseen role.

The heterogeneous nature of productive sectors requires that policy needs to be flexible enough to allow for local tailor made solutions and thus should aim to offer **policy principles or guides** rather than trying to be exhaustive in terms of activities and interventions. Policy guides can then also be used to allow an assessment on whether interventions are 'policy compliant'.

Classical sector programmes are based on a single sector policy linked to a single budget framework. Whereas something as wide as rural development may conceivably be coordinated by a single policy framework (provided it is flexible enough), a single budget framework is often not feasible as activities are spread out over different government (and often also non governmental) institutions. What may be more feasible is to **anchor funding for the programme(s) in existing budget frameworks** in such a way that it still allows for a comprehensive overview of (government and donor) funds and thus still provides a much needed PBA planning tool in linking policy objectives to available resources.

A critical component of a productive sector PBA is the coordination between actors. Line or sector ministries that are made responsible for the coordination of such programmes have to be given **a clear coordinating mandate that can be enforced**. Where central ministries (Finance, Planning) are strong enough, (some of) the coordination mandate may better be placed at their level.

Well-written policies and lots of funding have often failed to translate in improved service provision, increased growth or reduced poverty. A crucial bottleneck is capacity. Capacity development in the context of programme approaches has often been biased towards (i) government (ii) national levels and (iii) public finance management. In productive sectors this bias is especially undesired as sub-national levels and non-state actors are of crucial importance to the programme's success. Productive sector PBAs therefore have **to support capacity development among state and non-state actors**.

Productive sector PBAs should make **judicious use of available funding modalities**: Budget support may be appropriate where it concerns government core functions but experience has shown that it is not an ideal way to channel support to stakeholders outside the government. Pools or baskets may be useful to reduce transaction costs by harmonising donor procedures. Their use will depend on local circumstances but can include capacity development, contracts to the private sector for outsourced tasks, support to public-private partnerships etc. Project support may be useful where non-state actors are concerned, for capacity development or to pilot certain interventions.

Important to programme implementation is the extent to which **fund flows are predictable**. On the government side this means a transparent public finance management system and limited in-year budget changes. On the donor side this means that **donor fund flows have to be aligned to the budget cycle**. Ideally, budget support is meant to do exactly that, but there are too many programmes that have suffered because budget support was either not pledged or disbursed on time for it to be integrated in the budget cycle. Therefore, possibly more important than the funding modality, is the extent to which donor procedures for disbursement can be adapted to the annual budget cycle.

In conclusion, for sectors like agriculture and rural development an insistence on the classical model of the sector programme or a dogmatic pursuit of budget support as if these are ends in themselves is counter-productive. The PBA concept and its founding principles of ownership, coherence, coordination and the strengthening of local capacity, provide a helpful guide to supporting these sectors. Yet, at the same time, the PBA principles leave enough flexibility to adapt that support to local circumstances.

In short, governments and donors will have to dare 'thinking out of the box' and come up with coordinated programmes of support that make optimum use of the available instruments by being tailored to specific country and sector needs.

7.1 At country, region and donor level

To consolidate the lessons of the forum and to start looking beyond, working groups got together on the last day of the forum to discuss and decide on next steps. There were four country groups (Burkina Faso, Kenya, Mozambique and Namibia); there were two regional groups (one Anglophone, one Francophone) and, lastly, there was a group of donors. Brief findings per group were:

Burkina Faso reported that they were encouraged by this forum to look for practical solutions to their problems. The direction in which they intend to go after the forum was as follows:

- The consultation process with partners and stakeholders regarding the rural development strategy has great scope for improvement. There is a lot to be done, but talking with others has helped identify in what way to proceed.
- A road map will be developed to assist the implementation process; it will look at how to achieve a staged, incremental progress of the various sub-programmes.
- Already, four main steps in the implementation plan can be identified on the basis of experiences elsewhere: (i) The strategy and programme need to be analysed (ii) the programme should be compared to other similar programmes in other countries (iii) the current programme-status has to be assessed, in terms of constraints and challenges. These then should become the basis for the road-map (iv) following this analysis of the programme in Burkina Faso and a comparison with programmes elsewhere, a decision can then be made on the orientation to overcome identified constraints.
- An assessment needs to be made of the available resources, not just financial, but especially also in terms of technical expertise. The technical expertise that is present in the country needs to be used in supporting the rural strategy.

Kenya resolved on a number of clear-cut activities:

- The ASCU, or Agriculture Sector Coordinating Unit, should be made compliant with PBA principles. The ASCU team promised to write a report reflecting this issue after coming back from the forum.
- Also, it was felt that the medium term programme framework for SRA (which is until 2009) should be based on PBA principles (more than it is at present). Again the ASCU team will take an advisory role in this process.
- Lastly, the Kenya team resolved to introduce the findings of the Africa Forum to the COMESA / CAADP meeting that is to be held in Kenya on 14th December 2006.

Mozambique identified the following main areas of action:

- Coordination needs to be strengthened, not by setting up new mechanisms, but by reviving existing mechanisms.

- Participation has to be improved; there is need to involve all stakeholders, in particular those from the private sector and from civil society. We need to establish clarity regarding their roles.
- Leadership is a critical ingredient; in particular the roles of the Ministry of Finance and of the Ministry of Planning and Development are crucial for improved coordination.
- The Mozambique team further proposed that the Africa Forum should invite representatives of central ministries like Finance and Planning in future years.
- Also, it was felt that country-teams participating in the forum should be better selected beforehand, so as to represent main stakeholders in the programme.
- The Mozambique team finally resolved to start a ProAgri discussion at home, with special emphasis on M&E needs.

The **Namibia** team recognised that they are newest to the PBA discussion. Their action points were:

- Since the PBA is a relatively new instrument in Namibia, there is a need to sensitize and mobilise stakeholders around this discussion.
- There is need for a feedback system, so that action is taken. Here, the team felt they should look especially at lessons from Southern Africa.
- The team intends to keep programme frameworks simple, but based on a clear division of roles and responsibilities between different actors.
- There is need for a Core Function Analysis, but this should be done hand-in-hand with networking with other countries where these kind of processes have already taken place, such as Ghana and Burkina Faso.
- Some of the components of the PBA are still not well understood. An example is basket-funding or common pool fund. In Namibia the idea was explored, but not followed. It is time that we look at other countries and see whether any successful experiences with such a modality were made and what lessons we can take from there.

The **Anglophone Regional team** came up with the following three key areas of action:

- The institutional framework of the Africa Forum has to be identified, consolidated and strengthened. First, awareness needs to be raised among regional actors on what the Africa Forum is and what it aims to achieve. Then linkages to NEPAD and to the various Regional Economic Communities (RECs) need to be explored. The Africa Forum itself should produce a communiqué regarding its institutional integration in the NEPAD/CAADP structure.
- With respect to the regional promotion of the PBA concept it is proposed that RECs should sensitise countries on what PBAs are and they should support those countries who are implementing PBAs, either financially, technically or politically. One way of doing this would be to facilitate study tours and exchange visits between countries, within or across regions, to learn from each other's PBAs.
- There is a lot of scope for improvement regarding trade issues: RECs should more actively sensitise countries about ongoing trade initiatives, such as EPAs, ESA and the Common Custom Agreement.

The **Francophone Regional team** offered the following four main proposals:

- Strengthening the linkages between the Africa Forum and regional organisations is necessary. A first step could be via participants at the present forum, who are at the same time part of such regional structures, to carry to main findings of the forum into their organisations.
- With respect to the harmonisation of agricultural policies across countries, good experiences can already be reported from West Africa where national strategies are already harmonised to a certain extent. However, there is scope to further improve this harmonisation, especially via structures like ECOWAS.
- The Africa Forum itself should become more active in lobbying and networking with regional structures like ECOWAS, COMESA and SADC, but also towards structures like the Customs and Monetary Union.
- A suggestion for future Africa Forums is to ensure a better representation from representatives from regional and sub-regional structures.

Finally, the **donor group** managed to find some common ground around two main issues; that of country ownership and of performance monitoring:

- Country ownership is not clearly defined: Is it government ownership? Or should it be seen as wider than that?
- Ownership of the national or sectoral policy is difficult to achieve and in part, donors themselves are to blame. For country ownership to develop, one needs patience. Involving relevant stakeholders is a complex and time-consuming process. Do donors have the time to wait for this? Do donors have the flexibility to respond to this? Unfortunately, the answer is no. But what to do? Even the donors could not come up with a suggestion here!
- M&E should be seen and be treated as a management tool of the country. Only in second place is it also a requirement for donors.
- Where donors need data, they should, in as much as possible, buy into existing M&E systems and procedures.
- Where donors need additional data or where country systems are weak, donors should first help build up such country systems and try (as much as possible) to avoid parallel systems.
- Where additional data are needed before country systems are able to deliver them, donors should harmonise their data needs and agree on a common set of indicators rather than allowing every donor to tack on its own indicators to performance monitoring process.

