CAADP

NEPAD
TRANSFORMING AFRICA

Delivering on the Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods in Africa

Document for preparing country Biennial Review report on progress made for achieving the Malabo Declaration Goals and Targets

Technical Guidelines

Draft 31th March 2021

Key Performance Targets and Indicators for Monitoring and Reporting on the June 2014 AU Assembly Malabo Declaration for Agriculture Growth in Africa

Themes/ *Performance Areas*	Sub-themes/ *Performance Category*	Concerns/ *Objectives of the Category*	Performances Indicators						Existing Int. data Sources	Comments
			Item *(What is measured)*	Targets *(Where to reach)*	Baseline Year	Milestone Year	Reference	M&E Level		
1. Commitment to CAADP Process	1.1 Country CAADP Process	Develop/update national Plans for implementing Malabo declaration using CAADP implementation approach under inclusive and participatory process.	1.1- CAADP Process Completion Index (CAADPPro).	100%	2015	2018	*Malabo Decl.* 1(a) & 1(e)*Malabo Decl.* 1(a) &	Country, AUC*, NEPAD*		
	1.2 CAADP based Cooperation, Partnership & Alliance	Strengthen multi-sector coordination among stakeholders to improve implementation towards results, through establishment of a functional multi-sectorial and multi-stakeholder coordination body.	1.2- Existence of, and Quality of multi-sectorial and multi-stakeholder coordination body (Qc).	100%	2015	2018	*Malabo Decl.* 1(b) & 1(d)*Malabo Decl.* 1(b) & 1(d)*Malabo Decl.* 1(b) &	Country, RECs		
	1.3 CAADP based Policy & Institutional Review/ Setting/ Support	Strengthen existing agricultural policies and institutional settings to successfully implement NAIPs to achieve Malabo Declaration goals and targets.	1.3- Evidence-based policies, supportive institutions and corresponding human resources (EIP).	100%	2015	2018	*Malabo Decl.* 1(c), 2(b), 3(a), 6(c)*Malabo Decl.* 1(c), 2(b), 3(a), 6(c)*Malabo Decl.* 1(c), 2(b),	Country, AUC*, NEPAD*		
2. Investment Finance in Agriculture	2.1 Public Expenditures to Agriculture	Allocate enough funds for agriculture in national budgets.	2.1i- Government agriculture expenditure as % of total public expenditure (ţGAE).	10%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 2(a)*Malabo Decl.* 2(a)*Malabo Decl.* 2(a)	Country	ReSAKSS	
			2.1.ii- Government Agriculture Expenditure as % of agriculture value added (GAE_{AgVA}).	19%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 2(a)*Malabo Decl.* 2(a)*Malabo Decl.* 2(a)	Country		
			2.1iii- Official Development Assistance for agriculture, disbursement as % of commitment (agODA).	100%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 2(a)*Malabo Decl.* 2(a)*Malabo Decl.* 2(a)	Country		
	2.2 Domestic Private Sector Investment in Agriculture.	Put in place or strengthen mechanisms to attract domestic private investment in agriculture.	2.2- Ratio of domestic private sector investment to agriculture value added, % (ţDPrPb).	*5%*	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 2(b)*Malabo Decl.* 2(b)*Malabo Decl.* 2(b)	Country		
	2.3 Foreign Private Sector Investment in Agriculture.	Put in place or strengthen mechanisms to attract foreign private direct investment in agriculture.	2.3- Ratio of foreign private direct investment to agriculture value added, % (ţFPrPb).	*9%*	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 2(b)*Malabo Decl.* 2(b)*Malabo Decl.* 2(b)	Country , AUC, RECs, NEPAD	IFPRI, FAO	
	2.4 Access to finance	Increase access of smallholder farmers/rural households to and use of financial services for the purposes of transacting agricultural business (purchasing inputs, machinery, storage technologies, etc.)	2.4- Proportion of men and women engaged in agriculture with access to financial services, % (ţAgFs).	100%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl. 2(c) and SDG goal1, 1.4*	Country		

Themes/ *Performance Areas*	Sub-themes/ *Performance Category*	Concerns/ *Objectives of the Category*	Performances Indicators						Existing Int. data Sources	Comments
			Item *(What is measured)*	Targets *(Where to reach)*	Baseline Year	Milestone Year	Reference	M&E Level		
3. Ending Hunger	3.1 Access to Agriculture inputs and technologies	Promote utilization of cost-effective & quality agricultural inputs, irrigation, mechanization, and agrochemicals for crops, fisheries, livestocks and forestry e to boost agricultural productivity.	3.1i- Fertilizer consumption (kilogram per hectare of arable land), (Fz)	50 kilograms per hectare of arable land	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)	Country		
			3.1ii- Growth rate of the size of irrigated areas from its value of the year 2000 (RiIA).	100%	2000	2025	*Malabo Decl. 3(a) + African Water Vision 2025*	Country		
			3.1iii- Growth rate of the ratio of supplied quality agriculture inputs (seed, breed, fingerlings) to the total national inputs requirements for the commodity (ţAgI).	100%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)	Country		*Target will be set once data are available*
			3.1iv- Proportion of farmers having access to Agricultural Advisory Services (FAgAS).	100%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 3(a) + SDG*Malabo Decl.* 3(a) + SDG*Malabo*	Country		
			3.1v- Total Agricultural Research Spending as a share of AgGDP (ţTARS).	1%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)	Country		
			3.1vi- Proportion of adult agricultural population with ownership or secure land rights over agricultural land (ţHhSL).	100%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)	Country		
	3.2 Agricultural Productivity	Increase agricultural productivity.	3.2i- Growth rate of agriculture value added, in constant US dollars, per agricultural worker (ţAgW)	100%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)	Country		
			3.2ii- Growth rate of agriculture value added, in constant US dollar, per hectare of agricultural land (ţAgL).	100%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)	Country		
			3.2iii- Growth rate of yields for the 5 national priority commodities, and possibly for the 11 AU agriculture priority commodities (ţY).	100%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)*Malabo Decl.* 3(a)	Country		

Themes/ *Performance Areas*	Sub-themes/ *Performance Category*	Concerns/ *Objectives of the Category*	Performances Indicators						Existing Int. data Sources	Comments
			Item *(What is measured)*	Targets *(Where to reach)*	Baseline Year	Milestone Year	Reference	M&E Level		
	3.3 Post-Harvest Loss	Provide logistics support to all stages of the food production chain *(field/harvest, storage, processing, transportation, final retail market)* to limit degradation both in quantity and in quality of the produced food.Provide logistics support to all stages of the food production chain *(field/harvest, storage, processing, transportation, final retail market)* to limit degradation both in quantity and in quality of the produced food.	3.3- Reduction rate of Post-Harvest Losses for (at least) the 5 national priority commodities, and possibly for the 11 AU agriculture priority commodities (ţPHL).	50%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 3(b)*Malabo Decl.* 3(b)	Country	FAO, APHLIS	
3. Ending Hunger *… cont3. Ending Hunger … cont*	3.4 Social Protection	Integrate measures for increased agricultural productivity with social protection initiatives focusing on vulnerable social groups through committing targeted budget lines within our national budgets for social protection.	3.4- Budget lines (%) on social protection as percentage of the total resource requirements for coverage of the vulnerable social groups (ţSP)	100%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 3(c)*Malabo Decl.* 3(c)	Country		
	3.5 Food security and Nutrition	Promote initiatives to improve nutritional status, and in particular, the elimination of hunger and child under nutrition in Africa, by bringing down stunting, underweight, wasting; improving dietary diversity for women and children; and reducing population undernourishment in children and adult food insecurity.	3.5i- Prevalence of stunting (% of children under 5 years old) (St)	10%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 3(d) and the ARNS*Malabo Decl.* 3(d) and the ARNS	Country	DHS, WDI, WFI, WHO, UNICEF, IFPRI	
			3.5ii- Prevalence of underweight (% of children under 5 years old) (Uw)	5%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 3(d) and the ARNS*Malabo Decl.* 3(d) and	Country	DHS, WDI, WFI, WHO, UNICEF, IFPRI	
			3.5iii- Prevalence of wasting (% of children under 5 old) (W)	5%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 3(d) and the ARNS*Malabo Decl.* 3(d) and	Country	DHS, WDI, WFI, WHO, UNICEF, IFPRI	
			3.5iv-Prevalence of undernourished (% of the country's population) (U)..	5%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 3(d) and the ARNS*Malabo Decl.* 3(d) and the ARNS	Country	DHS, WDI, WFI, WHO, UNICEF, IFPRI	
			3.5v- Growth rate of the proportion of Minimum Dietary Diversity-Women (ţMDDW)	50%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 3(d) and the ARNS*Malabo Decl.* 3(d) and the ARNS	Country	DHS, WDI, WFI, WHO, UNICEF, IFPRI	
			3.5vi- Proportion of 6-23 months old children who meet the Minimum Acceptable Diet (MAD)	50%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 3(d) and the ARNS*Malabo Decl.* 3(d) and the ARNS	Country	DHS, WDI, WFI, WHO, UNICEF, IFPRI	
			3.5vii- Reduction in the prevalence (%) of adult individuals (15 years or older) found to be food insecure	50%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 3(d) and the ARNS*Malabo Decl.* 3(d) and the ARNS	Country	DHS, WDI, WFI, WHO, UNICEF, IFPRI	
			3.6i- Level of improvement of Food Safety Systems (food safety systems index)	100%	2015	2025	Malabo Decl. 3(d), 5(a,b)	Country	National competent authorities	

