

**2019 CAADP**  
**BIENNIAL REVIEW**  
**BRIEF**  
**NAMIBIA**



**Africa Agriculture  
Transformation Scorecard:  
Performance and Lessons**

# Africa Agriculture Transformation Scorecard: Performance and Lessons

## 2019 CAADP Biennial Review Brief: Namibia

Petrus Uushona,<sup>1</sup> Jacob Greffiths,<sup>2\*</sup> Greenwell Matchaya,<sup>2</sup> Sibusiso Nhlengethwa,<sup>2</sup> Bhekiwe Fakudze,<sup>2</sup> and Stephanus Sanda<sup>1</sup>

This brief was prepared by Petrus Uushona and Stephanus Sanda of the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Land Reform, Namibia with technical support from the Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System for Southern Africa (ReSAKSS-SA).

### Recommended Citation

Uushona, P., Greffiths, J., Matchaya, G., Nhlengethwa, S., Fakudze, B., and Sanda, S. 2021. Africa Agriculture Transformation Scorecard: Performance and Lessons. 2019 CAADP Biennial Review Brief: Namibia. Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (ReSAKSS). AKADEMIYA2063.

### About ReSAKSS

Established in 2006 under the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), the Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (ReSAKSS) supports efforts to promote evidence- and outcome-based policy planning and implementation. In particular, ReSAKSS provides data and related analytical and knowledge products to facilitate CAADP benchmarking, review, and mutual learning processes. AKADEMIYA2063 leads the work of ReSAKSS in partnership with the African Union Commission, the African Union Development Agency-NEPAD (AUDA-NEPAD), and leading regional economic communities (RECs).

**AKADEMIYA2063** receives funding from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) through the Feed the Future Policy LINK program under the Cooperative Agreement 7200AA19CA00019. The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the BMGF, USAID, or the US Government.

This publication has not been independently peer reviewed. Any opinions expressed here belong to the author(s) and are not necessarily representative of or endorsed by AKADEMIYA2063.

<sup>1</sup> Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Land Reform, Namibia.

<sup>2</sup> ReSAKSS, International Water Management Institute.

\*Corresponding author, email: I.Greffiths@cgjar.org .



# 1. Introduction

The 2014 Malabo Declaration outlines Africa's vision for accelerating, between 2015 and 2025, agricultural growth and transformation on the African continent through seven broad commitments. The commitments include: (1) upholding the principles and values of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), (2) enhancing investment finance in agriculture, (3) ending hunger in Africa by 2025, (4) reducing poverty by half by 2025 through inclusive agricultural growth and transformation, (5) boosting intra-African trade in agricultural commodities and services, (6) enhancing resilience of livelihoods and production systems to climate variability and other related risks, and (7) ensuring mutual accountability to actions and results by conducting a continent-wide Biennial Review (BR) to monitor progress in achieving the seven commitments. As part of fulfilling commitment 7 to mutual accountability, the second (2019) BR report and Africa Agriculture Transformation Scorecard (AATS) were launched at the 33rd African Union (AU) Summit in February 2020. This brief highlights Namibia's performance in the second BR and assesses challenges faced and lessons learned by the country during the review process. The brief also reviews policy and programmatic changes in Namibia that can be attributed to the first (2017) and second BRs. It concludes by highlighting required policy actions for Namibia to meet the Malabo Commitments by 2025.

## 2. Progress in Achieving the Malabo Commitments

Namibia is the driest country south of the Sahara Desert. It is also one of SADC's middle-income economies and a member of the Southern Africa Customs Union (SACU). Thus, it is expected that Namibia would not be an agrarian economy as per the World Bank's definition of middle-income countries. The AU Commission developed the Africa Agricultural Transformation Scorecard (AATS) to evaluate the progress made by individual member states, including Namibia, towards achieving the Malabo Declaration Commitments. For the second BR, the benchmark (minimum score for a country to be on track in implementing the Malabo Declaration commitments) was 6.66 out of 10 (AUC, 2020). Namibia achieved an overall score of 3.38 in the second BR, indicating that the country is not on track to meet the Malabo commitments and targets by 2025. Paralleling the performance to that of the first BR, it is worth noting that the country was on track then and it was amongst the best-performing countries in the region.

The second BR also indicates a retrogression of 18 percent of the country's performance when it is compared to the first BR (score of 4.11). It is worth mentioning that in the second BR, there are only 4 countries (Ghana, Mali, Morocco and Rwanda) in the continent that are on track and no country in the SADC region is on track.