7.2 Linking up to other initiatives

A final session was a panel discussion on how the Africa Forum to other initiatives, platforms or networks. The general conclusion was that although the Africa Forum has made some inroads in linking up to donor platforms, much more needs to be done to effectively reach out to African networks. A number of useful suggestions were made regarding platforms that should be considered. In particular these included:

- The Regional Economic Committees (RECs); especially SADC, ECOWAS and COMESA;
- African financial institutions such as the Africa Development Bank;
- The network of African Ministers of Agriculture and Rural Development;
- The network of African Evaluator or AfrEA; this is an umbrella organisation for national M&E associations and networks in Africa and a resource for individuals in countries where national bodies do not exist (www.afrea.org). The 4th AfrEA Conference takes place in Niamey, Niger from 15 to 21 January 2007. Findings of the present Africa Forum will be presented at that meeting;
- The African Partnership Forum; this is a venue for information sharing between African countries and development partners. It is meant to support the implementation of NEPAD programmes in the context of the MDGs. Members of the forum are AU / NEPAD, African Heads of State and representatives from EC, UN, IMF, WB, WTO as well as OECD members;
- Development Centre; this is an OECD DAC structure (www.oecd.org/dev) that links OECD members to emerging and developing economies;
- Sahel and West Africa Club or SWAC (previously known as Club du Sahel) as a bridge between OECD member states and countries in West Africa.
- The Global Donor Platform for Rural Development (www.donorplatform.org); existing linkages with the Africa forum are to be strengthened. First, the GDPRD will feed the Africa Forum results into the World Development Report 2008 process; Second the Africa Forum 2006 report will go to all GDPRD members and; Third, the GDPRD will play a more active role in the preparation for the 11th Africa Forum (in 2007) by posting forum topics on their website and soliciting relevant best practices.
- The Learning Network on Programme Based Approaches (LENPA); Africa Forum results have already been presented to several LENPA conferences. In addition, the final report of the present forum will be sent to all members and put on the website which hosts the LENPA network (<http://web.acdi.cida.gc.ca/pbas>).
- Strategic Partnership with Africa or SPA (www.spa-psa.org) and in particular linkages with SPA's working groups on Sector Programmes and Budget Support should be intensified.

To be able to link effectively to these networks and initiatives, it was felt that two important conditions need to be fulfilled:

- i The Africa Forum needs to develop a clear and concise message that it wants to disseminate;
- ii The Africa Forum should set up a working group as part of the preparations for the next forum whose task it is to reach out to other platforms and networks, with particular emphasis to African initiatives. Representatives of such platforms should then be invited to participate in the next Africa Forum.

The representative from COMESA, Cris Muyunda, ended this session with the encouraging comment that the Africa Forum *can* lobby for agriculture, provided it builds the right linkages.

Annex 1 Overview Africa Forum 1997 – 2006

<p>10th Africa Forum</p> <p>Programme-Based Approaches in agriculture and rural development: the specific challenges of productive sectors. 30 October to 3 November 2006, Windhoek, Namibia</p> <p>GTZ – IFAD – SIDA – InWent – CTA</p>	<p>The forum explored the bottlenecks to a successful programme in a sector, where most of the necessary investment and initiative comes not from public but from private sources. How do we reconcile the challenges of decentralisation and coordination between sectors with an aid instrument that appears best suited to ‘single sector - single ministry’ conditions? By looking at common challenges in areas like private sector participation, institutions & capacities and performance monitoring, the forum addressed the question: What does an ideal PBA for a productive sector look like?</p>
<p>9th Africa Forum</p> <p>Improving access to resources, services and markets: Agricultural Programmes as a comprehensive approach to rural poverty reduction? 19 to 23 September 2005, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso</p> <p>GTZ– EC – Swiss – InWent – CTA - IFAD</p>	<p>The concept of the Programme-Based Approach was discussed from the perspective of the farmers and their production system. By looking at the entire production process, the forum highlighted what agricultural programmes need to take into account and at what stage in the production process. It was agreed that for equitable rural growth to happen there is need for a complement of activities, focussing on different actors, both in the public and the private sector, both at national levels and below.</p>
<p>8th African Forum</p> <p>The Private Sector as a partner in the fight against poverty: Non-state actors in Agricultural Programmes. 6-10 September 2004, Nairobi, Kenya.</p> <p>GTZ – IFAD – InWent</p>	<p>The issue of “non-state actors in a PBA context” was explored in response to the growing recognition of the role of the private sector in poverty reduction. The forum looked at how the PBA may offer a framework in which private operators are supported, and what this means to the way donors operate. The role of the commercial producer was discussed and the commodity approach was brought back as a means to tackle production hurdles.</p>
<p>7th Africa Forum</p> <p>The Struggle for pro-poor growth: Linking national strategies to local priorities. 8-13 June 2003, Pretoria, South Africa.</p> <p>GTZ – CTA</p>	<p>In response to a concern over the re-centralising tendencies of nation-wide SWAps and PRSPs the forum discussed how to integrate local priorities into national programmes and how to ensure that resources reach lower levels and poor people. For the first time, the issue of trade was discussed and ways in which this may be better addressed by SWAps and PRSPs.</p>

<p>6th Africa Forum</p> <p>Sector Wide Approaches: Do they really help the poor? 13-16 Nov 2001, Accra, Ghana.</p> <p>GTZ – IFAD</p>	<p>The forum presented an overview of the SWAp and PRSP processes so far and tried to address the scope for sector programmes as implementation pillars of over-arching PRSPs. Special attention was given to experiences under SWAps of involving civil society in planning and implementation and to what extent these good and bad practices can act as lessons for PRSPs’.</p>
<p>5th Africa Forum</p> <p>Sector Wide Approaches: Still on course or heading for collapse? 13-17 Nov 2000 Harare, Zimbabwe.</p> <p>GTZ</p>	<p>Along with an accelerated rate of SP implementation across Africa, the disappointment with the actual results seemed to be growing. Based on an analysis of winners and losers of the SWAp process, special attention was given to how to make SWAps work better for non-state actors and at decentralised levels.</p>
<p>4th Africa Forum</p> <p>Participation in Sector Programmes. 20-23 Sep 1999, Lusaka, Zambia.</p> <p>GTZ – IFAD</p>	<p>The scope was expanded from a focus on agriculture to a focus on cross-sector operational challenges based on a realisation that many of the practical constraints to implementation (eg institutional reform, decentralisation) are not experienced by agricultural sector alone, but are common also in health and education.</p>
<p>3rd Africa Forum</p> <p>Training Workshop on Sector Programmes in Agriculture. 28 Sep– 1 Oct 1998, Harare, Zimbabwe.</p> <p>GTZ – WB</p>	<p>This workshop built on the capacity of practitioners with respect to implementing Agricultural SPs. Participants came from countries with ASIPs in progress and from countries where these were only at a planning stage in order to make optimum use of lessons learned.</p>
<p>2nd Africa Forum</p> <p>International Workshop on Agricultural Sector Investment Programmes. 12-14 Nov 1997, Lilongwe, Malawi. WB – GTZ</p>	<p>This meeting focussed on the institutional framework and institutional reforms as part of the ASIP process. Stakeholder participation was addressed and the majority of participants were from ASIP implementing countries.</p>
<p>1st Africa Forum</p> <p>International Workshop on Sector Programmes in Agriculture. 12-14 Feb 1997, Lusaka, Zambia.</p> <p>WB – IFAD – GTZ</p>	<p>This was the first international meeting on ASIPs held in sub-Saharan Africa. Most of the discussion revolved around definitions of SPs and required pre-conditions. The meeting stressed the need for further networking and thus provided the impetus for the subsequent annual event.</p>

Annex 2 Programme of the 10th Africa Forum, Namibia, 2006

MONDAY 30 October		
Registration	08:00	
Opening Ceremony	Master of Ceremony: Kahijoro Kahuure, Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry, Namibia	
Cultural group	08.15	
A word of welcome	08:30	Honourable Jerry Ekandjo, Minister of Lands and Resettlement, Namibia
Official opening of the 10 th Africa Forum	09:00	Right Honourable Nahas Angula, Prime Minister of the Republic of Namibia
A vote of thanks	08:45	Honourable Nickey Iyambo, Minister of Agriculture, Water and Forestry, Namibia
Photo call	09.45	
Tea / coffee	10:00	
Introduction		
Keynote Address: What can Africa learn from Africa?	10:30	Joseph Diescho, Leadership and Management consultant, South Africa
The Africa Forum: past, present and future	11:10	Peter Conze, Director General Africa Department, GTZ, Germany
Introduction to the forum and framework for discussions	11:30	Moderators
From Projects to Programmes: Old wine in new bottles or a fresh chance for development?	12:00	Desiree Dietvorst, consultant, Namibia
Lunch	13:00	
New directions for agriculture and rural development		
The Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme	14:00	Cris Muyunda, Economic Growth Deputy Team Leader of COMESA
The Paris Declaration and its implications for Rural Development	14:30	Michael Brüntrup, German Development Institute, Germany
The Global Donor Platform for Rural Development: supporting the World Development Report 2008	15:00	Claudia Kraemer, BMZ / Global Donor Platform for Rural Development Secretariat
Tea / coffee	15:30	
Taking stock		
EC Rural Development Support: experiences and challenges from Uganda	16:00	Reint Bakema, EC Delegation, Uganda
SWAPs for Agriculture and Rural Development: How to move the agenda forward?	16:30	Lidia Cabral, Overseas Development Institute, London
Cocktail reception	19:00	Drinks and finger food

Taking ownership of development: How true leaders can move mountains	08:30	Joseph Diescho, Leadership and Management consultant, South Africa
What's different in Agriculture and Rural Development?		
Sector Programmes in Rural Development: A contradiction in terms or a promising approach?	09:30	Desiree Dietvorst, consultant, Namibia
IFAD's position towards SWAPs in Agriculture and Rural Development and its implementation in Mozambique	10:00	Custodio Mucavele IFAD Country Officer and representative of the Eastern and Southern Africa Division, Mozambique
Tea / Coffee	10:30	
Experiences with Financial Cooperation in support of PBAs in Productive Sectors in a range of African countries	11:00	Christoph Kessler, Head of Agriculture and Natural Resources Division Africa, KfW (German Development Bank), Frankfurt, Germany
Enabling private investment in agriculture		
What does an enabling environment for agriculture look like?	11:30	Alex Rwego, Manager Uganda Commodity Exchange, Uganda
Reform needs for the creation of an enabling environment for private investment	12:00	Lancina Ki, Director General of Private Sector Promotion, Ministry of Commerce; Trade and Manufacture, Burkina Faso
Round Table discussion	12:30	
Lunch	13:00	
Supporting the private sector		
Main points from Africa Forum in Nairobi (2004)	14:00	Philip Karuri, Nairobi, Kenya
Ghana's Private Sector Development Strategy: A Programme Based Approach	14:30	Mavis MacCarthy, Coordinator Private Sector Development Support Programme, Ministry of Private Sector Development, Ghana
Organizing support to the private agricultural sector: the role of government and the role of financial and technical assistance	15:00	Simone Zoundi, General Director of the Société d'Exploitation des Produits Agricoles (SODEPAL), Burkina Faso
Tea / coffee	15:30	
Challenges in the provision of agricultural extension services in Kenya: an evolution from public to public-private partnership	16:00	F.K. Kamau, Deputy Director Extension Services, Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries, Kenya
Round Table discussion	16:30	

Field trips

Namibia is a country with unique challenges and opportunities. By setting aside a full day for field trips, the forum organisers hope to allow participants the opportunity to familiarise with conditions under which rural development is pursued. Participants can choose from one out of the following tours that are being organised.

