

CONCEPT NOTE

Implementing the CAADP Joint Sector Review Guidelines: What should be Reviewed?

Introduction and Background

The concept of mutual accountability is rooted in Managing for Development Results (MfDR), which is a management approach that involves using performance information at all stages of the development process to make better and more effective decisions and steer development efforts toward clearly defined goals (AfCoP 2012). Mutual Accountability means that each Stakeholder takes accountability and responsibility for their actions within the framework of collective action.

Since the launching of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) in 2003, the demand for inclusive stakeholder participation in setting policy and investment priorities and, consequently, for mutual accountability in the agriculture sector has increased. These have resulted in the signing of 30 country CAADP compacts and the preparation of national agricultural investment plans (NAIPs) in 26 of those countries;¹ which together spell out the development objectives of the sector, the policies and strategies to achieve those objectives, and stakeholder pledges and commitments to implement the policies and strategies.

To facilitate the mutual accountability process, the CAADP Mutual Accountability Framework (MAF) was developed (AUC-NPCA 2011). A key instrument for promoting mutual accountability is the Joint Sector Review (JSR), which a set of guidelines has been developed to assist country stakeholders to develop and implement the JSR (see CAADP MA-M&E JAG 2012). JSRs provide a platform to assess the performance and results of the agriculture sector and in turn assist governments in setting sector policy and priorities. Specifically, they aim to assess how well state and non-state stakeholders implemented pledges and commitments stipulated in the CAADP compacts, NAIPs, and related cooperation agreements in the sector. By allowing a broad spectrum of stakeholders to get insights into and influence overall policies and priorities of the sector, JSRs serve as a management and policy support tool for inclusive stakeholder planning, programming, budget preparation and execution, monitoring and evaluation, and overall development of the sector.

The CAADP JSR guidelines includes specific recommendations on the *how* to successfully conduct the process, which should be consistent with principles of ownership, relevance, inclusive participation, commitment to results by all participants, impartial-evidence informed, and learning, among others. This concept note elaborates on the content (or the *what*) of the JSR.

¹ As at February 2013, see [CAADP website](#) for details.

Rationale, Goal, and Objectives

JSRs in the agriculture sector are not new in the continent. Several countries (e.g. Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda) already conduct JSRs on a regular basis.² However, for such existing JSRs to be more effective as a mutual accountability tool and in making evidenced-based policies and investments in the sector, they will need considerable strengthening in terms of design, data and analysis, transparency, and stakeholder inclusion. To this end, it is important that there is empirical evidence on the achievement of jointly agreed milestones and targets. Even in countries that do not currently conduct a JSR or where there are no mutual accountability platforms, it is still important to have empirical evidence on the achievement of stated milestones and targets in the sector by way of strengthening national monitoring and evaluation systems and agriculture sector reviews in general.

The primary objective of this work is to provide analytical and technical support to countries to strengthen their national agriculture JSRs. The result of this will be improved evidence-based policies, planning, budgeting, and program implementation, based on a reliable assessment and reporting of performance in the sector against mutually-agreed targets. The support will aim to strengthen in-country technical and analytical capacity to conduct and develop JSRs and to undertake rigorous documentation of JSRs using the CAADP JSR Guidelines.

Activities, Methods, and Outputs

The overall content (or the *what*) of the JSR follows from the aims of the JSR as stated in the Guidelines:

- i. Describe and analyze the structure, conduct and performance (SCP) of the sector against mutually-agreed milestones and targets (including actions agreed in previous JSRs).
- ii. Identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) in the sector.
- iii. Based on the results and findings in the above, make recommendations for improving performance (RfIP) in the sector.