Themes/ *Performance Areas*	Sub-themes/ *Performance Category*	Concerns/ *Objectives of the Category*	Performances Indicators						Existing Int. data Sources	Comments
			Item *(What is measured)*	Targets *(Where to reach)*	Baseline Year	Milestone Year	Reference	M&E Level		
	3.6 Food Safety	Promote initiatives to improve nutritional status, and in particular, the elimination of hunger and child under nutrition in Africa, by bringing down child stunting, child underweight, child wasting, and child undernourishment; and improving dietary diversity for women and children.	3.6ii- Health apect of the Food Safety (food safety health index)	50%	2015	2025	Malabo Decl. 3(d)	Country	DHIS, UNICEF, SUA, FBS (FAO), IARC , National statistics;	
			3.6ii- Trade aspect of the Food Safety (food safety trade index)	50%	2015	2025	Malabo Decl. 3(c), 5 (a,b)	Country	Ministries, trade notification systems	
4. Eradicating Poverty through Agriculture	4.1 Agricultural GDP and Poverty Reduction	Sustain annual agriculture sector growth by ensuring higher contribution to GDP and to poverty reduction.	4.1i- Growth rate of the agriculture value added, in constant US dollars (ţAgGDP).	6%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 4(a)*Malabo Decl.* 4(a)	Country	IFPRI	
			4.1ii- Agriculture contribution to the overall poverty reduction target (Stand-by)	50%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 4(a)*Malabo Decl.* 4(a)	Country	IFPRI	*Further work to calculate the indicator*
			4.1iii- Reduction rate of poverty headcount ratio, at national poverty line (% of population), dpovN	50%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 4(a)*Malabo Decl.* 4(a)	Country	IFPRI	
			4.1iv- Reduction rate of poverty headcount ratio at international poverty line (% of population), dpovI	50%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 4(a)	Country	IFPRI	
			4.1v- Reduction rate of the gap between the wholesale price and farmgate price (ţfgws)	50%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 4(a)	Country	IFPRI	
	4.2 Inclusive PPPs for commodity value chains	Promote approaches via PPP arrangements to link smallholder farmers to value chains of priority agricultural commodities.	4.2- Number of priority agricultural commodity value chains for which a PPP is established with strong linkage to smallholder agriculture, (Nc)	5	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 4(b)	Country		
	4.3 Youth job in agriculture	Engage youth in agricultural sector development to contribute to reduce level of unemployment and poverty .	4.3- Percentage of youth that is engaged in new job opportunities in agriculture value chains, (ţYth)	30%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 4(c)	Country	UNIDO, ILO	

Themes/ *Performance Areas*	Sub-themes/ *Performance Category*	Concerns/ *Objectives of the Category*	Performances Indicators						Existing Int. data Sources	Comments
			Item *(What is measured)*	Targets *(Where to reach)*	Baseline Year	Milestone Year	Reference	M&E Level		
	4.4 Women participation in Agri-business	Promote initiatives that facilitate preferential entry and participation for women in gainful and attractive agri-business opportunities.	4.4- Proportion of rural women that are empowered in agriculture, (ţWE)	20%	2013	2023	*Malabo Decl.* 4(d) + *FTYIP of the AU Agenda 2063*	Country		
5. Intra-African Trade in Agriculture Commodities and services	5.1 Intra-African Trade in agriculture commodities and services	Promote intra-African trade in agriculture commodities and services while reducing importation of those commodities from outside Africa.	5.1- Growth rate of the value of trade of agricultural commodities and services within Africa, in constant US dollars (ţIAT).	200%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 5(a) & 9(c)	Country/ RECs*/ AUC/ NEPAD	UNCTAD, FAOstat, RECs	
	5.2 Intra-African Trade Policies and institutional conditions	Create and enhance regional and continental policies and institutional conditions and support systems to simplify and formalize the current trade practices to permit the achievement of intra-African trade target; including the promotion of the African Common position on agriculture-related international trade negotiations and partnership agreements.	5.2i- Trade Facilitation Index (TFI)	100%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 5(b)	Country/ RECs/ AUC/ NEPAD		*Further work to calculate the indicator*
			5.2ii- Domestic Food Price Volatility Index (CV)	7,5%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 5(b)	Country/ RECs/ AUC/ NEPAD		
6. Resilience to Climate Variability	6.1 Resilience to climate related risks	Promote initiatives of building resilience of production systems to reduce vulnerabilities of the livelihoods of African population to climate variability and other related risks.	6.1i- Percentage of farm, pastoral, and fisher households that are resilient to climate and weather related shocks (ţRAgHh)	30%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 6(a)	Country		
			6.1ii- Share of agriculture land under sustainable land management practices (SSLM)	30%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 6(a) + *FTYIP of the AU Agenda 2063*	Country		
	6.2 Investment in resilience building	Enhance investments for resilience building initiatives to protect rural workers and social groups, as well as vulnerable ecosystems.	6.2- Existence of government budget-lines to respond to spending needs on resilience building initiatives (EI_{RB})	100%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 6(b)	Country		
7. Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results	7.1 Country capacity for evidence based planning, impl. and M&E	Countries to increase capacity to generate, analyse and use data, information, knowlegde and innovations	7.1- Index of capacity to generate and use agriculture statistical data and information (ASCI)	63	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 7(c)	AUC, RECs, NEPAD, Country		*Target set as average of the 10 best ranked countries in the Africa Country Assessment report*
	7.2 Peer Review and Mutual Accountability	Put in place mechanisms and systems to recognize and appreciate performance of Member States with respect to progress on key commitments agreed upon.	7.2- Existence of inclusive institutionalized mechanisms and platforms for mutual accountability and peer review (ECI).	100%	2015	2018	*Malabo Decl.* 7(b) & 9(d)	AUC, RECs, NEPAD, Country		

Themes/ *Performance Areas*	Sub-themes/ *Performance Category*	Concerns/ *Objectives of the Category*	Performances Indicators						Existing Int. data Sources	Comments
			Item *(What is measured)*	Targets *(Where to reach)*	Baseline Year	Milestone Year	Reference	M&E Level		
	7.3 Biennial Agriculture Review Process	Institutionalize the use of the Biennial report to serve mutual accountability platforms, experiences sharing amongst African countries on agricultural development issues, and promote lessons learnt for performing on Malabo Declaration.	7.3 Country Biennial Report submission (BR).	100%	2015	2025	*Malabo Decl.* 7(a) & 9(d,e,f,g)	AUC, RECs, NEPAD, Country		

List of profiled Indicators for consideration in the Malabo Scorecard

Performance Indicators		Status of the profile
1.1	CAADP Process Completion Index (CAADPPro)	OK
1.2	Quality of multi-sectorial and multi-stakeholder coordination (Qc)	OK
1.3	Evidence-Informed Policies and corresponding human resources (EIP)	OK
2.1i	Government agriculture expenditure as % of total government expenditure (ţGAE)	OK
2.1ii	Government agriculture expenditure as % of agriculture value added (GAE_{AgVA})	OK
2.1iii	Official development assistance for agriculture, disbursement as % of commitment (agODA)	OK
2.2	Ratio of domestic private sector investment to agriculture value added, % (ţDPrPb)	OK
2.3	Ratio of foreign private direct investment to agriculture value added, % (ţFPrPb)	OK
2.4	Proportion of men and women engaged in agriculture with access to financial services, % (ţAgFs)	OK
3.1i	Fertilizer consumption (kilogram per hectare of arable land), (Fz)	OK
3.1ii	Growth rate of the size of irrigated areas from its value of the year 2000 (RiIA)	OK
3.1iii	Growth rate of the ratio of supplied quality agriculture inputs (seed, breed, fingerlings) to the total national inputs requirements for the commodity (ţAgI)	OK
3.1iv	Proportion of farmers having access to Agricultural Advisory Services (FAgAS)	OK
3.1v	Total Agricultural Research Spending as a share of AgGDP (ţTARS)	OK
3.1vi	Proportion of adult agricultural population with ownership or secure land rights over agricultural land (ţHhSL)	OK
3.2i	Growth rate of agriculture value added, in constant US dollars, per agricultural worker (ţAgW)	OK
3.2ii	Growth rate of agriculture value added, in constant US dollar, per hectare of agricultural land (ţAgL)	OK
3.2iii	Growth rate of yields for the 5 national priority commodities, and possibly for the 11 AU agriculture priority commodities (ţY)	OK
3.3	Reduction rate of Post-Harvest Losses for (at least) the 5 national priority commodities, and possibly for the 11 AU agriculture priority commodities (ţPHL)	OK
3.4	Budget lines (%) on social protection as percentage of the total resource requirements for coverage of the vulnerable social groups (ţSP)	OK
3.5i	Prevalence of stunting (% of children under 5 years old) (St)	OK
3.5ii	Prevalence of underweight (% of children under 5 years old) (Uw)	OK
3.5iii	Prevalence of wasting (% of children under 5 old) (W)	OK
3.5iv	Prevalence of undernourished (% of the country's population) (U).	OK
3.5v	Growth rate of the proportion of Minimum Dietary Diversity-Women (ţMDDW)	OK
3.5vi	Proportion of 6-23 months old children who meet the Minimum Acceptable Diet (MAD)	OK
3.5vii	Reduction in the prevalence (%) of adult individuals (15 years or older) found to be food insecure	OK
3.6i	Food Safety Systems Indicator (FSSI)	OK
3.6ii	Food Safety Health Indicator (FSHI)	OK
3.6iii	Food Safety Trade Indicator (FSTI)	OK
4.1i	Growth rate of the agriculture value added, in constant US dollars (ţAgVA)	OK
4.1ii	Agriculture contribution to the overall poverty reduction target	*Test results to be included in report*
4.1iii	Reduction rate of poverty headcount ratio, at national poverty line (% of population), dpovN	OK
4.1iv	Reduction rate of poverty headcount ratio at international poverty line (% of population), dpovI	OK
4.1v	Reduction rate of the gap between the wholesale price and farmgate price (ţfgws)	OK
4.2	Number of priority agricultural commodity value chains for which a PPP is established with strong linkage to smallholder agriculture, (Nc)	OK
4.3	Percentage of youth that is engaged in new job opportunities in agriculture value chains, (ţYth)	OK
4.4	Proportion of rural women that are empowered in agriculture, (ţWE)	OK
5.1	Growth rate of the value of trade of agricultural commodities and services within Africa, in constant US dollars (ţIAT).	OK
5.2i	Trade Facilitation Index (TFI)	OK
5.2ii	Domestic Food Price Volatility Index (CV)	OK
6.1i	Percentage of farm, pastoral, and fisher households that are resilient to climate and weather related shocks (ţRAgHh)	OK
6.1ii	Share of agriculture land under sustainable land management practices (SSLM)	OK
6.2	Existence of government budget-lines to respond to spending needs on resilience building initiatives (EIRB)	OK
7.1	Index of capacity to generate and use agriculture statistical data and information (ASCI)	OK
7.2	Existence of inclusive institutionalized mechanisms for mutual accountability and peer review (ECI)	OK
7.3	Country Biennial Report submission (BR)	OK