1. Urban resource management

08.30-09.00	Introduction on urban land tenure
09.00-13.00	Visit of two Shack Dwellers Sites (NHAG)
13.00-14.00	Lunch Break (lunch packets)
14.00-16.30	Waste Water Recycling, Windhoek (CoW)
16.30-18.30	Penduca Women's training center: Guided Tour and light dinner

2. Research and training in commercial agriculture

08.30-13.00	Visit Neudamm Agricultural College: Guided tour on farm and college
13.00-14.00	Lunch break (Farm Kitchen)
14.00-16.30	Karakul farming: Discussion with communal and commercial farmers at AGRA, have a look at pelts
16.30-18.30	Craft Center: Have a look at Namibian Craft, light dinner at Craft café

3. Park Management and Trophy Hunting

08:30-10:30	Game Drive in Daan Viljoen Game Park and Visit of the Resort
10:30-12:30	Presentation and discussion on Park Management in Namibia (MET: Parks and Wildlife Management)
12:30-14:30	Lunch: Traditional Braai (organized by Namibian Wildlife Resorts, NWR)
15:30-17:30	Visit of NYATI Wildlife Art Taxidermy Studio: Presentation on Trophy Hunting in Namibia
18:00	Dinner at Joe's Beerhouse

4. Water management

08.30-09.00	Introduction: Kuiseb Water Basin Management
09.00-11.30	Travel to Farm Harmony incl. various stop-overs along the Kuiseb basin
11.45-13.00	Welcome and Discussion about Gobabeb and WADE projects at Farm Harmony
13.00-14.00	Light Lunch at Farm Hochland Nest
14.00-16.30	Water demand and resource management – discussion and exchange of participants' own experiences
16.30-20.00	Sundowner and light dinner at Farm Hochland Nest

5. Land surveying, registration and valuation

08.30-09.00	Introduction: Land registration in Namibia
09.00-11.30	Visit Deeds Office, Survey and Mapping Office, Ministry of Lands and Resettlement, Windhoek: "Live presentation"
11.30-16.00	Departure: Rehoboth Deeds Office
16.30-19.00	Lake Oanob Resort: Boat tour and traditional braai

Participants can register during the first two days of the Forum. Participation in field trips is included in the Forum package.

THURSDAY 2 November

Main points from the Africa Forum in Pretoria (2003)	08:00	Lena Otoo, Ghana
Institutions and capacities		
Coordinating the Rural Development Strategy in Niger: successes, challenges and recommendations	08:30	Zeïnabou Maïkorema, Executive Secretary of the Rural Development Strategy, Niger
Experiences with the coordination of a the multi-sectoral Programme for the Modernisation of Agriculture in Uganda	08:50	Carol Kego Laker, Programme Officer, PMA Secretariat, Uganda
Inter- and intra sectoral coordination in Burkina Faso in the agriculture and the rural development sector	09:10	Nabyouré Ouédraogo, Coordination Secretariat for the Agricultural Sector Programme and the Rural Development Strategy, Burkina Faso
Institutional building and capacity needs: an assessment of the Agriculture Sector Coordinating Unit in Kenya	09:30	Simon Muhindi Agriculture Sector Coordinating Unit, Kenya
Round table discussion	09:50	
Tea / coffee	10:30	
Performance monitoring		
Main points from the Africa Forum in Ouagadougou (2005)		Ousmane Djibo, Burkina Faso
Performance and impact monitoring in Agriculture Sector Programmes; the case of Mozambique	11:00	Marcelo Chaquisse, Head of Planning and Dulce Chilundo, Head of MIS department, Ministry of Agriculture, Mozambique
Ten years after: A review of programme-based approaches in Zambia's Agricultural Sector	11:20	Klaus Droppelmann, Agriculture Consultative Forum, Zambia
Monitoring a cross-sectoral agriculture development framework: the case of Uganda's Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA)	11:50	Tom Kakuba, Director PMA Secretariat, Uganda
Round table discussion	12:10	
Lunch	13:00	

Open Space		
Brief feedback from the field trips	14:00	
Parallel presentations	15:00	<i>Includes tea / coffee</i>
Politics in policy reform; experiences with parliamentary committees and the reform of Kenya's agricultural legislation	Gem Argwings-Kodhek, Teamleader Working Group on Legislation, Agriculture Sector Coordinating Unit, Kenya	
Strengthening the delivery system for farm inputs to smallholder farmers; results from Malawi, Kenya and Zimbabwe	Caleb Wangia, East Africa Regional Director, CNFA / AGMARK, Kenya	
Supporting rural development in a fragile environment: Towards an NGO based PBA	Jean Lumbala, Democratic Republic of Congo	
Regional and national Forestry Sector Programmes; a review of experiences from the Congo Basin Region	Claus Michael Falkenberg, GTZ, Cameroon	
Country Pilot Partnership Project on Integrated Sustainable Land Management	Teofilus Nghitila, Director Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Namibia	
The role of the World Bank in supporting private irrigation initiatives	Jules Dékrin Traoré, Président 'Association des Professionnelles de 'Irrigation Privée' (APIPAC), Burkina Faso	
The role of associations in sector reform: An organisational analysis of the Kenya National Federation of Agricultural Producers (KENFAP)	Jane Tum, Kenya National Federation of Agricultural Producers (KENFAP), Kenya	
A response to the Millennium Challenge Account	Kwame Amezah, Ghana	
International trade negotiations; the case of cotton in West and Central Africa	Léonidas Hitimane, Secrétariat du Club du Sahel et de l'Afrique de l'Ouest, OCDE (OECD)	
The ideal PBA for productive sectors		
Are we any nearer to answering where we want to go and how we can get there?	17:00	Moderators
<i>Africa Forum Anniversary Party</i>	19:00	

Forum Findings		
A presentation of the forum framework: an ideal PBA for Productive Sectors	08:30	Moderators
Review, discussions and additions to the framework	09:00	Participants
What can each of us do?		
Implications at country level Implications at programme level Implications at donor level	10:00	Working Groups (parallel, <i>includes tea/coffee</i>)
Presentation Working Groups	11:00	Working Groups and moderators
Linking up to other networks and initiatives		
Who's Who? An institutional mapping exercise to help us find our role and place	12:00	With inputs by: Africa Forum, NEPAD, AU, African Development Bank, Global Donor Platform Rural Development, SPA, LENPA etc
Lunch	13:00	
Evaluation		
Filling out evaluation forms	14:00	Participants
What did we do well? Where can we do better?	14:20	Plenary evaluation
Tea / Coffee	15:00	
Closing Ceremony		
Thank you all!	15:30	Reimund Hoffmann and Albert Engel, SNRD
Concluding speech by a participant	16:00	
Official Closing of the 10 th Africa Forum in Windhoek	16:30	Nashilongo Shivute, Deputy Permanent Secretary Ministry of Lands and Resettlement, Namibia

Annex 3 List of participants

1. Abusah, Lambert Doe Delanyo
Ministry of Food and Agriculture
Assistant Director
Ghana
doeabusah@yahoo.com
2. Achayo, Emmanuel
Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives
Director for Policy and Planning
Tanzania
emmanuel.achayo@kilimo.go.tz
3. Adamou, Zada
LUCOP-GTZ
Adjoint Coordinator / Coordinateur adjoint
Niger
adamou.zada@gtz.de
4. Adu-Gyamfi, Kwabena
Afrique Link Ltd.
Ghana
ka-g@idngh.com
5. Agenbach, Yanka
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Agricultural Extension Officer Hardap Region
Namibia
agenbachy@mawrd.gov.na
6. Albert, Helmut
GTZ OE 45 Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Project Manager
Germany
helmut.albert@gtz.de
7. Amezah, Kwame Agbenyega
Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MOFA)
Director of Agric.Extension Services Ghana
Ghana
kamezah@hotmail.com
8. Antindi, Berfine N.
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Chief Agricultural Extension Officer
Namibia
caeorun@mweb.com.na
9. Asuming-Brempong, Samuel
University of Ghana
Senior Lecturer
Ghana
samsum@ug.edu.gh
10. Argwings-Kodhek, Gem
ASCU Ministry of Agriculture
Advisor
Kenya
gemaqx@gmail.com
11. Auino, Erastus
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
CAEO
Namibia
extomaheke@iway.na
12. Ausiko, Betty
Namibia
13. Ausiku, Petrus
Neudamm Agricultural College
Agricultural Training Officer
Namibia
pausiko@unam.na
14. Avis, Marysia
GTZ
Namibia
marysia.avis@gtz.de
15. Bakema, Reint
European Commission Delegation to Uganda
Attaché
Uganda
reint.bakema@ec.europa.eu
16. Becker, Achim
Consultant
Namibia
jb.becker@web.de
17. Beukes, Dana D.
Ministry of Lands and Resettlement
Registrar of Deeds
Namibia
dbeukes@mlrr.gov.na
18. Boateng-Siriboe, Adelaide
Ministry of Food and Agriculture
Acting Director
Ghana
absiriboe@yahoo.co.uk
19. Botes, André
Green Scheme
Consultant
Namibia
andrebotest@greenscheme.org.na
20. Boulan, Cédric
Ambassade de France
Conseiller du Secrétaire Exécutif
Niger
at-sdr@intnet.ne; cedricboulan@yahoo.fr
21. Braun-Yao, Michaela
PACT/GTZ