While these may seem rather general, the substance (including its boundaries or scope) derives from the phrase “mutually-agreed milestones and targets”. Identifying what the mutually-agreed milestones and targets are is fundamental in the JSR process or in any mutual accountability process. This is a nontrivial point, because it is futile to hold someone accountable for things they have not agreed to do or are not interested in doing. The ineffectiveness of existing JSRs as a mutual accountability tool in many countries is due largely to this, considering that governments and donors (the main stakeholders in current JSRs) often have different priorities and preferences for mode of support to countries (Kolavalli and Keefe 2012). In the CAADP process, such mutually-agreed

² This is called [Agricultural Joint Sector Review](#) in Ghana and [Joint Implementation Review](#) in Tanzania, for example. In general, many countries undertake some form of joint review, either specific for the agricultural sector or for the economy as a whole (see sample links for [Ghana](#), [Kenya](#), [Mozambique](#), [Rwanda](#), [Tanzania](#), and [Uganda](#)).

milestones and targets are articulated in documents such as the CAADP compacts, NAIPs, and New Alliance Cooperation Frameworks, which we use the term “cooperation agreements” to collectively refer to them.³

The contents of these cooperation agreements, which lays out what is mutually-agreed upon and which in turn should define the boundaries or scope of the review, are usually organized around five main areas: (1) development results such as income growth, poverty and hunger reduction, food and nutrition security, etc.; (2) overall agricultural sector growth target, with specific subsector and commodity targets; (3) required financial and non-financial resources; (4) policies, programs, institutions, and implementation processes; and (5) linkages (including pathways to achieve the development results), enabling environment and assumptions. Therefore the substance or topic of a JSR can focus on any one or combinations of these five areas. We will take each of them to elaborate further, laying out the: (i) main questions to be answered, (ii) methodologies and data needed to be used in answering the questions, and (iii) the outputs or reports to be generated. First, it is useful to define the concepts associated with the three elements that the JSR aims at (SCP, SWOT, and RfIP in the sector).

Structure, conduct and performance (SCP): The SCP framework derives from the analysis of markets. In this context, the structure consists of the relatively stable features in the agricultural sector (e.g. resource endowments, climate, policies, institutions, etc.) that influences how the different actors in sector operate and interact with each other (to achieve shared or individual goals and objectives). Conduct means what the different actors do to achieve their objectives and goals, while performance is the success in achieving the objectives and goals.

Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT): Strengths are characteristics of the specific intervention (e.g. policy, program, institution, process, mechanism, etc.) that give it an advantage over other competing or potential interventions in achieving a particular objective. Weaknesses on the other hand are characteristics that place the intervention at a disadvantage relative to others. Opportunities are elements that could be exploited to the advantage of the intervention in achieving its objectives, while threats are elements in the environment that retard the intervention in achieving its objectives.

Recommendations: These must be implementable and derive from the data, information, analysis and findings of the review. Based on the SWOT analysis for example, recommendations could be derived by matching the strengths to opportunities to define a competitive advantage, or by converting weaknesses and threats into strengths and opportunities that can be exploited. The recommendations need not be a long wish list. Where there is more one, they need to be prioritized to reflect immediate, medium and long term actions. Sequencing is also important here.

³ These also include the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) project appraisal documents, GrowAfrica business cases, and other CAADP-related initiatives whose implementation is rooted in collective action and inclusive participation between the state and non-state parties including donors, private sector, NGOs, farmers, etc..

We now take each of the five areas listed above to elaborate further on the content of the review in terms of: (i) main questions to be answered, (ii) methodological and data needs, and (iii) the outputs and reports. The presentation here is consistent with the ‘proposed layout of the JSR report’ included in the Annex of the JSR guidelines. However, the layout included in the guidelines is more along the lines of the content of the general CAADP M&E report, while the presentation below follows the content of a cooperation agreement, the basis for mutual accountability. And so while the CAADP M&E report (or the layout in the JSR guidelines) will contribute to a mutual accountability report, because not all of the content of existing and potential cooperation agreements is known, there is some generality to the presentation. But it carries the tone of reviewing performance in relevant indicators against mutually-agreed upon targets.

1. Review of Progress in Development Results

These are usually associated with medium- to long-term outcomes for the country as a whole such as reducing poverty and hunger, increasing food and nutrition security, increasing household incomes, increased competitiveness, among others. In the case of Ghana’s METASIP for example, it states to achieve 85% food self-sufficiency annually, while in the case of Mozambique’s New Alliance it states to help 3.1 million people emerge from poverty and hunger. Therefore, the interest here is to assess the direction in which the values of the indicators associated with the outcomes are moving against stated targets and benchmarks. As such, major questions include:

- Is the country on track to achieve its stated goals and outcomes?
- What are the achievements (a) in different parts of the country and (c) across different socio-economic groups—based on age and gender, sector of employment, size of operation, etc.?