STATUS OF THE PROFILES: *46 OK; 1 under test*

Theme 1 — *Commitment to CAADP process*

Performance Category **PC 1.1** **Country CAADP Process**

1. Objective of the PC

Develop/update national Plans for implementing Malabo declaration using CAADP implementation approach under inclusive and participatory process.

2. Performance Target

CAADP process to be fully completed at the country level: *Reach 100% of the completion, by the year 2018.*

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 1(a) & 1(e)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
CAADP Process Completion Index (CAADPPro) in the current review period (2020-2021).	The CAADPPRO is the measure of the level of country completion of the CAADP process in the country, through the level of availability of the necessary documents that justify the completion of each of the 4 main steps decided by the AUC and NPCA for rolling out implementation of Malabo declaration at country level. The 4 main steps include: *(i)- the Step of Domestication, (ii)- the step of NAIP Appraisal, (iii)- the step of NAIP implementation; and (iv)- Step of NAIP M&E and reporting* . This measure is based on the assumption that a ready document is enough to justify the successful completion of a particular step. Each step has a list of its proof documents that are weighted to compute the Indicator.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Existence of communication on internalizing or domesticating the Malabo Declaration, p1	Existence of *communication (leaflet or any other tool)* developed by the Country as part of the *"Domestication step"* to promote implementation of Malabo Declaration, while involving national stakeholders.	- p_1: which is the status of completing this step by the country.	p_1 is estimated with: - "No" = 0 - "Yes" = 100%	CAADP focal point, Ministry of Ag,
2. Existence of National Roadmap for implementing the Malabo Declaration, p2	Existence of *national roadmap* prepared by the Country as part of the *"Domestication step"* to plan implementation of the Malabo.	- p_2: which is the status of completing and availing the roapmap.	p_2 is estimated with: - "No" = 0 - "Yes" = 100%	CAADP focal point, Ministry of Ag,
3. Existence of Malabo-compliant NAIP Appraisal Report, p3	Existence of *NAIP apraisal report* with recommendations on necessary actions and programmatic elements to be considered by the Country to revise the existing NAIP to achieve Malabo targets.	- p_3: which is the status of completing and availing the NAIP apraisal report.	p_3 is estimated with: - "No" = 0 - "Yes" = 100%	CAADP focal point, Ministry of Ag,
4. Existence of a Malabo-compliant NAIP, p4	Existence of *Malabo Compliant NAIP* which is the revised NAIP that contains the programmatic elements (as per the recommendations of the appraisal report) to achieve targets o f the Malabo Declaration.	- p_4: which is the status of completing and availing the new NAIP.	p_4 is estimated with: - "No" = 0 - "Yes" = 100%	CAADP focal point, Ministry of Ag,
5. Malabo-compliant NAIP priorities reflected in national budget, p5	NAIP Implementation should make sure that the Malabo compliant NAIP annual costing is considered in annual budgeting process of the Country. The annual national Budget should reflect programmatic activities and budgeting of the NAIP.	- p_5: which is the existence Malabo-compliant NAIP priorities reflected in national budget.	p_5 is estimated with: - "No" = 0 - "Yes" = 100%	CAADP focal point, Ministry of Ag,
6. Existence of Malabo-compliant NAIP M&E system, p6	NAIP M&E is making sure that a *national NAIP M&E Framework* that involves key stakeholders, has been put in place to regularly monitor implementation of the new NAIP.	- p_6: which is is the status of establishing the NAIP M&E system.	p_6 is estimated with: - "No" = 0 - "Yes" = 100%	CAADP focal point, Ministry of Ag,
7. Existence of Malabo-compliant NAIP implementation	Existence of a regular *Annual NAIP's progress Report* .	- p_7: which is the is the status of availing the progress report.	p_7 is estimated with: - "No" = 0 - "Yes" = 100%	CAADP focal point, Ministry of Ag,

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year, the ***CAADP process completion Index*** in %, is : *CAADPPro* = **Average (p_i)** $_{i=1 \text{ to } 7}$

Theme 1 — *Commitment to CAADP process*

Performance Category **PC 1.2** **CAADP based Cooperation, Partnership & Alliance**

1. Objective of the PC

Strengthen multi-sector coordination among stakeholders to improve implementation towards results, through establishment of a functional multi-sectorial and multi-stakeholder coordination body.

2. Performance Target

Multi-sectorial coordination body and multi-stakeholder body fully established and operational at national level *(reach 100% for the Quality of multi-sectorial and multi-stakeholder coordination body,* ***Qc*** *)* **by 2018.**

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 7(b)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Existence of, and Quality of multi-sectorial and multi-stakeholder coordination body (**Qc**) in the period under review (2020-2021).	Multi-sectorial coordination means a situation where various agencies of government (inluding Agriculture, Education, Health, Nutrition, Water and Sanitation, Social protection, Works, Finance, Lands, Social Welfare, and Protection, etc) work together towards a common objective on contributing to the agricultural sector. Multi-stakeholder coordination means that several stakeholders including government, National Bureau of Statistics, CSOs, private sector, farmers organizations, youth and women Organizations work together through a coordinated platform to make and implement decisions that drive the national agricultural investment plan (e.g. Agricultural sector working group). The quality of multi-sectorial and multi-stakeholder coordination is assessed by several parameters, including broadness, inclusiveness, participatory, and openness.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Existence of quality terms of refereence (TORs), Qc1	The quality terms of reference of the multi-sectorial and multi-stakeholder coordination body is the document that clarifies: i) the objectives of the coordination body and how they are aligned to driving the sector; ii) the roles and responsabilities of involved stakeholders with their relevance; iii) the relevance to the sector; iv) the roadmap and budget of the coordination actions.	- Existence of the TORs, p_{TOR1} - Reflection of the key elements, p_{TOR2} *(Elements: i. alignment of the objectives; ii. Roles and responsabilities; iii. Roadmap; iv. Budget)* -Representation of stakeholders, p_{TOR3} *(Stakeholders categories: i. Government, ii. CSOs, iii.Private sector, iv.Research and knwoledge Oragnizations , iv. Farmer Organizations, and v. Development Partners)* - Relevance of membership, p_{TOR4} - Existence of List of official nominees (number + seniority) and affiliation, p_{TOR5}	- p_{TOR1} is estimated with *"No"=0 and "Yes"=100%* - p_{TOR2} *is in (%) the number of elements (of the 4 listed) reflected in the TORs devided by 4.* - p_{TOR3} *is in (%) the number of category (of the 5 listed) reflected in the TORs devided by 5.* - p_{TOR4} *is in (%) the number of relevant members (accordingly to national stakeholders' perception) devided by total number of members.* '- p_{TOR5} *is estimated with "No"=0 and "Yes"=1* *The Existence of quality terms of reference is estimated with:* $Qc_1 = \text{average}(p_{TOR(i)})$	CAADP focal point, Ministry of Ag, Country teams
2. Level of implementation of the coordination actions ***Qc 2***	This measures progress in implementing coordinations actions reflected in the TORs. The measure here is limited to the level of stakeholders involvement through engagement with stakeholders to hold all the coordination meetings planned in the TORs.	-Total number of meetings planned in the TORs for the evaluation period, N_{mT} - Total number of meetings organized during the evaluation period, N_{mO} - The number of invitations received by the stakeholders for each meeting, $N_{IN(i)}$ - The total number of required participants in the TORs, N_{INT}	- The Performance for meetings held (%) is: $p_{IMP1} = N_{mO}/N_{mT}$ *- For each meeting organized, the level of engagement is* $p_{IMP2(i)} = N_{IN(i)} / N_{INT}$. *The overall level of engagement* p_{IMP2} *is the average of all* $p_{IMP2(i)}$ *for all the meetings organized.* *The Level of implemtation of the coordination actions is estimated with:* $Qc_2 = (p_{IMP1} + p_{IMP2})/2$	CAADP focal point, Ministry of Ag, Country teams
3. Level of participation and inclusiveness ***Qc 3***	This measures the level of partcipation of all the organizations listed in the TORs as stakeholders of the coordination process.	- Total number of organizations, N_{Org} -Total number of meetings organized, N_{mO} - Number of organizations present at each meeting, N_{Orgi}	*The Level of Participation and inclusiveness is calculated with:* $Qc_3 = \sum(N_{Orgi}) / (N_{org} \times N_{mO})$	CAADP focal point, Ministry of Ag,
4. Level of commitment to decisions, ***Qc 4***	This measures the level of implementation (through translation in decisions) of recommandations made under the coordination mechanism .	- Total number of recommandations taken during the evaluation period, N_{RT} - Total number of decisions taken with out of the number of recommandations druing the evaluation period, N_{DT} -Number of decisions implemented, N_{DI}	*The level of commitment to decisions is calculated with:* $Qc_4 = (N_{DI} / N_{DT}) \times (N_{DT} / N_{RT})$	CAADP focal point, Ministry of Ag,
5. Level of Representation, ***Qc 5***	This measures the level of representation of the organisations in term of seniority attendance, at each of the meetings organized under the coordniation mechanism.	- Total expected senior attendances per meeting as reflected in the list of official nominees (number + seniority) in TORs for the involved organizations , T_{SA} - Total number of meetings organized during the evaluation period, N_{mO} - Observed senior attendances at each meeting, O_{SAi}	- For each meeting organized, the level of representation is $Qc_{5(i)} = O_{SA(i)} / T_{SA}$. *The Level of Representation is estimated with:* $Qc_5 =$ average $(Qc_{5(i)})$ or $Qc_5 = \sum O_{SA(i)} / (N_{mO} \times T_{SA})$	CAADP focal point, Ministry of Ag, Country teams