Coordinatrice Coop. Allemande
Agriculture/GRN, Mali
michaela.yao@gtz-pact.org

22. Bremer, Frank
GTZ
Country Director
Ivory Coast
Frank.Bremer@gtz.de

23. Brüntrup, Michael
German Development Institute
Senior Research Fellow
Germany
michael.bruentrup@die-gdi.de

24. Cabral, Lidia
Overseas Development Institute
Research Officer
UK
l.cabral@odi.org.uk

25. Carmichael, Beverly
Canadian International Development Agency
(CIDA), Mozambique Programme
Development Officer
Canada
beverly_carmichael@acdi-cida.gc.ca

26. Cervino, Paolo
Lux-Development Regional Office for Namibia
and South Africa
Regional Director
Luxemburg
paolo.cervino@luxdev.lu

27. Chaquisse, Marcello
Ministry of Agriculture
Head of Planning
Mozambique
mchaquisse@map.gov.mz

28. Chele, Anne
Ministry of Agriculture Kenya
Senior Assistant Director of Agriculture
Kenya
anne_chele@yahoo.com;
achele@kilimo.go.ke

29. Chilundo, Dulce
Ministry of Agriculture
Head of MIS Dept.
Mozambique
dchilundo@map.gov.mz

30. Chindebvu, Kalinde
National Planning Commission Secretariat -
RPRP
TA Monitoring/Evaluation
Namibia
kchindebvu@npc.gov.na

31. Chizuyuka, Richard

Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
Permanent Secretary, Zambia
secretaryps@maff.gov.zm

32. Christiansen, Thomas
CIM/Polytechnic of Namibia
Integrated CIM expert at the Department of
Land Management
Namibia
tchristiansen@polytechnic.edu.na

33. Coetzee, Sakkie
Namibian Agricultural Union
Executive Manager
Namibia
sakkie@agrinamibia.com.na

34. Compaoré, Albert
Section de la Coopération au Développement de
l'Ambassade de Suede au Burkina Faso
Chargé de Programme National Ressources
naturelles et Recherche scientifique
Burkina Faso
albert.compaore@sida.se

35. Conze, Peter
GTZ HQ
Director General, Africa Dept.
Germany
peter.conze@gtz.de; Karin.Becker@gtz.de

36. Dagano, Moussa Joseph
FEPPASI - Federation provinciale des
professionnelle Agricole de la sissili
Agronomist/Agriculteur
Burkina Faso
sissilivalakou@fasonet.bf; damimif@yahoo.fr

37. Dannson, Angela Mercy
Ministry of Food and Agriculture
Assistant Director
Ghana
angeladannson@yahoo.com

38. Danso, Salome Manubea
Ministry of Food and Agriculture
Deputy Director
Ghana
salomeamadanso@yahoo.co.uk

39. David e Silva, Margarida
FAO
Assistant to the FAO Representative
Mozambique
margarida.davidesilva@fao.org

40. de Figueiredo, Pedro
Embassy of Sweden/SIDA
1st Secretary Agric.+Nat.Ressources
Zambia
pedro.defigueiredo@sida.se

41. De Wet, Stefan

Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Director Resouce Management, Namibia
wets@mawrd.gov.na

42. Demas, Fanuel
Ministry of Environment and Tourism
Deputy Director
Namibia
fdemas@mweb.com.na

43. Demas, Sylvia
National Planning Commission Secretariat -
RPRP
Namibia
kchindebvuu@npc.gov.na

44. Desjardins, René
CIDA Program Support Team
Agriculture Specialist
Mozambique
rene@cida-psu.com

45. Diamoutene, Alassame Zie
Ministry for Agriculture
Director of Cabinet
Ivory Coast
diamoutene@hotmail.com

46. Diehl, Lothar
GTZ 03.2153.9-001.00
Programme Adviser
Ghana
lothar.diehl@gtz.de

47. Diescho, Joseph
Consultant
South Africa
josephdiescho@lantic.net

48. Dietvorst, Desiree
Rural Development
Namibia
dd@salamandernet.de

49. Diop, Babacar
Bureau d'appui à la Cooperation Canadienne
Private Sector Adviser/Conseiller Secteur
Prive & Ressources Naturelles
Senegal
babacar_diop@bacdi-senegal.org

50. Djibo, Ousmane
GTZ 03.2228.9-001.00
Technical Consultant for Finances/Conceiller
Technique en Financement
Burkina Faso
Ousmane.Djibo@gtz.de

51. Droppelmann, Klaus
Agric.Consultative Forum
Monitoring & Evaluation
Zambia
klaus@coppernet.zm; acfs@zamnet.zm

52. Ejlertsen, Maria
Agricultural Sector Programme Support
(ASPS), Danida/Government of Kenya
Junior Professionel Officer (JPO)
Kenya
jpo@asps-ke.org

53. Ekandjo, Jerry
Ministry of Lands and Resettlement
Minister
Namibia

54. Elocho Benga, Michel
Ministère du Développement Rural
Director of Cabinet & Adjoint of the
Minister/Directeur de Cabinet Adjoint de
Ministre
Congo
michaelbenga@yahoo.fr

55. Embundile, Martin
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
CAEO
Namibia
extohang@iway.na

56. Engel, Albert
GTZ 00.2063.6-001.00
Namibia
Albert.Engel@gtz.de

57. Essel, Daniel Bentum
Ministry of Food and Agriculture
Assistant Director
Ghana
dannielessel@yahoo.com

58. Falkenberg, Claus-Michael
COMIFAC Support Project 03.2454.1-001.00
Advisor to the COMIFAC
Kamerun
Claus-Michael.Falkenberg@gtz.de

59. Geiger, Eckart
InWEnt
Senior Project Manager
Germany
eckart.geiger@inwent.org

60. Glaeser, Anton
DED
Programme Manager Rural Development
Kenya
anton.glaeser@ded.de

61. Gombwa, Renford
Livestock Development Trust
Animal Production and Health Manager
Zambia
ren_gombwa@yahoo.co.uk

62. Gouesse, Aïdara
Office Ivoirien des Parcs et Réserves
General Director
Ivory Coast
oipr@avisoci
63. Guigma, Salif
Permanent Secretariat of Agric.
Sector, SP/CCPSA
Chef de la Division Elaboration des Politiques
Burkina Faso
salifg@yahoo.fr
64. Haccandy, Yao Alexis
Ministère de l'Agriculture
Director of Planning Department
Ivory Coast
haccandy@yahoo.fr
65. Hager, Claus
NAU
Manager
Namibia
claus@agrinamibia.com.na
66. Hailwa, Joseph
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Director of Forestry
Namibia
hailwaj@mwr.gov.na
67. Handunge, Emily
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
CAEO
Namibia
extopuwo@iway.na
68. Herlant, Patrick
European Commission
Quality Support Officer AIDCO/EG
Belgium
Patrick.Herlant@ec.europa.eu
69. Heyns, Pieter
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Under Secretary
Namibia
heyns@mawrd.gov.na
70. Hitimana, Leonidas
OECD
Agricultural Economist
France
leonidas.hitimana@oecd.org
71. Höffler, Heike
GTZ 04.2061.2-001.00
Programme Adviser
Kenya
Heike.Hoeffler@gtz.de
72. Hoffmann, Reimund
Promotion of Private Sector Development in
Agriculture
Programme Leader
Kenya
reimund.hoffmann@gtz.de
73. Ipinge, Sheehamandje
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Acting Director
Namibia
ipinges@mawrd.gov.na
74. Iiyambo, J.M.
Namibia
75. Imakando, M.
Livestock Development Trust
Director
Zambia
m_imakando@yahoo.com
76. Imalwa, V.N.
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Deputy Director/Extension Services
Namibia
extncdir@iway.na
77. Iyambo, Nicki
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Minister
Namibia
78. Izaaks, Albert
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Control Agric. Extension Technician
Namibia
izaaksa@mawrd.gov.na
79. Jourbert, Frans
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Chief Veterinarian
Namibia
joubertf@mawrd.gov.na
80. Kaheka, Ronn M
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Regional Head
Namibia
rwsoshco@africaonline.com.na
81. Kahuure, Kahijoro
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Permanent Secretary
Namibia
kahuurek@mawrd.gov.na
82. Kakuba, Tom
PMA Secrétariat MAAIF
Ag. Director/Program Officer - M&E
Uganda
monitoring@pma.go.ug;
tomkakuba@yahoo.com