Methods. Regarding whether the country is on track to achieve its overall objectives and outcomes, this can be addressed using descriptive statistics; first calculating the percentage difference or change between the baseline (or end) and current values of the relevant indicators, and then analyzing the progress associated with the difference or change. Most of the indicators here are fairly straightforward and the data for analyzing them can be obtained from food balance sheets, core welfare indicators questionnaire (CWIQ), demographic and health surveys (DHS), labor surveys, household income and expenditure surveys, and other relevant national household surveys.⁴

Depending on the representativeness of the data at sub-national levels and across different socio-economic groups, they can also be used in answering the question on how the achievements have been distributed across different parts of the country and among different socio-economic groups.

The main problem is that the data on these indicators are not collected on an annual basis, because their values are slow to change over time. And so simulations (e.g. using straight line extrapolation)

⁴ See the CAADP M&E framework (Benin et al. 2010) for the details on these and other indicators.

can be used to obtain inter-survey measures. Normally, this requires handling large micro-level datasets and applying weighted sampling techniques.

Outputs. The main output will be in a form of a summary table showing the baseline values, endline target, and current status of the indicator, using color codes as done in a scorecard for example for visual effect, based on analysis of the percentage difference between the current value and end target value for example (see Table 1.1). These should be part of a report describing the main trends and findings structured according to: introduction, methodology and data, results and findings, conclusions, recommendations, and annexes of tables and charts on indicators and other detailed information. In addition, a dataset with more details on the indicators and their measures over the relevant periods of time should be provided.

Table 1.1: Progress in achieving development results

Indicator and measurement	Baseline		End Target		Current Status	
	Year	Value	Year	Value	Year	Value*
Indicator 1						
Indicator 2						
...						
Indicator n						

* in addition use color codes based on the percentage difference $(D) = [(current - target) / target] * 100$:

$D \geq 100\%$	Target achieved or surpassed
$\alpha < D < 100\%$	On track
$D \leq \alpha$	Not on track or deteriorated
	No data (explain why there are no data)

α is an agreed-upon value or benchmark of progress or being on track.

2. Review of Agricultural Sector Performance (Growth and Trade)

The agricultural sector consists of crops, livestock, forestry and fishery subsectors, which are in turn made up of numerous commodities and commodity groups. In the cooperation agreements, specific growth rate and trade targets are given for the entire sector as well as for different subsectors, commodity groups, or individual commodities. For example, the continent-wide target of 6 percent annual growth rate for the entire sector has been adopted by many countries. To cite some specific examples: Ghana's METASIP states to raise agGDP growth from 5.1 to 6% per year; Mozambique's states to achieve 7% agGDP growth rate per year; Rwanda's GAFSP states to develop 900 hectares for irrigation; and Senegal's AMAP states to raise non-traditional agricultural exports from 3,052 to 12,000 tons in three years. Compared to the development results, the targets here tend to be more short- to medium-term in nature and so assessment of progress should be more precise. The major questions here include:

- To what extent have the growth and trade targets in the overall agricultural sector, as well as in the different subsectors and commodities, been achieved?
- How have the different subsector and commodity achievements contributed to progress in achieving the sector's overall performance?

- What are the achievements in subsector and commodity production and productivity under (a) different agro-ecologies of the country, (b) different technology packages and husbandry, and (c) different types of producers—based on size of operation and gender and age of farmers, etc.?

Methods. Regarding whether the growth and trade targets in the overall sector and in different subsectors and commodities been achieved, this can be addressed using descriptive statistics; first calculating the percentage difference or change between the baseline (or end) and current values of the relevant indicators, and then analyzing the progress associated with the difference or change. The indicators here are also fairly straightforward,⁵ and those measured at the aggregate and national levels are relatively easy to come by and can be obtained from national accounts data. The main challenge will be obtaining up-to-date information as many national accounts data are produced with a lag of one or two years. Therefore, the current values of some indicators may have to be estimated based on the most recent data that are available.