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year, the ***Existence of, and Quality of multi-sectorial and multi-stakeholder coordination body*** in %, is :

$Qc = \sum(Qc_i)_{i=1 \text{ to } 5}$

Theme 1 — *Commitment to CAADP process*

Performance Category **PC 1.3** **CAADP based Policy & Institutional Review/ Setting/ Support**

1. Objective of the PC

Strengthen existing agricultural policies and institutional settings to successfully implement NAIPs to achieve Malabo Declaration goals and targets.

2. Performance Target

Evidence-based policies and institutions that support planning and implementation are established and implemented by the country to deliver on Malabo *(reach 100% for the Evidence-based policies, supportive institutions and corresponding human resources, **EIP**)* **by 2018.**

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 1(c), 2(b), 3(a) & 7(c)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Evidence-based policies, supportive institutions and corresponding human resources (EIP) in the period under review (2020-2021).	This indicator assesses three things: (i) the extent to which policies guiding the implementation of the NAIP are based on evidence from the Biennial Review Report or other relevant studies; (ii) existence of supportive institutions; and, (iii) adequacy of human resources to implement the NAIP.

4. Disaggregation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Evidence-based policies and strategies evidence: EPE	Extent to which policies, strategies and plans of the agricultural sector are anchored on evidence from the Biennial Review Report or other relevant studies	• Total number of policies and strategies in the NAIP (TNP) • Number of policies and strategies that are evidence-based (NEP) Assessment through Experts opinion surveys on the extent to which policies and strategies are evidence based.	The Evidence-based policies will be given by: EPE = (NEP/TNP)*100	CAADP focal point: ratings should be undertaken in inclusive multi-stakeholder processes
2. Supportive institutions (laws and regulations): EPI	Extent to which existing institutions (In this indicator, institutions are defined as the laws and regulations that guide activities in the sector) are adequate to support implementation of the NAIP	• Number of policies and strategies elements in the NAIP that require supportive institutions (laws and regulations) (NRI) • Number of institutions (laws and regulations) that exist to support policies and strategies (NIP).	Country score will be given by: EPI = (NIP/NRI)*100	CCAADP focal point: ratings should be undertaken in inclusive multi-stakeholder processes
3. Full-time equivalent staff dedicated to agricultural policy planning, implementation and M&E within the Ministry of agriculture: FTE	Adequacy (numbers and capacity) of full-time equivalent professionals dedicated to agricultural policy planning, implementation and M&E within the Ministry of agriculture	Professional personnel engaged calculated as equivalent full-time. • Number of required fulltime staff positions for planning and M&E (FTP) • Number of staffing positions filled (FTS)	FTE = (FTS/FTP)*100	Ministry of agriculture, National data

5. Indicator Computing

*For a given year, the **Evidence-based policies, supportive institutions and corresponding human resources, is***
EIP = (EPE + EPI + FTE)/3

Theme 2 — *Investment Finance in Agriculture*

Performance Category **PC 2.1i** **Public Expenditures to Agriculture**

1. Objective of the PC

Allocate enough funds for agriculture in national budgets.

2. Performance Target

Increase Government expenditures to agriculture as part of national expenditures to at least 10% from the year 2015 to 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 2(a)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Government agriculture expenditure as % of total government expenditure (ţGAE).	As adopted in Maputo in 2003 and Malabo in 2014, AU Heads of State and Government committed to allocate at least 10% of annual public expidutres to agriculture. The AU/NEPAD Guidance Note valdated in 2015 on the "Enhanced Measurement and Tracking of Government Expenditure for Agriculture and its Quality in Africa Countries" provides background on the composition of the agriculture sector and constitution of agriculture expenditure, thereby making clearer country progress toward compliance of the 10% agriculture expenditure target, and the rationale for appropriate levels of spending; and (2) the improvements in the quality of spending.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Total Government Expenditure in local currency unit (lcu): TGE	Expenses incurred in providing nonmarket or public goods and services to the country. This is limited in this profile to the expenses fo the General government sector, described below:	Expenses incurred in performing the different ***i*** functions of government (e.g. administration, economic, infrastructure, social, and public safety) based on the Classification of the Functions of Government (COFOG) and categorized according to ***j*** economic uses: (1) compensation of employees, (2) use of goods and services, (3) consumption of fixed capital, (4) interest, (5) subsidies, (6) grants, (7) social benefits, and (8) miscellaneous other expense. [E_{ij}].	TGE = $\sum[TGE_{ij}]$	IMF Government Finance Statisitics (GFS) Manual; AU Guidance note
	- General government sector, which includes central or federal, state, and local government units	Expenses incurred by the government sector in performning the different functions according to the different expenditure categories, also referred to as on-budget expenditure. [TGE_{ij}]	Add up expense for all functions by all economic uses. $\sum[TGE_{ij}]$	
2. Government Agriculture Expenditure in local currency units (lcu): GAE	Expenses incurred on a set of administrative, construction, and operational support activities related to the production of crops, livestock, forestry, and fishing. This is limited in this profile to the expenses of General government sector described below:	Expenses incurred in performing different ***i*** agricultural subfunctions (e.g. policy and planning, research, extension, irrigation, infrastructure and marketing, farm support, other) according to the above ***j*** economic uses in the ***k*** agricultural subsectors [E_{ijk}]. Notes: The main issue here is to identify the various agricultural subfunction performed by different public sector agents, considering multi-functional development projects as discussed tin the AU Guidance Note.	GAE = $\sum[GAE_{ij}]$	IMF Government Finance Statisitics (GFS) Manual; AU Guidance note
	- General government sector, which includes central or federal, state, and local government units.	Expenses incurred by the government sector in performning the different agriculture subfunctions according to the different expenditure categories, also referred to as on-budget expenditure. [GAE_{ijk}]	Add up expense for all subfunctions by all economic uses in all subsectors. $\sum[GAE_{ijk}]$	

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), government agriculture expenditure as % of total government expenditure is:
ţGAE = GAE * 100 / TGE

Theme 2 — *Investment Finance in Agriculture*

Performance Category **PC 2.1ii** **Public Expenditures to Agriculture**

1. Objective of the PC

Allocate enough funds for agriculture in national budgets.

2. Performance Target

Ensure adequate intensity of agricultural spending by keeping annual Government agriculture expenditure as % of agriculture value added to no less than (or at a minimum of) 19% from the year 2015 to the year 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 2(a)….* *Average of top 10 ratios of GAE $_{AgVA}$*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Government Agriculture Expenditure as % of agriculture value added (**GAE_{AgVA}**).	It is a measure of agricultural spending intensity ratio, which is a more relevant measure of a country's agricultural expenditure commitment and of placing it within a continent-wide or an international context.

4. Disaggregation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Government Agriculture Expenditure in local currency units (lcu): **GAE**	Refer to Profile PC 2.1 i		GAE	
2. Agriculture Value Added in local currency units (lcu): **AgVA**	Refer to Profile PC 3.2 I (in lcu)		AgVA	

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year, the ***Government Agriculture Expenditure as % of agriculture value added*** , **GAE_{AgVA} = GAE * 100 / AgVA**

Theme 2 — *Investment Finance in Agriculture*

Performance Category **PC 2.1iii** **Public Expenditures to Agriculture**

1. Objective of the PC

Allocate enough funds for agriculture in national budgets. It is also intended to ensure donors are delivering on their pledges and comitment to support national plans

2. Performance Target

Ensure that Official Development Assistance (ODA) committed to implement the NAIPs is fully disbursed to countries. The target is to have 100% ODA disbursement annually from 2015 to 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 2(a)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Official development assistance for agriculture, disbursement as % of commitment (**agODA**).	This Indicator measures donor commitments/pledges to ensure that what is committed/pledged is actually disbursed to countries to implement NAIPs. It also measures what is actually disbursed and spent incountry on the invstment plans as opposed to what is pledged and spent at donor headquarters or what is spent in country but not aligned with investment plans.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. ODA for Agriculture, gross disbursements (US$): **agODAD**	Actual ODA disbursed to support agricultural activities (crops, livestock, forestry, and fishery).	Actual ODA disbursed by all donors through all channels in performing different ***i*** agricultural subfunctions (e.g. policy and planning, research, extension, irrigation, marketing, farm support, other) in the ***k*** agricultural subsectors [$agODAD_{ik}$]. Notes: Channels include public sector, public private partnership, multilateral organizations, NGOs and civil society, etc.	Add up ODA disburesed for all subfunctions in all subsectors. $\sum[agODAD_{ik}]$	OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS); National data sources.
2. ODA for agriculture, commitments (US$): **agODAC**	ODA commitments made to support agricultural activities (crops, livestock, forestry, and fishery).	ODA commitements made by all donors through all channels to support performance of different ***i*** agricultural subfunctions (e.g. policy and planning, research, extension, irrigation, marketing, farm support, other) in the ***k*** agricultural subsectors [$agODAC_{ik}$]	Add up ODA commitments for all subfunctions in all subsectors. $\sum[agODAC_{ik}]$	OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS) and Country Disbusement Figures as contained in National databases

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year, official development assistance for agriculture, disbursement as % of commitment is: **agODA = agODAD * 100 / agODAC**.