**Table 1: Namibia summary of BR scores by theme**

Theme	Benchmark	SADC	Regional (Southern Africa)	SADC Low-income	SADC Middle-income	Namibia
Recommitment to CAADP	10.00	7.42	7.50	6.76	7.03	4.26
Enhance Agriculture Finance	10.00	4.22	4.15	3.25	4.20	4.48
Ending Hunger by 2025	5.04	2.51	2.47	2.07	2.42	1.47
Halving Poverty through Agriculture	3.94	1.29	1.25	1.18	1.14	0.55
Intra-Africa Trade in Agriculture Commodities and Services	3.00	2.66	2.91	3.24	2.35	1.99
Enhancing Resilience to Climate Change	7.00	4.81	4.65	3.78	4.61	5.83
Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results	7.64	7.04	6.95	5.43	7.03	5.10

Theme	Benchmark	SADC	Regional (Southern Africa)	SADC Low-income	SADC Middle-income	Namibia
All Commitments	6.66	4.28	4.27	3.67	4.11	3.38
Progress on All Commitments						

Source: Authors' calculations based on country BR scores (2020). Legend: ■ not on track ■ on track

Notes: SADC Low-income Countries: Angola, Democratic Republic of Congo, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe. SADC Middle-income Countries: Botswana, Eswatini, Lesotho, Mauritius, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa, and Zambia. Tanzania was not included in the SADC average and the SADC low-income category because it was grouped as part of the East African Community.

Despite Namibia's poor performance in the second BR, the country was on track in 3 out of the 24 commitment categories (food safety, intra-African trade policies and institutional conditions, and resilience to climate-related risks). In comparison to Namibia's performance in the first BR, the country was on track in 8 out of 24 commitment categories (retrogression of 62.5 percent). The other notable improvements include a 7.7 percent increase in the score of theme 2 (enhancing agricultural finance) and a 45.4 percent increase in the score of theme 6 (enhancing resilience to climate change).

**Table 2: Namibia BR scores by theme (first and second BRs)**

Themes	First BR	Second BR	Change	% change	Second BR Benchmark	Status
Recommitment to CAADP	4.79	4.26	-0.53	-11.1	10.00	
Enhancing Agriculture Finance	4.16	4.48	0.32	7.7	10.00	
Ending Hunger by 2025	2.65	1.47	-1.18	-44.5	5.04	
Halving Poverty Through Agriculture	3.13	0.55	-2.57	-82.1	3.94	
Intra-Africa Trade in Agriculture Commodities and Services	3.85	1.99	-1.86	-48.3	3.00	
Enhancing Resilience to Climate Change	4.01	5.83	1.82	45.4	7.00	
Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results	6.16	5.10	-1.05	-17.0	7.64	
All Commitments	4.11	3.38	-0.72	-17.5	6.66	

Legend: ■ not on track ■ on track

Namibia's overall score for the second BR reflects a retrogression of 17.5 percent when compared to the first BR. The country is also not on track in any of the Malabo Commitment themes, a 100 percent decline when compared to performance in the first BR. On another note, on average, the country performed far worse than the SADC as a whole, SADC middle-income countries, and SADC low-income countries, as well as the Southern Africa region. For theme 6 (enhancing resilience to climate change), however, Namibia performed better than the SADC region as a whole, on average (Table 1). The areas of very weak performance included the commitments to ending hunger by 2025 (score of 1.47 compared to the minimum score of 5.04) and halving poverty through agriculture (score of 0.55 compared to the minimum score of 3.94).

### 3. Challenges and Lessons Learned from the Second BR

- Namibia still faces a huge task ahead when it comes to the coordination of the BR process with regards to multi-stakeholder coordination. The agriculture sector's farming community is represented by two separate entities (smallholder farmers and large commercial farmers); the large commercial farmers are not cooperative in terms of releasing their data and also forming part of the National Agriculture Stakeholders for the BR process.

- The country's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system still needs to be enhanced and harmonized because it is quite fragmented. Expediting the CAADP process in the country would aid in aligning the country's M&E system to the BR process requirements.
- Despite not having clearly defined mutual accountability processes in the country, Namibia has adopted a joint sector review (JSR)-like validation process for the BR report. Notably, stakeholder attendance to the BR process activities has increased when compared to the first BR process.

#### Data Challenges and Lessons

- Namibia's data collection does not occur yearly or regularly, which resulted in data gaps in the BR report. In addition, the Namibia Statistics Agency does not provide estimates for most of the key indicators needed for regular reporting.
- Another challenge was that some of the indicators have parameters that are measured differently by the Namibia Statistics Agency when compared to the BR technical guidelines.
- These challenges highlight the issue of data standards and protocols. The data provided by different institutions within the country are in different modalities compared to the BR requirements.
- The data systems in the country are not harmonized resulting in an M&E system that is underwhelming.