83. Kalle, Christiane
GTZ
Country Director
Namibia
christiane.kalle@gtz.de
84. Kamau, Felix K.
Ministry of Livestock & Fisheries Development
Deputy Director/Extension Services
Kenya
kamaufelix60@yahoo.com
85. Kambinda, Ndunda Mildred
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Dep. Director
Namibia
kambindam@mawrd.gov.na
86. Kambonde, L
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Chief Agricultural Extension Technician
Namibia
87. Kandjii, S.H.
Namibia
88. Kanguatjivi, Eugene
NSU - MAWF
Extension Officer
Namibia
kanguatjivie@mawrd.gov.na
89. Karabo, Ernestus
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Otjiwarango
Namibia
nwsdjoz@africaonline.L23com.na
90. Karuri, Philip
GTZ PSDA
Programme Manager
Kenya
p.karuri@gtzpsda.co.ke
91. Kasheeta, Sophia
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Dep. Director
Namibia
kasheeta@mawrd.gov.na
92. Kashululu, Rose-Mary Popyemi
Ministry of Lands & Resettlement
Deputy Director North-North West Region
Namibia
kashululu@yahoo.com
93. Kasita, Maria
Ministry of Lands and Resettlement
Deputy Director
Namibia
mkasita@hotmail.com
94. Kavari, Tjipekapora
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Agric.Economist
Namibia
kavarit@mawrd.gov.na
95. Keboneilwe, Daphne
Ministry of Agriculture
Principal Rural Sociologist
Botswana
dkeboneilwe@gov.bw
96. Kessler, Christoph
KFW
Head of Agriculture and Natural Ressources
Division Africa
Germany
christoph.kessler@kfw.de
97. Ki, Lancina
Ministère du Commerce de la Promotion de
l'Enterprise et de l'Artisanat (MCPEA)
General Director Promotion of the Private
Sector/Directeur Général de la Promotion du
Secteur Privé
Burkina Faso
lancinaki@yahoo.fr
98. Kihu, Mwai
Agricultural Business Development (ABD)
Board Member, Chairman Finance &
Administration Committee
Kenya
mwaikihu@fechim.com
99. Kimenyi, Elizabeth
Ministry of Agriculture
Deputy Director of Agriculture
Kenya
ewkimenyi@yahoo.com
100. Kirk, Michael
Philipps Universität Marburg
Professor
Germany
kirk@wiwi.uni-marburg.de
101. Kirsch-Jung, Karl-Peter
GTZ-ProGRN
Programme Director
Mauretania
Karl-Peter.Kirsch-Jung@gtz.de
102. Kraemer, Claudia
BMZ
Deputy Head of Division Rural Development,
Global Food Security
Germany
claudia.kraemer@bmz.bund.de

103. Kressirer, Robert
GTZ OE 4503
Head Rural Development Section
Germany
Robert.Kressirer@gtz.de
104. Kroll, Witta
SNRD
Secretariat SNRD
Namibia
Witta.Kroll@gtz.de
105. Kumwenda, Ian
Malawi Agriculture Sector Investment
Programme (MASIP)
Coordinator
Malawi
masip@malawi.net
106. Laker, Caroline Kego
PMA Secrétariat MAAIF
Social Development Specialist
Uganda
socdev@pma.go.ug; kegolaker@yahoo.co.uk
107. Liehoun, Christine
Ministère de l'Environnement et du Cadre de
Vie
Directrice des Etudes et de la Planification
Burkina Faso
mcliehoun@yahoo.fr
108. Losseau, Albert
European Commission Delegation
Del Mozambique Food Security
Mozambique
albert.losseau@ec.europa.eu
109. Louwrens, Annamié
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Chief Agricultural Extension Officer Karas
Region
Namibia
keetm@iway.na
110. Lumbala, Jean
Butoke
President et coordinateur de la Sécurité
Alimentaire et Nutrition
Congo
lumbulajean@yahoo.com
111. Lwana, Vathiswa
GTZ-Ruliv
Local Facilitator
South Africa
vathiswa@ruliv.org.za
112. Lyimo, Christine
Ministry of Livestock Development
Ag Assistant Director, Training
Tanzania
tinalyimo@yahoo.co.uk
113. MacCarthy, Mavis
MCM Associates
Executive Director
Ghana
MAMacCarthy@att.net
114. Magagula, Charles
GTZ / MRDP
Partner
South Africa
cmagagula@mpg.gov.za
115. Magwedere, Kudakwashe
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Veterinarian/Food law enforcement
Namibia
gwedas@yahoo.co.uk
116. Maikorema, Zeinabou Badéri
Ministère Development Agric. - Strategie Dev.
Rural Niger
Secrétaire Exécutif SDR
Niger
se_sdr@intnet.ne
117. Malumani, John
Ministry of Lands and Resettlement
Namibia
118. Mamadou Abdou Gaoh, Sani
LUCOP-GTZ
Unit Coordinator/Coordonnateur Unite Suivi-
Evaluation Communication
Niger
mamadou.sani@gtz.de
119. Manda, Matthews
Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
Deputy Director
Malawi
imprestadmin@fidpmw.org
120. Martin, Angula Lyno
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Chief Agricultural Extension Officer
Namibia
martina@mawrd.gov.na
121. Mazibuko, Mkhalelwa
GTZ-Ruliv
Programme Manager Rural Development
South Africa
mk@ruliv.org.za

122. Mbaisa, Mclesia
Ministry of Lands and Resettlement
Principal Deeds Examiner
Namibia
mbaisao7649@itc.na
123. Menjengua, Manfred
MRLGHRD
Deputy Director Rural Development Planning
Namibia
mmenjengua@mrlgh.gov.na
124. Mleche, Win
Regional Secretarat, Mtwara
Livestock Adviser
Tanzania
wchmleche2@yahoo.co.uk
125. Mohr, Ulrich
GTZ OE 4500
Head of Division Agriculture, Fisheries, and Food
Germany
Ulrich.Mohr@gtz.de
126. Moosmann. Karl
DED
Sector Desk Officer Rural Development
Germany
karl.moosmann@ded.de
127. Morupisi, Carter Nkatla
Ministry of Agriculture Botswana
Deputy Permanent Secretary
Botswana
nmorupisi@gov.bw
128. Msiska, Tomaida
European Commission
Development Diversification and STABEX
Malawi
tomaida.msiska@cec.eu.int;
Tomaida.smiska@ec.europa.eu
129. Mucavele, Custodio
IFAD
Country Officer Mozambique
Mozambique
Custodio.Mucavel@fao.org
130. Mudau, Khathutshelo
GTZ Limpopo Departure of Agriculture
Manager Partnership Division
South Africa
mudauks@yahoo.com
131. Muhindi, Simon
Ministry of Agriculture
Programme Officer Agriculture Sector
Coordination Unit
Kenya
sbarasam@yahoo.com
132. Mushabati, Matthew Mukutwa
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Chief Agricultural Extension Officer
Namibia
katagric@iway.na
133. Muttota, Loide
Namibia
134. Muyunda, Cris
COMESA
Senior Adviser / Agriculture
Zambia
cmuyunda@comesa.int
135. Nantanga, LI
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
CAEO
Namibia
nantangal@mawrd.gov.na
136. Naudili, Vicky N.
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Chief Agricultural Extension Officer
Namibia
extoschon@iway.na
137. Ndala, Eric
Ministry of Lands and Resettlement
Namibia
138. Nehemia, Abraham
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Diretor
Namibia
nehemiaa@awrd.gov.na
139. Ngallo, Grace J. T.
Ministry of Planning, Economy & Empowerment
Assistant Director
Tanzania
ngallo4@yahoo.com
140. Nghipondoka, Veronica Kukengwa
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Chief Agricultural Extension Technician
Namibia
extotjiw@iway.na
141. Nghitila, Teofilus
Ministry of Environment and Tourism
Namibia
142. Nicolau, Patrícia
FAO
Program Officer for Rural Development and Natural Resources
Mozambique
patricia.nicolau@fao.org

143. Njeru, D.K.
Ministry of Agriculture
Director of Agriculture Extension
Kenya
mbaki@wanadu.com
144. Njiwa, Daniel
MASIP
Economist
Malawi
masip@malawi.net
145. Nkana, Fiskani
Ministry of Agriculture
Economist
Malawi
fiskaninkana@yahoo.co.uk
146. Nsanzya, Kizito
GTZ-Ruliv
Information and Knowledge Manager
South Africa
kizito@ruliv.org.za
147. Nyenza, Aloysius G.T.
Ministry of Water
Director of Policy & Planning
Tanzania
dppmaji@raha.com
148. Odhiambo, Frederick
Ministry of Cooperative Development and
Marketing
Commissioner for Cooperative Development
Kenya
fanuelodjambo@hotmail.com
149. Okafor, Uzo
Namibia
150. Orina, Margaret
GTZ PSDA
Programme Officer
Kenya
m.orina@gtzpsda.co.ke
151. Orphal, Jana
GTZ, Sector Project Land Management
Project Officer
Germany
jana.orphal@gtz.de
152. Otoo, Lena
Ministry of Food & Agriculture, PDMED
Assistant Director
Ghana
lena_otoo@yahoo.com
153. Ouattara, Sériba
Ministry of Trade
Burkina Faso
'seouatt@hotmail.com'
154. Ouédraogo, Charles Auguste
Ministère des Ressources Animales du
Burkina Faso
Chargé d'Etudes
Burkina Faso
charleoued@yahoo.fr
155. Ouédraogo, Jacob
PICOFA
National Coordinator/Coordonnateur National
Burkina Faso
jacobouedra@yahoo.fr; picofa@fasonet.bf
156. Ouédraogo, Nabyouré Ignace
Ministère de l'Agriculture de l'Hydraulique et
des Ressources SP/CPSA
Chargé d'Etudes
Burkina Faso
onisnaby@yahoo.fr
157. Parviainen, Tuulikki
Embassy of Finland
Counsellor
Namibia
tuulikki.parviainen@formin.fi
158. Petrus, Erich
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Agriculturist
Namibia
petruse@mawrd.gov.na
159. Pickardt, Tanja Thekla
GTZ 00.2063.6-001.00
Namibia
Tanja.Pickardt@gtz.de
160. Pietryk, Jim
Canadian International Development Agency
Senior Policy Advisor
Ghana
jim.pietryk@cidapsu.org
161. Pilgram, Klaus
GTZ
Senior Adviser
Germany
Klaus.Pilgran@gtz.de
162. Platt, Hendrik
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
C/Technician
Namibia
platt@mawrd.gov.na
163. Platt, Jan Johannes
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Control Agric. Technician
Namibia
plattj@mawrd.gov.na