Regarding how the different subsector and commodity achievements have contributed to progress in achieving the sector’s overall performance, this can be addressed using decomposition methods in an accounting sense. The models, especially the social accounting matrices (SAMs), that were used in analyzing alternative agricultural growth and investment options in the CAADP roundtables will be particularly useful here (see Diao et al. 2012). Depending on the country, this will involve either updating an existing model or developing a new one.

Answering the third question on how achievements in subsector and commodity production and productivity have been distributed across different parts of the country and among different socio-economic groups will also involve decomposition methods and will require detail disaggregated data on the relevant indicators across the different units of analysis desired. Such data, except district-level production data for some commodities, are not readily available from the national statistics bureaus. These will have to be developed from available household survey and GIS data, including biophysical and infrastructure. IFPRI’s Spatial Production Allocation Model (SPAM) (You et al. 2009) will be particularly important here.

Outputs. As with the development results, the main output here will also be in the form of a summary table showing the baseline values, endline target, current status of the indicator, and an assessment of the progress associated with the key indicators agreed on (see Table 2.1). Color code based on analysis of the percentage difference between the current value and end target value can also be used to enhance visualization of the results. Similarly, a report and dataset should be included.

Table 2.1: Progress in achieving agricultural sector targets

Indicator and measurement	Baseline		End Target		Current Status	
	Year	Value	Year	Value	Year	Value*

⁵ See footnote 1.

Indicator 1						
Indicator 2						
...						
Indicator n						

* in addition use color codes based on the percentage difference (D)=[(current-target)/target]*100:

D ≥ 100%	Target achieved or surpassed
β < D < 100%	On track
D ≤ β	Not on track or deteriorated
	No data (explain why there are no data)

β is an agreed-upon value or benchmark of progress or being on track.

3. Review of Progress in Meeting Financial and non-Financial Commitments

The main thing here is assessing the extent to which the different partners or signatories (government, donors, private sector, NGOs, CSOs, FBOs, etc.) to the cooperation agreements have met their commitments, including the composition and quality of the disbursements or expenditures made.⁶ And so the key questions here include:

- To what extent have the different partners been able to meet their overall financial and non-financial commitments?
- What is the composition and quality of the actual disbursements and expenditures and how have these been spent across the different (a) objectives of the sector, (b) subsectors and major commodities, (c) policies, programs and institutions, (d) leading or major implementation units at all levels, and (e) socio-economic groups in different parts of the country?
- How have the amount, nature, and allocation of expenditures influenced (a) incentives of the different implementing agencies to deliver, (b) delivery of public goods and services, (c) production and productivity in different subsectors, and (d) overall sector growth?

Methods. In answering the first question, there is need to consider different indicators for the different partners, consistent with their roles and responsibilities. For the **state or government**, the main thing here will be looking at actual expenditures expressed as a percentage of the budgeted amounts. For **donors**, this will involve analyzing actual disbursements expressed as a percentage of the pledged or committed amounts, in line with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness principles of alignment and harmonization. For the **private sector**, the analysis of achievement versus planned will likely involve non-monetary indicators such number of contracts executed, number of people employed or employment opportunities created, number of processing plants established, etc. against their planned levels.⁷ Assessing progress of the commitments of **NGOs**,

⁶ See the 2012 ReSAKSS ATOR for details on how the budgets of the NAIPs have been distributed across different objectives, activities, functions and target populations (Benin and Yu 2013).

⁷ The GrowAfrica business cases have more on these types of indicators.

CSOs, and FBOs may also involve some of these indicators in addition to number of farmers mobilized, amount of co-funding mobilized, etc. against their planned levels.

The second question on composition, quality, and distribution requires detail disaggregation of data on the different indicators according to the different classifications mentioned above to the extent that they are applicable.

Regarding how the disbursements and allocation of expenditures have influenced different indicators (including incentives, delivery of public goods and services, sector productivity and outcomes), it will be good to focus on the big or critical investments (e.g. R&D, irrigation, farm subsidies) and calculate rates of return on investment.