Theme 2 — *Investment Finance in Agriculture*

Performance Category **PC 2.2** **Domestic Private Sector Investment in Agriculture.**

1. Objective of the PC

Put in place or strengthen mechanisms to attract domestic private investment in agriculture.

2. Performance Target

Ensure that domestic private sector investment in agriculture as % of agriculture value added is no less than xx% from 2015 to 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 2(b) …. Average of top 10 ratios of ţDPrPb*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Domestic private sector investment in agriculture as % of agriculture value added (**ţDPrPb**).	Private sector Investment is defined as any use of private sector resources intended to increase future production output or income, to improve the sustainable use of agriculture-related natural resources (soil, water, etc.), to improve water or land management, etc. Increased investment is the predominate source of economic growth in the agricultural and other economic sectors. Private sector investment is critical because it indicates that the investment is perceived by private agents to provide a positive financial return and therefore is likely to lead to sustainable increases in agricultural production. It shows the relative domestic private investments in agriculture (DPrIA) to the size of the agricltural sector.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Domestic Private Investment in Agriculture in current US$: **DPrIA**	Composed of investment oriented loans provided by the banking sector to the agricultural sector (crops, livestock, forestry, and fishing), as well as private equity investments		DPrIA	Government Monetary and Financial Statistics; FAO Statistical Division
2. Agriculture Value Added in current US$: **AgVA**	Refer to Profile PC 3.2.i (with value in current US$)		AgVA	

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year, ratio of domestic private sector investment in agriculture as % of agriculture value added is: ţDPrPb = DPrIA *100 / AgVA

Theme 2 — *Investment Finance in Agriculture*

Performance Category **PC 2.3** **Foreign Private Sector Direct Investment in Agriculture.**

1. Objective of the PC

Put in place or strengthen mechanisms to attract foreign private direct investment in agriculture.

2. Performance Target

Ensure that foreign private direct investment in agriculture as % of agriculture value added is no less than xx% from 2015 to 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 2(b) …. Average of top 10 ratios of ţFPrPb*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Foreign private direct investment in agriculture as % of agriculture value added (**ţFPrPb**).	Private sector Investment is defined as any use of private sector resources intended to increase future production output or income, to improve the sustainable use of agriculture-related natural resources (soil, water, etc.), to improve water or land management, etc. Increased investment is the predominate source of economic growth in the agricultural and other economic sectors. Private sector investment is critical because it indicates that the investment is perceived by private agents to provide a positive financial return and therefore is likely to lead to sustainable increases in agricultural production. It shows the relative foreign private investments in agriculture (FPrIA) to the size of the agricltural sector.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Foreign Direct Investment in agriculture in current US$: FPrIA	Foreign direct investment (FDI) in agriculture (crops, livestock, forestry, and fishing).	FDI data can be availed by country statistics.	FPrIA	Government Monetary and Financial Statistics; FAO Statistical Division
2. Agriculture Value Added in current US$: AgVA	Refer to Profile PC3.2.i		AgVA	

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year, the ratio of foreign private direct investment in agriculture as % of agriculture value added is: ţFPrPb = FPrIA * 100 / AgVA

Theme 2 — *Investment Finance in Agriculture*

Performance Category — **PC 2.4 Access to Finance**

1. Objective of the PC

Increase access of smallholder farmers/rural households to and use of financial services for the purposes of transacting agricultural business (purchasing inputs, machinery, storage technologies, etc.)

2. Performance Target

Ensure that 100% of men and women engaged in agriculture have access to financial services to be able to transact agriculture business by 2025

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 2(c) and SDG goal1, 1.4*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Proportion of men and women engaged in agriculture with access to financial services, % (**ţAgFs**)	Use of financial services is considered critical for increasing smallholder agricultural productivity. Financial services include savings accounts, credit, digital payments, microfinace, and insurance. The evidence is clear that women are less likely than men to use any of these services. Continued dependence on cash perpetuates the marginalization of the poor and inhibits their ability to take advantage of economic opportunities within and outside of agriculture as well as to absorb shocks without falling deeper into poverty. Men and women considered in this profile are any household member of 15 years and older.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Total number of men and women engaged in agriculture, NtAg	Total number number of men and women engaged in agriculture.	Basic demographics and poverty measurement (available through FII-Financial Inclusion Insight Surveys). - Total number of men engaged in agriculture, NtAgM - Total number of women engaged in agriculture, NtAgW	**NtAg** = NtAgM + NtAgW	Financial Inclusion Insight (FII) Survey by Intermedia
2. Number of men and women engaged in agriculture that have access to financial services, NfsAg	Number of men and women engaged in agriculture who are financially included. Financial inclusion includes ownership/use of at least one of any financial service, including bank and non-bank financial institutions (bank and savings accounts), mobile money, etc.	- Number of men engaged in agriculture that have access to financial services, NfsAgM - Number of women engaged in agriculture that have access to financial services, NfsAgW	**NfsAg** = NfsAgM + NfsAgW	

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the Proportion of men and women engaged in agriculture with access to financial services, % is :

$ţAgFs_t$ = NfsAg *100/ NtAg

Theme 3 — *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category **PC 3.1i** **Access to agriculture inputs and technologies**

1. Objective of the PC

Promote utilization of cost-effective & quality agricultural inputs, irrigation, mechanization, and agrochemicals for crops, fisheries, livestocks and forestry to boost agricultural productivity.

2. Performance Target

Ensure minimum use of fertilizer for African agriculture development at level of consumption of at least 50 kilograms per hectare of arable land, from 2015 to 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 3(a)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Fertilizer consumption (kilogram of nutrients) per hectare of arable and permanent crops land), (**Fz**)	Total fertlizer consumption is divided by arable land and permanent crops area to obtain consumption in nutrients/arable land and permanent crops area.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Total fertilizers consumption (N+P, N+P+K) in Kg, Fc	Quantity of fertilizer in metric tons of plant nutrient consumed in agriculture by a country (FAO Code 5157)	Nitrogen fertilizers (N total nutrients) (FAOSTAT code 3102) Phosphate fertilizers (P205 total nutrients) (FAOSTAT code 3103) Potash fertilizers (K20 total nutrients) (FAOSTAT code 3104)	Total fertilizers consumption (N+P, N+P+K): Different fertilizers reported are summed to obtain total fertilizers consumption. Fc_i **Fc** = Sum (Fc_i)	FAO
2. Arable and Permanent Crops Land in hectare, L	- Arable land is the land under temporary agricultural crops (multiple-cropped areas are counted only once), temporary meadows for mowing or pasture, land under market and kitchen gardens and land temporarily fallow (less than five years). The abandoned land resulting from shifting cultivation is not included in this category. (L1) - Permanent crops is the land cultivated with long-term crops which do not have to be replanted for several years (such as cocoa and coffee); land under trees and shrubs producing flowers, such as roses and jasmine; and nurseries (except those for forest trees, which should be classified under "forest"). Permanent meadows and pastures are excluded from land under permanent crops. (L2)	*Arable land area (FAO Code 6621)* *Permanent crops area (FAOSTAT code 6650)*	*Total Fertilizer Consumption is divided by Arable Land and Permanent Crops Area to obtain Consumption in nutrients/Arable Land and Permanent Crops Area;* L_i **L** = Sum (L_i)	FAO

5. Indicator Computing

For any given year (t) the Fertilizer consumption (kilogram of nutrients) per hectare of arable and Permament Crop land areas), is given by the ratio **Fz = Fc /L**

Theme 3 — *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category **PC 3.1ii** **Access to agriculture inputs and technologies**

1. Objective of the PC

Promote utilization of cost-effective & quality agricultural inputs, irrigation, mechanization, and agrochemicals for crops, fisheries, livestocks and forestry to boost agricultural productivity.

2. Performance Target

Increase the size of irrigated areas (as per its value observed in the year 2000), by 100% by the year 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *African Water Vision 2025*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Growth rate of the size of irrigated areas from the size of the year 2000 (**RiIA**).	The irrigated areas (IA) is the total area equiped for irrigation. The growth rate of irrigated areas (RiIA) is the change (%) in its value in 2000.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Irrigated areas in hectares (IA2000)	Total area under irrigation in the country, as reported in the year 2000.	Indentifed areas in the country that are under irrigation in the year 2000.	Sum of all the recorded areas.	
2. Irrigated areas in hectares (IA_t)	Total area under irrigation in the country, as reported for the year of the evaluation, the year *t*.	Indentifed areas in the country that are under irrigation in the year *t* .	Sum of all the recorded areas.	

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the growth rate of the size of irrigated area (in %), is: ***RiIA*** $= (IA_t - IA_{2000}) * 100 / IA_{2000}$

Theme 3 — *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category **PC 3.1iii** **Access to agriculture inputs and technologies**

1. Objective of the PC

Promote utilization of cost-effective & quality agricultural inputs, irrigation, mechanization, and agrochemicals for crops, fisheries, livestocks and forestry to boost agricultural productivity.