164. Probst, Kirsten
GTZ
Namibia
kirsten.probst@gtz.de
165. Rabitsch, Maria-Waltraud
Austrian Development Agency (ADA)
Responsible for Poverty Reduction, Rural
Development, Decentralization
Austria
waltraud.rabitsch@ada.gv.at
166. Ramaru, Johannes Malose
GTZ-BASED/LDA
Manager
South Africa
ramarujm@agricho.norprov.gov.za;
mjramaru@yahoo.com
167. Rasmussen, Erling
Danida
Senior Policy Advisor
Kenya
saasps@asps-ke.org
168. Rassmann, Janna
GTZ
Intern
Namibia
Janna.Rassmann@gmx.net
169. Reinecke, Sabine
GTZ
Intern
Namibia
sabine_reinecke81@yahoo.de
170. Rigava, Mackay
Ministry of Lands & Resettlement
Acting Valuer General
Namibia
mrigava@namibia.com.na
171. Robert, Roxanne
Canadian International Development Agency
(CIDA)
2nd Secretary (Development)
Ghana
roxanne.robert@international.gc.ca
172. Rojahn, Harald
National Planning Commission Secretariat -
RPRP
Team Leader
Namibia
hrojahn@npc.gov.na
173. Rothkegel, Bernd
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Director Planning
Namibia
rothkegelb@mawrd.gov.na
174. Rumpf, Magaretha
Translator
Namibia
175. Rwego, Alex
Commodity Exchange
Manager
Uganda
alexkr@uce.co.ug
176. Sageus, Kintinu
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Assistant to PS
Namibia
177. Samute, Willie White
Ministry of Local Government and Rural
Development
Principal Secretary
Malawi
samutew@hotmail.com
178. Schaefer, Georg
GTZ Division 41, Economic Policy and
Employment
Head of working group on Programme-based
Approaches
Germany
Georg.Schaefer@gtz.de
179. Sckell, Stefan
German Embassy
Namibia
180. Sheehama, Erika Rita
Neudamm Agricultural College
Agricultural Training Officer
Namibia
esheehama@unam.na
181. Shivute, Nashilongo
Ministry of Lands and Resettlement
Under Secretary
Namibia
nkshivute@namibia.com.na
182. Some, Jules Marie
GTZ/PDA Agriculture Development
Programme
Adjoint Coordinator/Coordinateur Adjoint
Burkina Faso
jules.some@gtz.de
183. Spottiswoode, Cécile
Translator
South Africa
interpret@metaset.com
184. Sprung, Rolf
DED
Program Coordinator
Germany
rosrung@iway.na

185. Srofenyoh, Francis
Ministry of Food and Agriculture
Assistant Economist
Ghana
francis_srofenyoh@yahoo.com
186. Steenkamp, Johannes
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Director
Namibia
steenkampj@mawrd.gov.na
187. Thomas, Uuyuni Lyagwanithwa
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Agricultural Economist
Namibia
world_thomas@yahoo.com
188. Tjimune, Vehaka
NNFU
Executive Director
Namibia
tjimune@nnfu.org.na
189. Tjipueja, Harry
Ministry of Lands and Resettlement
Director Land Reform
Namibia
190. Tjिताura
Jeanetha
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Agricultural Economist
Namibia
tjिताuraj@mawrd.gov.na
191. Traéré, Jules Dékrin
APIPAC
Secrétaire Exécutif
Burkina Faso
jdtraore@yahoo.fr; apipac@fasonet.bf
192. Tsanigab, Salomon M
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Senior Agricultural xt. Officer
Namibia
extgroot@iway.na
193. Tsheehama, Franz
Ministry of Lands and Resettlement
PS
Namibia
194. Tum Chepchirchir, Jane
Kenya National Federation of Agricultural Producers
Programme Officer
Kenya
producers@kenfap.org
195. Ucham, Augustinus
Ministry of Lands and Resettlement
Acting Deputy Director
Namibia
196. Van de Loo, Antony
Royal Danish Embassy
Chargé de Programme Agriculture
Burkina Faso
antloo@um.dk
197. Van Uytvanck, Mark
European Commission Delegation
Attaché Rural Development
Namibia
mark.van-uytvanck@ec.europa.eu
198. Volkmann, Eckhard
Division for Agriculture, Fisheries and Food -
Agricultural Policy Adviser
Project Officer
Germany
Eckhard.Volkmann@gtz.de
199. von Krosig, Lydia
European Commission Delegation
Programme Officer - Rural Development
Namibia
lydia.von-krosigk@ec.europa.eu
200. Voordewind, Paul
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Chief Agricultural Extension Officer
Namibia
exthardap@iway.na
201. Walla, Kah
Moderator
Cameroon
strategs@yahoo.com
202. Wamoko, Jane
Danida-Agricultural Programme Support
(Danish Embassy)
Programme Officer
Kenya
janwam@um.dk
203. Wangia, Caleb
CNFA/AGMARK
E. Africa Regional Director
Kenya
cwangia@agmarkkenya.org
204. Zoundi Kafando, Simone
SODEPAL, FIAB, CES
Directrice Générale de SODEPAL, Présidente
der FIAB, Membre de CES
Burkina Faso
sodepal1@fasonet.bf

Annex 4 Description of Fieldtrips

1. Urban Resource Management

In the rapidly expanding urban areas, many poor people have no official rights to the land on which they have settled. Problems of uncertain land rights and of resource management in general on the edges of growing towns affect more than 100 000 families in Namibia why access to resources such as affordable land and water for the poorest and most disadvantaged sectors of society is needed, which is particularly precarious for land utilized for subsistence farming. The participants of the trip will be given insights to and first-hand information on the flexible land tenure system applied in Namibia by visiting two shack dwellers sites in Windhoek-Katutura and secondly on water management by a visit to the Windhoek Waste Water Treatment Plant

2. Research and Training in Commercial Agriculture

The two foreseen visits – to the Neudamm Agricultural College and AGRA – seek to provide the participants with relevant information on ongoing developments in agriculture, particularly on livestock farming, as well as on latest training techniques in Namibia.

Neudamm Agricultural College:

The College, approx. 40 km from the main UNAM campus in Windhoek, aims to promote sustainable agriculture and natural resources management in Namibia, through teaching, research and extension services to communal and commercial farming communities. Neudamm College – offering agricultural training for more than 50 years now – is renowned for its Karakul, Dorper, beef and horse breeding and its extensive farm for training, breeding and research.

Karakul Farming: AGRA

The AGRA Co-operative - one of the main forces in the farming and agricultural sectors in Namibia with more than 7 000 members and 18 outlets nationwide provides service to Namibia's farming, agriculture and consumer sectors. Participants will discuss with communal and commercial farmers of AGRA and have a look on its pelt sorting centre.

3. Park Management and Trophy Hunting

Approximately 13.8% of Namibia's land surface area is proclaimed as national parks and recreation areas. In addition, Namibia has established a strong community-based natural resource management programme (CBNRM) outside protected areas, which enables rural communities registered as conservancies to benefit from game and tourism.

The protected area system contributes significantly to rural development and the national tourism industry. In the past few years a significant increase in the value of wildlife-based industries could be witnessed, with trophy hunting being a key channel of marketing wildlife and a main source of income for communal conservancies.

During the excursion the Daan Viljoen Game Park, situated 25km outside of Windhoek, will be visited. Information on park management in Namibia will be provided by a representative from the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET). At lunchtime the participants are invited to a traditional Braai organized by the Namibian Wildlife Resorts. In the afternoon a visit to the NYATI Wildlife Art Taxidermy Studio in Windhoek will give an overview about trophy hunting in Namibia.

4. Water Management

Most regions in Namibia are facing high variability of available water: meaning drastic seasonal alterations of drought and flooding as surface water is almost only available periodically – with abundant volumes of water during the wet season, whereas fluctuations are assumed to even intensify under the influence of climatic change.

These circumstances in combination with typically high agricultural activities along water bodies throughout Namibia putting pressure on the resource underline the need for an integrated land and water management in basins and is thus of crucial importance to rural development.

In this manner the field trip seeks to provide its participants various information on and insights into the “Integrated Water Resource Management” concept applied in Namibia. Accordingly, to illustrate the potential and problems at different sites in Namibia, the planners have foreseen an in-depth discussion with the Kuiseb Basin Management Committee at farm Harmony.

5. Land surveying, registration, and valuation

Due to its long commercial history Namibia acquired a comparatively modern land registration system. At the moment the government is promoting the computerisation of this system. In this context the big challenge is to consider traditional land rights in communal areas as well.

The trip will provide the participants an introduction into the land registration system. It will lead to the Deeds Office Windhoek where a live demonstration of the Deeds registry will be given. Additionally the Departments of Land Valuation and Mapping will be visited.

Highlight of the day will be Deeds Office Rehoboth where in the past - inspired by an objectionable political system (Apartheid) - property rights could successfully be re-distributed.

Annex 5 Forum Evaluation

Evaluation 10th Africa Forum

1. Logistics

To what degree were you satisfied with:

	😊😊	😊	☹	☹☹			
	1	2	3	4	5	average	total no of answers
...the information about the Forum beforehand?	22	26	12	7	4	2.23	71
...the accommodation at Hotel Safari - Safari Court?	28	28	2		1	1.61	59
...the working environment?	36	28	4	1		1.57	69
...simultaneous translation services?	15	25	21	5		2.24	66

2. Flow of the Forum

To what extent...