The fundamental data required to do the analyses in this section have to be provided by the individual partners themselves, which is unlike the data needed for the other topics that can be obtained from third-party agencies. Therefore, the success of the review here will depend on the willingness and ability of the different partners to provide the financial and nonfinancial data timely. While some of the data (particularly governments spending and ODA) are publicly available, they may be too general to measure up against what is mutually-agreed upon between the different partners in the cooperation agreements. For example, government spending often includes donor funding that is channeled through government accounts. These together makes up public agriculture expenditure (PAE). And so while it is easy to separate the contribution of government and (individual) donors to PAE (which is part of answering the first question), it will be impossible to assess differences in government and donor funding composition, quality, and distribution (i.e. answering the second question). Another level of challenge with existing PAE data derives from the fact that the government's audited accounts, which is source of PAE data, reflect more the outlays associated with the organizational structures of government (which is fine with getting information to address expenditure allocation across leading or major implementation units) rather than outlays associated with the other indicators of disaggregation needed.⁸

On the data for NGOs, CSOs, FBOs, there is need to separate or distinguish general private sector investment flows, including foreign direct investments (FDI), from commitments and related investments deriving from the cooperation agreement. General private sector investment in the sector may be considered as outcomes of government policies or as a measure of crowding-in of private investment by public spending.⁹

The rates of return on investment analysis will require data on the outputs and outcomes of the investments, which can be obtained from project documents and household/farm surveys. Expert

⁸ The on-going PAE classification work by IFPRI's public investment team using case studies of Ghana, Kenya, and Mozambique will be important for developing the data aggregation methodology.

⁹ This is reviewed under the section on the linkages.

opinion surveys will be useful here to gain insights on important but unobservable/measurable effects.

Outputs. Regarding the commitments and allocation of expenditures, the main output will be a summary table showing the planned and achieved (both in levels and as ratio of planned), using color codes as done in a scorecard for example to indicate progress for quick visual effect. It will be good to also consider progress against long-term commitments versus progress on annual basis (see Table 3.1). On the rates of return on investment analysis, the main output will be summarized in a table showing for each investment and amount invested the calculated rates compared with what is expected or with other international benchmarks. However, because it takes time for investments to materialize, these may be done occasionally. As before, these outputs will be accompanied by a detail report of the findings of the review and datasets.

Table 3.1: Progress in meeting financial and non-financial commitments

	Long term				Annual			
	Units	Planned or Targeted (a)	Incremental Amount Achieved (b)	(b)/(a) *	Units	Planned or Targeted (d)	Achieved (e)	(e)/(d) *
Donors								
Total (all donors)								
Donor 1								
...								
Donor n								
Government								
Total agriculture								
Disaggregated								
Indicator 1								
...								
Indicator n								
Private Sector, NGOs, CSOs								
Indicator 1								
...								
Indicator n								

* in addition use color codes based on the ratio of achieved to planned (R):

≥ 1	Target achieved or surpassed
$\delta < R < 1$	On track
$\leq \delta$	Not on track or deteriorated
No data	No data (explain why there are no data)

δ is an agreed-upon value or benchmark of progress or being on track.

4. Review of Policies, Programs, Institutions, and Implementation Processes

Ultimately farmers, producers, and traders are the ones that have to make the necessary investment decisions that will bring about the expected improvements in production, productivity and trade that will help achieve the sector's overall growth and trade objectives. But because farmers', producers, and traders' investment decisions are based on the potential profitability and risks of alternative investment opportunities in and outside agriculture, which are influenced by government decisions (in addition to other factors outside their control), the core issue here is assessing how the different

sector policies (e.g. land, seed, producer price, trade, etc.), programs (e.g. extension, irrigation, fertilizer subsidy, etc.), and institutions (pesticide laws, water use rights, grades and standards, etc.) have contributed to creating an enabling environment for increased farmer and private sector investments. The focus here is on the policies, programs and institutions (*PPIs*) that are specified in the cooperation agreements, including the strategies for improving the capacity of the agencies and organizations that are involved with developing and implementing the *PPIs*. It is important to first identify all the *PPIs* stated in the cooperation agreement and then focus on a few critical ones for the remainder of the review. And so major questions to answer here include:

- What progress has been made in making and implementing the different *PPIs* that were identified and targeted in achieving the sector's objectives and targets? And how have different stakeholders contributed to the progress made?
- What are the processes and mechanisms in place to ensure that investments in the sector reflect the agreed upon policies and programs?
- What progress has been made in building or strengthening the capacity of policymakers and different agencies and organizations involved in making and implementing the different *PPIs*?
- How can the relevant institutions, processes, and mechanisms be strengthened to achieve higher value for money, including implementation of policies and programs that lead to greater profitable investments by farmers and the private sector in different parts of the country?