2. Performance Target

Double (100% increase) the current levels of quality agricultural inputs for crops (seed), livestock (breed), and fisheries (fingerlings), by the year 2025 from the year 2015.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 3(a)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Growth rate of the ratio of supplied quality agriculture inputs (seed, breed, fingerlings) to the total national inputs requirements for the commodity (ţAgI).	Inputs (for improved varieties, improved breed, and improved fingerlings) supplied compared to national input requirements. This is a measure of the extent to which quality inputs is utilized to boost production of the considered commodity. This will be derived from the proportion of quality seed used by crop (quality seed sold as a proportion of total national seed requirement for at least one priority commodity).

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Total national quality agriculture inputs requirement for the considered commodity *i* ($AgIR_i$)	- Crops: the quantity of seed (of improved and local varieties) required to cultivate the total area of one selected crop from the 5 priority value chains. - Livestock *(cattle, sheep, goat, pig, camels)* : the total number of female animal at a reproducive age. - Livestock (poultry): the total number of chicken. - Fish: the total capacity (in number of fish) of fish ponds.	- Crops: **Total area cultivated of the selected crop,* Ac_i **Recommended seed rate of the selected crop,* Rs_i - Livestock *(cattle, sheep, goat, pig, camel)* : *NfcRa* - Livestock (poultry): *Nch* - Fish: *Cfp*	- Crops: $AgIR_i = Ac_i \times Rs_i$ - Livestock *(cattle, sheep, goat, pig, camel)* : $AgIR_i = NfcRa$ - Livestock (poultry): $AgIRi = Nch$ - Fish: $AgIRi = Cfp$	National Statistics FAO
2. Supplied quality agriculture inputs for the commodity *i* ($AgIS_i$)	- Crops: Quality seed of improved varieties of the selected crop supplied to farmers for planting. - Livestock *(cattle, sheep, goat, pig, camel)* : the number of female animal at a reproducive age that are artificially inseminated. - Livestock *(poultry)* : the number of Day Old Chicks (DOC) supplied or sold. - Fish: number of improved fingerlings supplied or sold.	- Crops: **Total amount of quality seed of improved of varieties sold for the commodity i ,* $QqSivS$ - Livestock*(cattle, sheep, goat, pig, camel)* : *NfcRaI* - Livestock *(poultry)* : N_{DOC} - Fish: N_{Fgl}	- Crops: $AgIS_i = QqSivS$ *(counting)* - Livestock *(cattle, sheep, goat, pig, camel)* : $AgIS_i = NfcRaI$ - Livestock *(poultry)* : $AgIS_i = N_{DOC}$ - Fish: $AgIS_i = N_{Fgl}$	National Statistics FAO
3. Ratio of supplied quality agriculture inputs to the total national inputs requirements for the commodity (R_i)	- Crops: Extent to which quality seed of improved varieties is used nationally by farmers. - Livestock *(cattle, sheep, goat, pig, camel)* : Extent to which improved breeds is used at national level by farmers. - Livestock *(poultry)* : Extent to which the DOC are used at the national level by farmers. - Fish: Extent to which the imporved fingerlings are used at the national level by farmers.	- Crops: - Livestock *(cattle, sheep, goat, pig, camel)* : - Livestock *(poultry)* : - Fish: $AgIR_i$ and $AgIS_i$	- Crops: - Livestock *(cattle, sheep, goat, pig, camel)* : - Livestock *(poultry)* : - Fish: $R_i = AgISi / AgIRi$	FAOstat or national data

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***Growth rate of the ratio of supplied quality agriculture inputs to the total national inputs requirements for the commodity*** (in %), is : $ţAgI_t = (R_t - R_{2015}) / R_{2015}$

Theme 3 — *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category **PC 3.1iv** **Access to agriculture inputs and technologies**

1. Objective of the PC

Promote utilization of cost-effective & quality agricultural inputs, irrigation, mechanization, and agrochemicals for crops, fisheries, livestocks and forestry to boost agricultural productivity.

2. Performance Target

All farmers have access to quality agricultural advisory services that provide locally relevant knowledge, information and other services by 2018

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 3(a), SDG Target*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Proportion of farmers having access to Agricultural Advisory Services (AFAgAS)	Agricultural extension is the function of providing need- and demand-based knowledge in agronomic techniques and skills to rural communities in a systematic, participatory manner. This indicator is the percentage of farmers having access to Agricultural Advisory Services through training, information sharing, and other extension support related services to farmers and small-to-medium enterprises in rural value chains .

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Number of farmers having access to Agricultural Advisory Services, **NFAgAS**	Farmers having access to Agricultural Advisory Services (ASS) through training, information sharing, and other extension support related services to farmers and small-to-medium enterprises in rural value chains. The AAS can be provided through public extension services, Agribusiness private companies, CSOs, Farmer organizations, Cooperatives, integrated Rural Development Projects. The advisory service can be organized through physical tranings, ICT, Video, Pamphlet, training school farms, etc.	Total number of farmers with access to agricultural extension workers	Sum of all recorded farmers covered by extention workers or having access to AAS by other means	Administrative data, and/or agricultural-based household survey
2. Total Number of farmers, **NF**	Total number of farmers involved in crop production, livestock, fishery and forestry.	Total number of farmers	Sum of all recorded farmers	Administrative data, and/or agricultural-based household survey

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***proportion of farmers having access to Agricultural Advisory Services*** is in (%) ,

$AFAgAS_i = (NFAgAS_t/NF_t) \times 100$

Theme 3 — *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category **PC 3.1v** **Access to Agriculture inputs and technologies**

1. Objective of the PC

Promote utilization of cost-effective & quality agricultural inputs, irrigation, mechanization, and agrochemicals for crops, fisheries, livestocks and forestry to boost agricultural productivity.

2. Performance Target

Increase the level of Investments in Agricultural Research and Development to at least 1% of the Agricultural GDP, from 2015 to 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 3(a)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Total Agricultural Research Spending as a share of AgGDP (**ţTARS**)	Total agricultural R&D spending as a share of AgGDP offers useful insights into relative levels of agricultural R&D investment across countries and over time. It should be noted, however, that they do not take into account the policy and institutional environment within which agricultural research occurs, the broader size and structure of a country's agricultural sector and economy, or qualitative differences in research performance across countries, so they need to be interpreted with care (ASTI). Agricultural R&D spending data is divided by total AgGDP values taken from the World Development Indicators.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Total Agricultural Research Spending (lcu), TARS	ASTI's national agricultural research expenditure data is categorized as salary-related expenses, operating and program costs, and capital investments by government, nonprofit, private sector, and higher education agencies. Data on spending by private entities are excluded, due to lack of availability.	- *Salaries (W)=FTE phd * Wphd +FTE msc*Wmsc+FTEbsc*Wbsc* - *Program and Operation Cost (POC)* - *Capital Investment (CI)*	*TARS= W +POC +CI*	ASTI (www.asti.cgiar.org/data)/ Countires/ NARS/NARIs
2. Agriculture, value added (lcu), AgVA	*Refere to profile PC 3.2i*		*AgVA*	Countries/National Bureau of Statistics/WDI

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year, the Total Agricultural Research Spending as a share of AgGDP in %, is ţTARS =TARS/AgVA*100

Theme 3 — *Eradicating Poverty through Agriculture*

Performance Category **PC 3.1vi** **Access to agriculture inputs and technologies**

1. Objective of the PC

Promote utilization of cost-effective & quality agricultural inputs, irrigation, mechanization, and agrochemicals for crops, fisheries, livestocks and forestry to boost agricultural productivity.

2. Performance Target

Ensure that 100% of farmers and agribusiness interested in agricultural production have rights of access to the required land by 2018

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 4(c) , SDG goal*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Proportion of adult agricultural population with ownership or secure land rights over agricultural land (**ţHhSL**).	Land is a key factor of production and research indicates that land tenure security is necessary for investment in new technologies and sustainable practices. While men face a set of potential causes of tenure insecurity, such as a poorly functioning legal system and potential takeovers from powerful elites or the government, women face an additional layer of tenure insecurity if their rights are not recognized by the family, community, or law. Due to variation in land tenure arrangements, cultural contexts and legal frameworks, different ways of conceptualizing land rights, including land ownership, exist across and within countries. This indicator includes land held individually or jointly recognizing patterns of sole or joint ownership vary across contexts and have different implications in terms of law and property rights. As an official definition of agricultural population does not exist, the SDG indicator 5.a.1 definition is recommended. Such consistency would also reduce the burden on national statistic bureaus and land registries. **Adult agricultural population i**s defined as: all adult individuals living in agricultural households – i.e. households who operated land for agricultural purposes and/or raised/tended livestock in the past 12 months, regardless of the final destination of the production (SDG 5.a.1 definition). 2**. Agricultural Land**: In compliance with the classification proposed by the World Census of Agriculture 2020 (WCA 2020), land is considered 'agricultural land' according to its use (FAO, 2017). In particular, agricultural land includes: land under temporary crops; land under temporary meadows and pastures; land temporarily fallow; land under permanent crops; land under permanent meadows and pastures. (SDG 5.a.1 definition) The indicator monitors a range of individual-level tenure rights and associated tenure security, disaggregated by sex.