	1	2	3	4	5	average	total no of answers
...was the structure of the programme clear?	14	43	13	2		2.04	72
...could you follow the sequences of topics?	17	38	15	2		2.03	72
...were you happy with the structure of "presentations - round table discussion - Q&A Plenary"?	23	23	19	6	1	2.15	72
...were you happy with the moderation?	40	29	1		1	1.49	71
...did you like the duration of the forum (5days)	22	34	7	2	4	2.01	69

3. Forum Methodology

To what extent did you benefit from:

	1	2	3	4	5	average	total no of answers
...presentations of resource persons?	16	38	13	4		2.07	71
...discussions around the tables?	16	33	19	3	1	2.17	72
...plenary questions and answer sessions?	8	29	28	5	1	2.46	71
...field trip?	31	26	5		2	1.69	64
...open space?	12	31	18	5	1	2.28	67
...elaboration of results?	7	30	24	8		2.48	69
...informal discussions?	21	38	9	2		1.89	70
...cocktail reception and social dinner?	29	27	4	2	1	1.71	63

4. To what degree were you satisfied with the topics?

	1	2	3	4	5	average	total no of answers
--	---	---	---	---	---	---------	---------------------

Overall Forum Topic							
1. Opening Ceremony	43	25	2	1		1.45	71
2. Introduction	33	33	2	1		1.58	69
3. New directions for Agriculture and Rural Development	15	41	14	1		2.01	71
4. Taking Stock	4	43	20	1		2.26	68
5. What's different in Agriculture and Rural Development?	10	35	21	3		2.25	69
6. Enabling private Investment in Agriculture	8	35	21	7		2.38	71
7. Supporting the Private Sector	10	29	27	4	1	2.39	71
8. Institutions and Capacities	10	33	25	3		2.30	71
9. Performance Monitoring	8	25	30	5	3	2.58	71

5. Expectations

	1	2	3	4	5	average	total no of answers
To what extent have your expectations been met concerning							
Broadening my theoretical knowledge around PBAs?	20	33	15	4		2.04	72
Getting to know practical tools of how to implement PBAs?	12	23	30	5	2	2.47	72
Meeting other people who have experience with PBAs?	22	30	17	2	1	2.03	72

Comments

- 26 more time for group discussions needed
- 20 too many presentations
- 13 too many topics, not enough time to reach at sufficient depth on the topics
- 11 better interpretation needed (from English into French)
- 9 include a free afternoon for participants to visit the town where the meeting is held
- 7 excellent organization
- 6 more analytical work is necessary, e.g. working groups with precise questions
- 5 leave space for result findings and conclusions, debated amongst participants
- 5 involve more implementers at the decentralized levels e.g. districts, local authorities to share experiences
- 5 open space: fewer topics or chance to participate in at least 2 presentations
- 5 more time for questions
- 5 presentations were too theoretical
- 4 methodology was very good (animation, plenary, RT discussion)
- 4 more time for participants to familiarize with the host country
- 4 invite regional bodies (SADC, COMESA, African Union, NEPAD...)
- 4 more interaction between participants like open space needed
- 4 distribute more and earlier information on forum and the agenda to participants
- 3 links between presentations not strong enough
- 3 invite relevant stakeholders (e.g. farmers associations)
- 3 increase number of presentations from implementers, focus on practical achievements
- 3 too many overlapping / very similar presentations
- 2 more participants from the ministries should be invited that are decision makers for PBAs, especially from Ministry of Planning and Development and Ministry of Agriculture
- 2 case studies which indicate success of practical implementation of PBAs needed
- 2 time for participants to rest needed
- 2 problems with hotel booking: at arrival there was no reservation
- 2 more information and discussion on the concept of PBAs before sharing country

experiences

2 round table discussions did not work very well

2 presentations should focus on lessons learnt and impacts

2 excellent moderators

2 countries should be represented by their own participants instead of donor representatives

1 a full day field trip was a good idea

1 many newcomers would have benefited from a general introduction to PBAs

1 2-3 persons could be assigned to summarize each section so the final draft product would be more elaborate

1 focusing less on presentations, but on lessons learnt and recommendations

1 create a mailing discussion group to allow continuous discussion of specific issues

1 pay attention that by institutionalizing Africa Forum within Nepad, the quality of presentations and invitations remains open, transparent, inclusive

1 send out documents before

1 conclude with a clear consensus on the way forward

1 more social dinners to allow interaction and sharing of experiences of participants

1 more people from Namibia should be invited

1 at least one full day to be allocated to discuss the way forward

1 in-house workshop for Namibia with co-sponsors

1 Involvement of the Namibian Government into the Forum at highest level of government was very good

1 host countries should be more involved from the stage developing the programme, it is not enough to involve them for speeches

1 resource persons contributions were not coordinated and badly presented

1 Forum presentations were too government focused; not NGOs and other development agencies operating outside government framework

1 invite public sector and talk for themselves what they think works (e.g. farmers, producers)

1 Better involvement at grassroots level for whom we are planning to uplift their livelihood

1 last day better only up to lunch, as many people are leaving earlier anyway

1 change interaction methodology

1 3 days would be enough

1 no good, convincing PBAs in productive sector were presented

1 heading question: "The specific challenges.." unanswered

1 inviting speakers from South Africa and Egypt

1 sensitization on other African countries to take part to this conference on a regular basis

1 organizers should be very clear on the time given to presenters as they prepare for their presentations, to avoid rushed presentations

1 some sessions: little time even for the presenters to be able to cover well their topics

1 report of action taken in the previous forum

1 include technical aspects and concrete orientation

1 stimulate comment as much as questions to the presentations as there was a lot of knowledge to share in the audience

1 concentrate on the results of PBAs and not only on what we plan and do at present

1 allow a discussion of questions which cannot be answered by presenters

1 a lot of inputs, but not a consolidation of joint learning

1 consider to have the Forum in this format every second year and find a different formulae for the intermittent years, this would allow more focused discussions

1 good mix, conclusive environment

1 open and frank discussions were very informative

1 good planning, but impact lacking

1 too much repetition in presentations

1 answer to questions such as what has worked, what made it work lacked

1 good presentations and leadership speech

1 more success stories needed from PBA countries

1 combine event better with host country

1 logistics well, good support

1 excellent exchange platform

1 it was good that the Forum was linked to CAADP

Annex 6 List of PBAs in Agriculture and Rural Development

The following information was compiled by Helmut Albert and Elke Peiler, GTZ, Eschborn and is taken from their report called *PBAs in Agriculture and Rural Development: A synthesis of key findings from across Africa* (Draft, October 2005).

NB:

Type of document

The boundaries between policy, strategy and programme tend to be somewhat fluid; nevertheless it is important to make the distinction. A guide can be: A policy outlines a vision, direction or overall objectives (What do we want to achieve?); a strategy outlines the broad steps to get towards that policy (How do we get there?), and a programme generally outlines concrete activities in the form of a workplan and budget (What do we need to do to get there?).

Scope

For example, multi-sector in scope are PRSPs but also Rural Development programmes; sector programmes can be Agriculture, but also Lands (eg Tanzania's ASDP); sub-sector programmes are for example Ghana's AgSSIP which focuses on service provision.

Burkina Faso

Country	Burkina Faso
Title of Document	« Document de stratégie de développement rural à l'horizon 2015 » (January, 2004)
Author(/Owner)	« Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Hydraulique et des Ressources Halieutiques » (Ministry of Agriculture, Hydraulics and Halieutics Resources) (information not provided in the document)
Timeframe	2005-2015
Type of Document <i>(eg policy, strategy, programme)</i>	Strategy
Scope <i>(eg multi-sector, sector, sub-sector)</i>	Multi-sector
Focus <i>(eg investment, institutional reform, commercialisation)</i>	Institutional reform
Programme stage <i>(eg planning, implementation, monitoring)</i>	Implementation
Volume of funding	No information provided
Funding agencies <i>(government, donors, others)</i>	Government, technical and financial partners, NGOs, private sector (banks and other operators, professional organisations, local communities)
Other documents used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministère de l'Agriculture (Juin, 2000) : Stratégie de croissance durable du secteur de l'agriculture – Résumé actualisé du plan stratégique opérationnel (PSO) - Ministère de l'Agriculture et Ministère des Ressources Animales (Dec, 1997) : Stratégie opérationnelle de croissance durable des secteurs de l'agriculture et de l'élevage – Document d'orientation stratégiques à l'horizon 2010

Cameroon

Country	Cameroon
Title of Document	« Document de stratégie de développement du secteur rural » (July, 2005)
Author(/Owner)	Ministère de l'Agriculture et du Développement Rural (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development)
Timeframe	2006-2015 (Strategy) 2006-2010 (Programme = Action plan)
Type of Document <i>(eg policy, strategy, programme)</i>	Strategy divided in three parts: diagnosis, strategic framework (cadre stratégique) and operational framework (cadre opérationnel) (programme)
Scope <i>(eg multi-sector, sector, sub-sector)</i>	Multi-sector
Focus <i>(eg investment, institutional reform, commercialisation)</i>	Institutional reform, investment
Programme stage <i>(eg planning, implementation, monitoring)</i>	Implementation
Volume of funding	US\$ 1.958 million (over 5 years until 2010)
Funding agencies <i>(government, donors, others)</i>	Government, local authorities, NGOs, private sector, banks, technical partners, donors
Other documents used	-

Ethiopia

Country	Ethiopia
Title of Document	Food Security Strategy (FSS) (March, 2002) Update from the original FSS of 1996
Author(/Owner)	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (information not provided in the document)
Timeframe	No information provided
Type of Document <i>(eg policy, strategy, programme)</i>	Strategy
Scope <i>(eg multi-sector, sector, sub-sector)</i>	Sector: agriculture (cross cutting issues addressed)
Focus <i>(eg investment, institutional reform, commercialisation)</i>	Commercialisation
Programme stage <i>(eg planning, implementation, monitoring)</i>	Implementation (information taken from PRSP Policy Matrix for Ethiopia)
Volume of funding	No information provided
Funding agencies (government, donors, others)	Government, private sector, NGOs, donors
Other documents used	-