Methods. On progress made in implementing different *PPIs*, the first thing that needs to be done is compiling a list (inventory) of the different *PPIs* identified in the relevant cooperation agreements (see Box 1 on sample policy actions in the case of Mozambique for example). Expert opinion surveys and public records will then be used to determine the status of implementation of each *PPI*, which should be based on the

**Box 1: Example of Policy Actions in Mozambique's
New Alliance Framework**

- Pass seed law
- Adopt seed and fertilizer regulatory frameworks
- Adopt rural land use rights and transfer regulations
- Eliminate specified internal and non-tariff barriers to trade
- Enact food fortification regulations; define institutional coherence
- Enact mobile finance regulations

policy matrices in the cooperation agreement. For each *PPI*, the expert opinion surveys will be used to map out key players and actors (e.g. ministers, principal secretaries, directors, parliament members, federal executive council, state governors, other cabinet members, donors, farmers, researchers, etc.) involved, their roles, and their influence in making and implementing it. The same applies to the second question on stocktaking of the different processes and mechanisms in place ensure that investments in the sector reflect the agreed upon policies and programs.

Based on the map of the key players and actors involved, the next questions on progress made in building or strengthening their capacity in making and implementing the *PPIs* and how to strengthen mechanisms and processes can be addressed using narratives and descriptive statistics of change between baseline (or end) and current values of the relevant indicators on capacity for policymaking, programs planning and implementation, organizational management, and institutional development, among others. This will be done using structured questionnaires to assess changes in the capacity of the different stakeholders, as well as needs/gaps in performing their roles effectively.¹⁰

Outputs. The main outputs will be two summary tables: the first will be a scorecard of progress in the major *PPIs* against any policy matrices (see Table 4.1); and the second is also a scorecard type of progress in building or strengthening the capacity of the different actors involved in the above (see Table 4.2). These will be accompanied by a detail report of the findings and recommendations of the review, and a dataset on the values of the indicators.

Table 4.1: Progress in implementing policies, programs and institutions

Indicator and measurement	Current Status*
Indicator 1	Narrative ...
Indicator 2	
...	
Indicator n	

* use color codes based on narratives:

Green	Target achieved or surpassed
Yellow	On track
Red	Not on track or deteriorated
Grey	No data (explain why there are no data)

Table 4.2: Progress in strengthening capacity of different actors

Indicator and measurement	Baseline		End Target		Current Status	
	Year	Value	Year	Value	Year	Value*
Indicator 1						
Indicator 2						
...						
Indicator n						

* in addition use color codes based on the percentage difference $(D)=[(current-target)/target]*100$:

$D \geq 100\%$	Target achieved or surpassed
$\eta < D < 100\%$	On track
$D \leq \eta$	Not on track or deteriorated
	No data (explain why there are no data)

η is an agreed-upon value or benchmark of progress or being on track.

5. Linkages, Enabling Environment, and Assumptions

¹⁰ The capacity needs assessments that is currently being carried out by ReSAKSS for the establishment of country SAKSS can provide useful baseline information on key actors engaged in strategic policy analysis, investment planning and implementation, monitoring and evaluation, and knowledge management. The assessments are being carried out at the individual, organizational, and policy process levels.

This section is composed of two parts. The first is on linkages among the different sections above, in particular between investments and agricultural sector performance, and between agricultural sector performance and overall development results. The second component is on risk factors, particularly those things that are outside the control of the implementers of the cooperation agreement.

5.1. Linkages with Development Results

The main thing here is to see how any progress made meeting the financial and non-financial commitments as well as progress made in implementing the *PPIs* have contributed to: changes in agricultural productivity, growth, and trade; performance in other sectors; and overall development results. As such, major questions include:

- How has the progress made in different partners meeting their financial and non-financial commitments, as well as how they have been allocated, influenced agricultural production, productivity, and growth?
- How has the progress in making and implementing the different *PPIs*, as well as progress in building or strengthening the capacity of policymakers and different agencies and organizations involved, influenced agricultural production, productivity, and growth?
- How has agricultural sector performance contributed to the achievements in other sectors as well as the progress made in achieving the country's overall goals and outcomes (development results)?
- Could higher agricultural growth and greater development outcomes been achieved? Or could it have been worse? How and why?
- What are the different or new interventions, in and outside of agriculture, that could be made to hasten overall progress and lead to better-distributed outcomes?