4. Disaggregation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Total adult agricultural population in the country, NTFHh	Adult Agricultural Population: All adults living in agricultural households who operate land for agricultural purposes and/or raised livestock over the past 12 months, regardless of final purpose of the production. (SDG 5.a.1) Agricultural land - See above for definition	Demographic data, agricultural census. Data must be disaggregated by sex to reveal gender disparities, as the gender dimension of land tenure security is a critical.	Excludes households that do not operate land for agri purposes or raise livestock; households whose members are engaged in agricultural sector only as wage laborers; households who have tenure rights over agricultural land, but do not operate the land directly or indirectly(e.g., through hired laborers)	LSMS-ISA or FAO Gender & Land Rights Database
2.Number of agricultural population with secure land rights , NFHhSL	Number of adults living in agricultural households who operate land for agricultural purposes and/or raised livestock over the past 12 months, regardless of final purpose of the production who is able to demonstrate through documentation ownership rights of property. Ownership is defined as providing the landholder with a complete bundle of rights, including the right to possess, exclude, use and transfer land. However, in systems where land is owned by the state, the term refers to possession of the rights most akin to ownership in a private property system; for instance, long-term leases, occupancy, tenancy or use rights granted by the state, often for several decades, and that are transferrable. In these contexts, it is more appropriate to speak of 'tenure rights' rather than 'ownership'. (SDG Indicator 1.4.2 and 5 .a.1 definition).	Household survey data	Excludes duplicates, urban households, men/women less than 18 years old and missing data Results are unweighted	LSMS-ISA or FAO Gender & Land Rights Database

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***proportion of farm households with ownership or secure land rights, ţHhSL*** is :

$$ţHhSL_t = NFHhSL_i * 100 / N_TFHh_t$$

Theme 3 — *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category **PC 3.2i** **Agricultural productivity**

1. Objective of the PC

Increase agricultural productivity.

2. Performance Target

Double (100% increase) the current agricultural labor productivity levels by the year 2025 from the year 2015.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 3(a)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Growth rate of agriculture value added, in constant US dollars, per agricultural worker (ţAgW).	Agriculture value added per worker is a measure of agricultural productivity. Value added in agriculture measures the output of the agricultural sector (International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities, Rev.4 or ISIC divisions 1-5) less the value of intermediate inputs. Agriculture comprises value added from forestry, hunting, and fishing as well as cultivation of crops and livestock production (WDI, Word Bank, 2016).

4. Disaggregation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Agriculture value added in constant local currency units (AgVA)	Agriculture corresponds to ISIC divisions 1-5 and includes forestry, hunting, and fishing, as well as cultivation of crops and livestock production. Value added is the net output of a sector after adding up all outputs and subtracting intermediate inputs. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or depletion and degradation of natural resources. The origin of value added is determined by the International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC), revision 3 (WDI, World Bank, 2016).	Total agricultural value added in constant US dollars (AgVA)		National Statistics WDI FAO
2. Total number of agricultural workers (W)	The term "agricultural workers" is used in preference to "farmworkers" as it better reflects the broad nature of plantations, horticulture, primary agricultural processing and aquaculture, fisheries (inland and marine), livestock and recognizes that waged agricultural workers form a part of the larger rural workforce (FAO, ILO, and IUF, 2007)	Total number of agricultural workers (W)		National Statistics WDI FAO
3. Agricultural value added per agricultural worker, AgW	Total agriculture value added, divided by total number of agricultural workers for 2015.		AgW=AgVA/W	
4. Baseline value of the AgW (AgW_{2015})	The baseline value is an average of five-year value, from 2011 to 2015.		AgW_{2015}	

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***Growth rate of Agriculture value added per agricultural worker*** (in %), is :

$$ţAgW_i = (AgW_t - AgW_{2015}) * 100 / AgW_{2015}$$

Theme 3 — *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category **PC 3.2ii** **Agricultural productivity**

1. Objective of the PC

Increase agricultural productivity.

2. Performance Target

Double (increase by 100%) the current agricultural land productivity levels, by the year 2025 from the year 2015.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 3(a)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Growth rate of agriculture value added, in constant US dollar, per hectare of agricultural land (ţAgL).	Agriculture value added per hectare of land is a measure of agricultural productivity. Agriculture comprises value added from forestry, hunting, and fishing as well as cultivation of crops and livestock production (WDI, Word Bank, 2016).

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Agriculture added value for crops and livestock in lcu (AgVAcl)	*Refere to profile PC 3.2i*	Total agricultural value added in lcu (AgVA).		National Statistics WDI FAO
2. Agricultural land (L3)	In compliance with the classification proposed by the World Census of Agriculture 2020 (WCA 2020), land is considered 'agricultural land' according to its use (FAO, 2017). In particular, agricultural land includes: land under temporary crops; land under temporary meadows and pastures; land temporarily fallow; land under permanent crops; land under permanent meadows and pastures. (SDG 5.a.1 definition)	Total agricultural land in hectare (L3)		National Statistics WDI FAO
3. Agriculture value added per hectare of agricultural land (AgL)	Agriculture value added divided by total agricultural land in hectare.		AgL=AgVA/L3	
4. Baseline value of the agriculture value added per hectare of agricultural land (AgL_{2015})	The baseline value is an average of five-year value, 2015.		AgL_{2015}	

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***Growth rate of agriculture value added, at constant US dollars, per hectare of agricultural land*** (in %), is :

$$ţAgL_t = (AgL_t - AgL_{2015}) *100/ AgL_{2015}$$

Theme 3 — *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category **PC 3.2iii** **Agricultural productivity**

1. Objective of the PC

Increase agricultural productivity.

2. Performance Target

Double (100% increase) the current agricultural yield levels, by the year 2025 from the year 2015.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 3(a)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Growth rate of yields for the 5 national priority agricultural commodities, and possibly for the 11 AU strategic agricultural commodities(*) ($\text{ŧ}Y$).	Production per unit of area for products. In most of the cases yield data are not recorded but obtained by dividing the production data by the data on area harvested (FAO).

4. Disaggregation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Total production for individual commodity (Pd_i)	Production data refer to the actual harvested production from the field or orchard and gardens, excluding harvesting and threshing losses and that part of crop not harvested for any reason. Production therefore includes the quantities of the commodity *(crop, livestock products, fish, etc...)* sold in the market (marketed production) and the quantities consumed or used by the producers (auto-consumption) (FAO).	Production for individual commodity, in ton (t) .		National Statistics FAO
2. Total size of the production unit for individual commodities (L_i)	Production unit can be expressed in terms of surface of land on which a crop is grown, heads of cattle for livestock, etc...	Size of the production unit for individual commodities (hectare for crops, heads of cattle for livestock, etc...)		National Statistics FAO
3. Yield (Y_i)	Total production divided by total area for products.		$Y_i = Pd_i / L_i$	FAOstat or national data
4. Baseline value (Y_{2015}) of the yield	The baseline value (Y_{2015}) is an average of three to five-year value, from 2015.		Y_{2015}	

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***Growth rate of yields for individual priority commodity*** (in %), is :

$\text{ŧ}YI_t = (Y_t - Y_{2015}) / Y_{2015}$

(*) The 11 AU Strategic commodities are:

-Rice, -Maize, -Legumes, -Cotton, -Oil palm, -Beef, -Dairy, -Poultry and fisheries, -Cassava, -Sorghum and -Millet.

Theme 3 — *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category — **PC 3.3 Post-Harvest Loss**

1. Objective of the PC

Provide logistics support to all stages of the food production chain *(field/harvest, storage, processing, transportation, final retail market)* to limit degradation both in quantity and in quality of the produced food.

2. Performance Target

Halve (decrease by 50%) the current levels of Post-Harvest Losses (PHL), by the year 2025 from the year 2015.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 3(b)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Reduction rate of Post-Harvest Losses for (at least) the 5 national priority commodities, and possibly for the 11 AU strategic agricultural commodities(*) (ţPHL).	Percentage of total production that is lost (quantitative and qualitative) occuring during all stages of the post-harvest phases of the system for priority products. For the purpose of this report, post-haverst losses (PHL) are restricted to the losses that occur during harvesting, storage, transport, processing, packaging and sales.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Production (in million tons) of the commodity (Pd_i)	Production is the total actual harvest excluding any losses, and the part of the product not harvested for any reason. It includes quantities of the commodity sold in the market and quantities consumed or used by the producers.	Weight of crop and animal production		National source or FAO or APHLIS
2. Loss in million of tons (Ls_i)	Food losses refers to any loss by deterioration or waste. The term "loss" includes both food loss and food waste. Depending on the availability of data, wastage or PHL at the strict sense will be used and comparison from one year to the other will be made in a consistent manner.	Weight of damaged or lost product/commodity at each stage of the following stages of post-harvest system that includes: - Loss at Harvesting; L_{hv} - Loss at Storage; L_{st} - Loss at Transport; L_{tr} - Loss at Processing; L_{pr} - Loss at Packaging; L_{pc} - Loss at Sales; L_{sl}	*The total loss of the commodity i is:* $Ls_i = L_{hv} + L_{st} + L_{tr} + L_{pr} + L_{pc} + L_{sl}$	National source or FAO or APHLIS
3.Post Harvest Loss for the commodity *i* (PHL_i)	Post-harvest loss the commodity *i*.		$PHL_i = (Ls_i / Pd_i) \times 100$	FAOstat or national data
4. Overall Post Harvest Loss for the year t (PHL_t)	National average value of the Post harvest loss for the year t for all the reported commodities.		$PHL_t = (\sum(Pd_i \times PHL_i)) / \sum Pdi$	

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***Reduction rate of Post-Harvest Losses for (at least) the 5 national priority commodities**,*** (%), is : $ţPHL = (PHL_t - PHL_{2015}) * 100 / PHL_{2015}$

(*) The 11 AU strategic commodities are:

-Rice, -Maize, -Legumes, -Cotton, -Oil palm, -Beef, -Dairy, -Poultry and fisheries, -Cassava, -Sorghum and -Millet.

Theme 3 — *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category — **PC 3.4 Social Protection**

1. Objective of the PC

Integrate measures for increased agricultural productivity with social protection initiatives focusing on vulnerable social groups through committing targeted budget lines within our national budgets for social protection.