## 4. Policy and Programmatic Changes Following the First and Second BRs

The following actions taken by Namibia contributed to the country's success during the second BR:

- While the country did not meet the benchmark score, there were policy and programmatic changes. Namibia is looking to formalize multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder engagements in the country so that they can encapsulate mutual accountability, peer review, and JSR principles.
- The country is also currently developing its first Malabo Declaration Compliant National Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (NAFSIP).
- Additionally, the country is currently finalizing the Implementation Action Plan for the revised National Food and Nutrition Security Policy.
- The government through the National Planning Commission is currently rolling out a harmonized M&E system which includes, among others, an Integrated National Performance Framework and National Guidelines for M&E.

## 5. Recommendations for Ensuring Achievement of Malabo Commitments by 2025

Overall, the second BR report shows that Namibia is not on track to achieve the Malabo commitments by 2025. This is a setback for the country because, in the first BR, the country's overall score was above the minimum benchmark score, indicating that the country was on track to achieving the Malabo commitments. Moreover, the country is still quite a long way away regarding putting in place policies and implementation strategies to attract its youth into agricultural value chains and increasing spending for the improvement of resilience to climate-related risks. Namibia needs to implement recommendations emanating from the second BR to ensure that there is progress



in the commitment themes for which it did not do well, while still focusing on themes where the performance was satisfactory. The following recommendations are important for Namibia to improve the implementation of the Malabo commitments and to get back on track for the next BR:

1. The Namibian government should speed up the development of a Malabo-compliant National Agricultural Investment Plan for implementing the Malabo commitments using an inclusive and participatory process.
2. There should be a drive towards an increase in public expenditure in agriculture by increasing access to agriculture inputs and technologies.
3. There is a dire need to improve farmers' access to agricultural production inputs to improve the country's productivity. The development of drought-tolerant and disease-resistant varieties is paramount.
4. The government should expand opportunities for more farm households to increase ownership or access to secure land rights, especially among smallholder farmers in communal areas.
5. The Namibian government should expand the provision of incentives that generate employment opportunities in agricultural value chains for the youth.
6. Namibia should develop and enhance its early warning systems for the benefit of smallholder agriculture. The country should also consider conducting Resilience Index Measurement Analysis (RIMA) so that resilience patterns become known (from household to national level).
7. The government should increase the quantity and quality of investments that improve and sustain performance of the agriculture sector to end hunger and reduce poverty. The development of post-harvest loss technologies is essential in the country's quest to improve food security and end hunger.
8. The country should conduct a post-harvest loss assessment at national or sectoral level of agricultural products. Such data will be useful for further estimates and for decision-making in the area of post-harvest loss reduction.
9. Further, Namibia should increase investments in resilience building to contribute to household resilience to climate and weather-related shocks.
10. Lastly, Namibia should strengthen agricultural data collection and management systems to ensure that all Malabo commitment goals and targets are reported in the future.

## 6. References

AUC (African Union Commission). 2020. *Biennial Report to the AU Assembly on implementing the June 2014 Malabo Declaration*. The 2019 report to the January 2020 Assembly. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: AUC.

Namibia CAADP Report. 2019. *Country Performance Reporting Template on progress made for implementing the June 2014 Malabo Declaration*. The Draft report for April 2019 to the January 2020 Assembly. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: AUC.

# ReSAKSS SA

Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System  
by AKADEMIYA2063 & IWMI

## ReSAKSS-Southern Africa

Private Bag X813  
Silverton 0127  
Pretoria, South Africa  
Tel: + 27128459141  
Fax: + 27 (0)12 845 9110  
Email: [resakss-africa@akademiya2063.org](mailto:resakss-africa@akademiya2063.org)  
Website: [www.resakss.org](http://www.resakss.org)



AKADEMIYA

The Expertise We Need. The Africa We Want.

## AKADEMIYA2063 Headquarters

Kicukiro/Niboye KK 341 St 22  
P.O. Box 1855  
Kigali, Rwanda  
Tel: +250 788 304 270  
Email: [hq-office@akademiya2063.org](mailto:hq-office@akademiya2063.org)  
Website: [www.akademiya2063.org](http://www.akademiya2063.org)

## AKADEMIYA2063 Regional Office

Lot N\*3 Almadies  
BP 24 933 Ouakam  
Dakar, Senegal  
Tel: +221 77 761 73 02  
Email: [hq-office@akademiya2063.org](mailto:hq-office@akademiya2063.org)  
Website: [www.akademiya2063.org](http://www.akademiya2063.org)