Methods. The basic thing here is getting a sense of cause-effect relationships by way of assessing the effectiveness of the different efforts. Answering these questions is very important for raising and maintaining the high profile of the role of agriculture in the economy, especially if the ministry of finance is to be convinced to allocate more funds to the sector. Because outcomes take time to materialize through different pathways, answering these questions will require detail data on different variables identified in the pathways and over many years. It will also require complex methods. But the fundamentals of the different approaches are situated in the project evaluation literature (see e.g. Ravallion 2008 and Imbens and Wooldridge 2008). In answering the first three questions, different impact assessment tools will be needed (see Benin et al. 2012). Expert opinion surveys will be used to gain insights on important but unobservable/measurable factors that cannot be captured in the quantitative methods.

Answering the fourth question on whether greater outcome could have been achieved will involve simulation techniques using results from the impact assessment. Answering the question on the different or new things that need to be done to achieve greater and better-distributed progress will involve analyzing the above findings together to arrive at recommendations.

Outputs. The main output will be a summary table showing how progress made in the different sections has contributed to different outcomes (see Table 5.1). Ideally, these will be elasticities (e_{ij}), and color-coding could be used to enhance visual presentation of the results in terms of comparing estimates with international standards of results of other initiatives. These will be accompanied by a detail report of the findings and recommendations, and a dataset on the values of the indicators.

Table 5.1: Effect of progress in implementing agreement on agricultural and non-agricultural sector performance, and overall development results

X ↓	Y→	Agricultural sector			Non-agricultural sectors			Overall results		
		Indicator 1	Indicator 2	...	Indicator 1	Indicator 2	...	Indicator 1	Indicator 2	...
Financial commitments										
Indicator 1		e_{ij}								
Indicator 2										
...										
PPIs										
Indicator 1										
Indicator 2										
...										
Capacity building										
Indicator 1										
Indicator 2										
...										
Implementation processes										
Indicator 1										
Indicator 2										
...										
Agricultural Sector performance		n.a.	n.a.	n.a.						
Indicator 1		n.a.	n.a.	n.a.						
Indicator 2		n.a.	n.a.	n.a.						
...		n.a.	n.a.	n.a.						

$$\text{elasticity } (e_{ij}) = (\% \text{ change in } Y_j) / (\% \text{ change in } X_i \text{ or progress in } X_i)$$

n.a.=not applicable

In addition and based on comparison to some standard elasticity (\hat{e}), or for qualitative measures, use color codes:

> \hat{e}	Above average
= \hat{e}	Average
< \hat{e}	Below average
	No data (explain why there are no data)

5.2. Enabling Environment and Assumptions

The substance of this part of a JSR derives primarily from the section on risk assessment, and assumptions of underlying the pathways of impact, i.e. the channels through which implementation of the proposed policies, programs, investments, and institutions are expected to achieve the

subsector and commodity targets, which in turn are expected to lead to achievement of the sector’s growth and productivity targets, and then the country’s overall outcomes. These involve mostly things that are outside the control of the implementers of the sector strategy. But they could also be due to inaccurate assessment of the things under the control of the implementers, including the situation that is supposed to be improved, or the instruments that are proposed to be used, or the expected outcomes to be achieved. Key questions for the review here include:

- Have any of the risk parameters changed in a manner to affect implementation of the strategy and achievement of results? How have they changed and what are their potential impacts on implementation of the strategy and achievement of results?
- How valid are the data, assumptions and analysis used in setting the benchmarks/targets stated in the strategy or cooperation agreement?
- What are the more reliable benchmarks/targets to set?

Methods. The first questions can be addressed using comparative descriptive statistics or narrative of change between the baseline and current values of the relevant risk parameters, and then analyzing whether the change is substantial enough to derail implementation and/or achievement of the results.