Ghana

Country	Ghana
Title of Document	- Agriculture Services Sub-sector Investment Program (AgSSIP) - Mid term Review Report (Sept, 2004) - Food and Agriculture Sector Development Policy (Sept, 2002)
Author(/Owner)	Government of Ghana - Ministry of Food and Agriculture
Timeframe	AgSSIP - first Phase: 1 st Nov 2000 to 31 st Oct 2003 (one year extension up to Oct 2004)
Type of Document <i>(eg policy, strategy, programme)</i>	AgSSIP: Programme Food and Agriculture Sector Development Policy: Policy
Scope <i>(eg multi-sector, sector, sub-sector)</i>	AgSSIP: Sub-sector (Cross-cutting issues addressed)
Focus <i>(eg investment, institutional reform, commercialisation)</i>	Investment and commercialisation
Programme stage <i>(eg planning, implementation, monitoring)</i>	Implementation and monitoring
Volume of funding	US\$ 74.99 million
Funding agencies <i>(government, donors, others)</i>	GTZ, DANIDA, AFDB, EU, DFID, JICA, CIDA, USAID, IFC, Government, private sector
Other documents used	Republic of Ghana (2004): Implementation Support Mission-Aide Memoire

Kenya

Country	Kenya
Title of Document	Strategy for Revitalising Agriculture (SRA) (March, 2004)
Author(/Owner)	Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) and Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development (MLFD)
Timeframe	2004-2014
Type of Document <i>(eg policy, strategy, programme)</i>	Strategy plan
Scope <i>(eg multi-sector, sector, sub-sector)</i>	Sector: agriculture (cross cutting issues addressed)
Focus <i>(eg investment, institutional reform, commercialisation)</i>	Institutional reform and investment
Programme stage <i>(eg planning, implementation, monitoring)</i>	Implementation
Volume of funding	Total cost of reengineering the whole economy as estimated in the ERS: US\$ 6,160.107 million
Funding agencies <i>(government, donors, others)</i>	Government, local authorities (LAs), NGOs, private sector, donors
Other documents used	-

Country	Malawi
Title of Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agricultural Sector Priority, Constraints, Policies and Strategies Framework for Malawi - Agriculture Sector Investment Programme (March, 2002) - Review of Malawi Agricultural Policies and Strategies (Nov, 1999)
Author(/Owner)	Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (Malawi Government)
Timeframe	1999-2009 (Ten-year rolling investment plan)
Type of Document <i>(eg policy, strategy, programme)</i>	Policy and Strategy
Scope <i>(eg multi-sector, sector, sub-sector)</i>	Sector: agriculture (cross cutting issues addressed)
Focus <i>(eg investment, institutional reform, commercialisation)</i>	Investment
Programme stage <i>(eg planning, implementation, monitoring)</i>	Planning
Volume of funding	Estimated costs for the period 2002 – 2008 approximately US \$ 152. No information on donor funds for MASIP is provided.
Funding agencies (government, donors, others)	World Bank, IFAD, DANIDA, CIDA, FAO, The Netherlands Government, EU, Government of Norway, USAID, Africa Development Fund, Republic of China, Government, private sector
Other documents used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DFID Malawi (April, 2005): Stimulating Growth in Malawi: The Role of Agriculture and the Private Sector - GoM (Jan, 2005): National Medium Term Investment Programme

Mozambique

Country	Mozambique
Title of Document	Strategy Document PROAgri II (May, 2004)
Author(/Owner)	Government of Mozambique - Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Timeframe	PROAGRI I: 1999 - 2004 PROAGRI II: 2005 - 2009
Type of Document <i>(eg policy, strategy, programme)</i>	Strategy
Scope <i>(eg multi-sector, sector, sub-sector)</i>	PROAGRI I: Sector PROAGRI II: Multi-Sector
Focus <i>(eg investment, institutional reform, commercialisation)</i>	PROAGRI I: Institutional Reform PROAGRI II: Agriculture and rural development
Programme stage <i>(eg planning, implementation, monitoring)</i>	PROAGRI I: Implementation and monitoring PROAGRI II: Planning
Volume of funding	PROAGRI I: US\$ 108.3 million PROAGRI II: US\$ 275.227 million (projected amount)
Funding agencies <i>(government, donors, others)</i>	DANIDA, USAID, EU, World Bank, UNDP, GTZ, IFAD, FAO, DFID, Netherlands, Ireland, Sweden, Government, private sector
Other documents used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (May, 2003): PROAGRI Evaluation Report (GoM) - Donor Working Group (Dec, 2004): Improving Agricultural Sector Partnerships through Swap - Report on PROAGRI donor consultations - MADER/GoM (June, 2004): PROAGRI 1st Annual Review - AFD- STR-POL- Virginie Leroy-Saudubray (Dec, 2003): Mission Report

Namibia

Country	Namibia
Title of Document	National Agricultural Policy (NAP) (Oct, 1995)
Author(/Owner)	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development
Timeframe	No information provided
Type of Document <i>(eg policy, strategy, programme)</i>	Policy
Scope <i>(eg multi-sector, sector, sub-sector)</i>	Sector: agriculture (cross cuttings issues addressed)
Focus <i>(eg investment, institutional reform, commercialisation)</i>	Commercialisation
Programme stage <i>(eg planning, implementation, monitoring)</i>	Implementation of the policy by different programmes
Volume of funding	No information provided
Funding agencies (government, donors, others)	Government, private sector, NGOs, donors
Other documents used	-

Namibia (cont.)

Country	Namibia
Title of Document	Strategic Options and Action for Land Reform (2005)
Author(/Owner)	Ministry of Lands and Resettlement
Timeframe	2006 – 2020
Type of Document <i>(eg policy, strategy, programme)</i>	Policy, strategy and programme (Action Plan)
Scope <i>(eg multi-sector, sector, sub-sector)</i>	Sector: land (cross cuttings issues addressed)
Focus <i>(eg investment, institutional reform, commercialisation)</i>	Land reform (investment, institutional reform)
Programme stage <i>(eg planning, implementation, monitoring)</i>	Implementation to start in 2007
Volume of funding	EUR 484,000,000 (15 year period)
Funding agencies (government, donors, others)	Government, donors
Other documents used	-

South Africa

Country	South Africa
Title of Document	Strategic Plan for the Department of Agriculture (March, 2003)
Author(/Owner)	Department of Agriculture
Timeframe	2003 - 2006
Type of Document <i>(eg policy, strategy, programme)</i>	Strategy
Scope <i>(eg multi-sector, sector, sub-sector)</i>	Sector: agriculture (cross cutting issues addressed)
Focus <i>(eg investment, institutional reform, commercialisation)</i>	Investment and commercialisation
Programme stage <i>(eg planning, implementation, monitoring)</i>	Planning
Volume of funding	Planned Expenditure for three years (2003/2004, 2004/2005, 2004/2005): US\$ 505 million
Funding agencies (government, donors, others)	Government, private sector No information on donors provided
Other documents used	-

Tanzania

Country	Tanzania
Title of Document	Agricultural Sector Development Strategy (ASDS) (Oct, 2001)
Author(/Owner)	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS), Ministry of Co-operatives and Marketing (MCM), and Ministry of Water and Livestock Development (MWLD)
Timeframe	2002-2007 (5 years)
Type of Document <i>(eg policy, strategy, programme)</i>	Strategy
Scope <i>(eg multi-sector, sector, sub-sector)</i>	Sector: agriculture (cross cutting issues addressed)
Focus <i>(eg investment, institutional reform, commercialisation)</i>	Institutional reform
Programme stage <i>(eg planning, implementation, monitoring)</i>	Implementation
Volume of funding	US\$ 255.3 million (only includes items that are channelled through the three agricultural sector Ministries. Excludes items that are to be financed through other Ministries).
Funding agencies (government, donors, others)	Government, local Government, Commodity Boards, private sector, NGOs, donors (JICA, Danish Embassy, DFID, Irish Aid, Japanese Embassy, WB, EU)
Other documents used	- Hanatani, A. (undated): Implementing Agriculture SP in Tanzania: issues and challenges. Power Point Presentation, Africa Department, JICA

Uganda

Country	Uganda
Title of Document	Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA) (Aug, 2000)
Author(/Owner)	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MFPED)
Timeframe	2000-2017 (Intervention matrix provided for 36 months, review after first three years)
Type of Document <i>(eg policy, strategy, programme)</i>	Programme
Scope <i>(eg multi-sector, sector, sub-sector)</i>	Sector: agriculture (cross cutting issues addressed)
Focus <i>(eg investment, institutional reform, commercialisation)</i>	Institutional reform
Programme stage <i>(eg planning, implementation, monitoring)</i>	Implementation
Volume of funding	Interim resource requirements for the first year of implementing priority programmes as defined under the PMA: US\$ 35.114 – 55.289 million
Funding agencies (government, donors, others)	Government, LAs, NGOs, private sector, donors (Royal Danish Embassy/DANIDA, Worldbank, FAO, DFID, EU and other members of the Donor Sub-group on agriculture)
Other documents used	-

Zambia

Country	Zambia
Title of Document	Agricultural Commercialisation Programme (ACP) (Nov, 2001) Successor programme to the Agricultural Sector Investment Programme (ASIP) (1996-2001)
Author(/Owner)	Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (MAFF)
Timeframe	2002-2005
Type of Document <i>(eg policy, strategy, programme)</i>	Programme
Scope <i>(eg multi-sector, sector, sub-sector)</i>	Sector: agriculture (cross cutting issues addressed)
Focus <i>(eg investment, institutional reform, commercialisation)</i>	Commercialisation
Programme stage <i>(eg planning, implementation, monitoring)</i>	Implementation
Volume of funding	US\$ 287 million
Funding agencies (government, donors, others)	Government, private sector, NGOs, donors, beneficiaries (25%)
Other documents used	-



**Programme Based Approaches in
Agriculture and Rural Development**
The Specific Challenges of Productive Sectors