Addressing the second question involves assessment of the underlying data, assumptions and analysis used in the strategy or cooperation agreement. Basically, this is a review of the baseline information and its consistency with the stated targets. Although, the review of the assumptions in general appears last in the series of review topics, it is probably the first thing to be reviewed, by way of validating the cooperation agreement or strategy to begin with. This can be done by reviewing the sources of data and their values against other competing sources and values. The assumptions and analysis can be judged against the state of the art literature and evidence on the different topics as well as pathways of impact for example. Then, more reliable benchmarks and targets can be recommended to the extent that the data, assumptions and analysis deviate from what is more believable.

Outputs. The main output will be a summary table showing how the different assumptions and risk parameters have changed and an assessment of how the changes may have affected different outcomes (see Table 5.2). Color-coding could also be used to enhance visual presentation of the results (see notes to Table 5.2). These will be accompanied by a detail report of the findings and recommendations, and a dataset on the values of the indicators.

Table 5.2: Change in assumptions and risk factors and its effect on implementing agreement and achieving of results

Assumption/Risk Parameter	Initial/Baseline assessment	Current assessment or change from baseline*	Effect of change implementation of the cooperation agreement**	Effect of change in achieving results***

* increased a lot (-2), increased a little (-1), no change (0), decreased a little (+1), decreased a lot (+2)

** retarded it a lot (-2), retarded it a little (-1), no significant effect (0), enhanced it a little (+1), enhanced it a lot (+2)

*** retarded it a lot (-2), retarded it a little (-1), no significant effect (0), enhanced it a little (+1), enhanced it a lot (+2)

In addition to narratives and number codes, use color codes:

+1 or +2	Risk decreased; Enhanced implementation of agreement or achievement of results
0	No change in risk; Insignificant effect on implementation of agreement or achievement of results
-1 or -2	Risk increased; Retarded implementation of agreement or achievement of results
	No data (explain why not)

References

- AfCoP (African Community of Practice) on managing for development results. 2012. *AfCoP Casebook*. http://api.ning.com/files/NRqcilcLpcZL-u8u9god2Ds4ZGvK53CwLpRo3pN9s6xN9Rr-A0s6vwGAfe2dQdhUpkEaneBevAympmGCys*QLQR0ultbD1tr/AfCopCaseBookENGLISH.pdf
- AUC-NPCA 2011. Mutual Accountability Framework (MAF).
- Benin, S. and Yu, B. 2013. *Complying the Maputo Declaration Target: trends in public agricultural expenditures and implications for pursuit of optimal allocation of public agricultural spending*. ReSAKSS Annual Trends and Outlook Report 2012. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) (*forthcoming*).
- Benin, S., Mogues, M. and Fan, S. 2012. Agricultural growth and poverty reduction impacts of public investments: assessment concepts and techniques. In Mogues and Benin, [*Public Expenditures for Agricultural and Rural Development in Africa*](#). Routledge, UK.
- Benin, S., Johnson, M. and others. 2010. [*Monitoring and Evaluation \(M&E\) System for the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme \(CAADP\)*](#). *ReSAKSS Working Paper 6*. IFPRI, Washington, D.C., USA.
- CAADP MA-M&E JAG 2012. Guidelines to Undertaking Agriculture Joint Sector Reviews Developed by the CAADP Joint Action Group on M&E/MAF
- Diao, S., Thurlow, J., Benin, S. and Fan, S. (Eds.). 2012. [*Strategies and Priorities for African Agriculture: Economywide Perspectives from Country Studies*](#). IFPRI, Washington, DC.
- Imbens, G.M. and J.M. Wooldridge. 2009. Recent developments in the econometrics of program evaluation. *Journal of Economic Literature* 47, 5-86.
- Kolavalli, S. and Keefe, M. 2012 Reflections on Influencing Country Policies and Strategies: The Toy Story. GSSP Policy Note.
- Ravallion, M. 2008. *Evaluating anti-poverty programs*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3625. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- You, L., S. Wood, and U. Wood-Sichra. 2009. Generating Plausible Crop Distribution Maps for Sub-Saharan Africa Using a Spatially Disaggregated Data Fusion and Optimization Approach. *Agricultural Systems* 99 (2-3): 126-140.