2. Performance Target

Commit within national budgets, budget lines that amount to 100% of the total resource requirements for coverage of the vulnerable social groups, from 2015 to 2025, for use to support social protection initiatives, and to address any eventual disasters and emergencies with food and nutrition security implications.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 3(c)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Budget lines (%) on social protection as percentage of the total resource requirements for coverage of the vulnerable social groups (t_SP).	The Budget lines on social protection (SP) for farm households or communities is defined here as the amount of money that the country allocates for preventive, protective, promotive or transformative assistance to farm individuals, households or communities. This may be in the form of cash transfers (CT); emergency food supplies (EFS); school feeding (SF) programmes; or other protective services (input supplies, water services, livestock protection programme, national pension scheme, orphan and vulnerable children programme, etc.) that protect vulnerable farming households against livelihood risks on an ogoing basis or in times of emergency/disasters. All components included in the calculation should be spent on farm individuals, households, or communities as opposed to urban communities not engaged in agricultural activities. The total resource requirements for coverage of the vulnerable social groups could be derived from the vulnerability assessment of the country.

4. Disaggregation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Budget Allocation to social protection Cash Transfers for food and cash reserves in lcu (BA_{CT})	Approved budget allocation to social protection in form of cash transfers (CT) for food and cash reserves, to farm individuals, households or communities that helps to protect aginst livelihood risks.	Budget allocation to social protection cash transfers for food and cash reserves, BA_{CT} 1a. Total number of beneficiaries of Cash Transfers for food and cash reserves, nBACT		National government budget records National Bureau of Statistics
2. Budget Allocation to social protection Emergency Food Supplies in lcu (BA_{EFS})	Approved budget allocation to social protection in form of emmergency food supplies (EFS) to farm individuals, households or communities. This include hunger safety, famine, or any other disaster or emmergency. Costs of strenghtening early warning systems for advanced and proactive responses are included in this category.	Budget allocation to social protection Emergency Food supplies, BA_{EFS} 2a. Total number of beneficiaries of Emergency Food Supplies, nBAEFS		National government budget records National Bureau of Statistics
3. Budget Allocation to social protection School Feeding in lcu (BA_{SF})	Approved budget allocation to social protection in form of school feeding (SF) to rural communities.	Budget allocation to social protection School Feeding, BA_{SF} 3a. Total number of beneficiaries of School Feeding, nBASF		National government budget records National Bureau of Statistics
4. Budget Allocation to social protection Other protective services in lcu (BA_{Other})	Approved budget allocation to social protection (not covered above) promotive or transformative of agriculture eg. input support and other services like water orr livestock protection e.g. vaccinations etc. including national pension scheme, orphan and vulnerable children programme, etc.)	Budget allocation to social protection Other protective services, BA_{Other} 4a. Total number of beneficiaries of Other Protective Services, nBAOther		National government budget records National Bureau of Statistics
5. Total Budget Allocation to social protection in lcu (TBA_{SP})	Sum of all the above approved budget allocations on social protection.		$TBA_{SP} = BA_{CT} + BA_{EFS} + BA_{SF} + BA_{Other}$	National government budget records National Bureau of Statistics
6. Total Budget Requirements for social protection in lcu (TBR_{SP})	Total resource requirements for coverage of the vulnerable social groups **as derived from budget requests** from all government bodies including for Cash Transfers for food and cash reserves, Emergency Food Supplies, school feeding and initiatives promotive or transformative of agriculture eg. input support and other services like water orr livestock protection e.g. vaccinations etc. including national pension scheme, orphan and vulnerable children programme, etc.)		TBR_{SP}	National government budget records National Bureau of Statistics

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***Budget lines on social protection as percentage of the total resource requirements for coverage of the vulnerable social groups*** (in %), is : t_SP_t = **TBA_{SPt} *100/ TBR_{SPt}**

Theme 3 — *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category **PC 3.5i** **Food security and Nutrition**

1. Objective of the PC

Promote initiatives to improve nutritional status, and in particular, the elimination of hunger and child under nutrition in Africa, by bringing down stunting, underweight, wasting; improving dietary diversity for women and children; and reducing population undernourishment in children and adult food insecurity.

2. Performance Target

Bring down child stunting to 10%, by the year 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 3(d)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Prevalence of stunting (% of children under 5 years old) (St).	Stunting is a height-for-age measurement that is a reflection of chronic undernutrition. This indicator measures the percent of children 0-59 months who are stunted, as defined by a height for age Z score < -2. Although different levels of severity of stunting can be measured, this indicator measures the prevalence of all stunting, i.e. both moderate and severe stunting combined. While stunting is difficult to measure in children 0-6 months and most stunting occurs in the -9-23 month range (1,000 days), this indicator reports on all children under 59 months to capture the impact of interventions over time and to align with DHS data.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Percent of children 0-59 month of age that is stunted (St)	Percent of children 0-59 months of age with a height for age Z-score of <-2 SD.	Total number of children 0-59 months of age (T) Number of children 0-59 months of age that are stunted (S)	St = S/T*100 **The numerator for this indicator is the total number of children 0-59 months in the sample with a height for age Z score < -2. The denominator is the total number of children 0-59months in the sample with height for age Z score data.**	WHO, DHS surveys, UNICEF MICS WB https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators https://data.unicef.org/topic/nutrition/malnutrition/ https://databank.worldbank.org/source/world-development-indicators
2. Percent of male children 0-59 month of age that is stunted (Hm)	Percent of male children 0-59 months of age with a height for age Z-score of <-2 SD	Total number of male children 0-59 months of age (Tm) Number of male children 0-59 months of age that are stunted (Sm)	*Stm = Sm/Tm*100*	WHO, DHS surveys, UNICEF MICS
3. Percent of female children 0-59 month of age that is stunted (Hw)	Percent of female children 0-59 months of age with a height for age Z-score of <-2 SD	Total number of female children 0-59 months of age i(Tf) Number of female children 0-59 months of age that are stunted (Sf)	Stf = Sf/Tf*100	WHO, DHS surveys, UNICEF MICS

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***Prevalence of stunting (% of children under 5 years old)*** (in %), is : St_t = **St**

Theme 3 — *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category **PC 3.5ii** **Food security and Nutrition**

1. Objective of the PC

Promote initiatives to improve nutritional status, and in particular, the elimination of hunger and child under nutrition in Africa, by bringing down stunting, underweight, wasting; improving dietary diversity for women and children; and reducing population undernourishment in children and adult food insecurity.

2. Performance Target

Bring down underweight to 5% or less, by the year 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 3(d)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Prevalence of underweight (% of children under 5 years old) (Uw).	Underweight is a weight-for-age measurement. Underweight is a reflection of acute and/or chronic undernutrition. This indicator measures the percent of children 0-59 months who are underweight, as defined by a weight for age Z score < -2. Although different levels of severity of underweight can be measured, this indicator measures the prevalence of all underweight, i.e. both moderate and severe underweight combined.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Percent of children 0-59 months of age that is underweight (Uw)	Percent of children 0-59 months of age with a weight for age Z-score of <-2 SD.	Total number of children 0-59 months of age (T) Number of children 0-59 months of age that are underweight (U)	Uw = U/T*100 **The numerator for this indicator is the total number of children 0-59 months in the sample with a weight for age Z score < -2. The denominator is the total number of children 0-59 months in the sample with weight for age Z score data.**	WHO, DHS surveys, UNICEF MICS WB https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators https://data.unicef.org/topic/nutrition/malnutrition/ https://databank.worldbank.org/source/world-development-indicators
2. Percent of male children 0-59 month of age that is underweight (Uwm)	Percent of male children 0-59 months of age with a weight for age Z-score of <-2 SD	Total number of male children 0-59 months of age (Tm) Number of male children 0-59 months of age that is underweight (Um)	*Uwm = Um/Tm*100*	WHO, DHS surveys, UNICEF MICS
3. Percent of female children 0-59 month of age that is underweight (Uwf)	Percent of female children 0-59 months of age with a weight for age Z-score of <-2 SD	Total number of female children 0-59 months of age (Tf) Number of female children 0-59 months of age that is underweight (Uf)	Uwf = Uf/Tf*100	WHO, DHS surveys, UNICEF MICS

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***Prevalence of underweight (% of children under 5 years old)*** (in %), is : Uw_t = **Uw**

Theme 3 — *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category **PC 3.5iii** **Food security and Nutrition**

1. Objective of the PC

Promote initiatives to improve nutritional status, and in particular, the elimination of hunger and child under nutrition in Africa, by bringing down stunting, underweight, wasting; improving dietary diversity for women and children; and reducing population undernourishment in children and adult food insecurity.

2. Performance Target

Bring down wasting to 5% or less, by the year 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 3(d) & the Africa Regional Nutrition Strategy (ARNS)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Prevalence of wasting (% of children under 5 old) (W).	This indicator measures the percent of children 0-59 months with acute malnutrition, as defined by a weight for height Z score < -2. Although different levels of severity of wasting can be measured, this indicator measures the prevalence of all wasting, i.e. both moderate and severe wasting combined.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1.Percent of children 0-59 months of age that are wasted	Percent of children 0-59 months of age with a weight for height Z-score of <-2 SD	Total number of children 0-59 months of age (T) Number of children 0-59 months of age that are wasted (W)	Wa = W/T*100 **The numerator for the indicator is the total number of children 0-59 months in the sample with a weight for height Z score < -2. The denominator is the total number of children 0-59 months in the sample with weight for height Z score data.**	WHO, DHS surveys, UNICEF MICS WB https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators https://data.unicef.org/topic/nutrition/malnutrition/ https://databank.worldbank.org/source/world-development-indicators
2. Percent of male children 0-59 month of age that are wasted	Percent of male children 0-59 months of age with a weight for height Z-score of <-2 SD	Total number of male children 0-59 months of age (Tm) Number of male children 0-59 months of age that are wasted (Wm)	*Wam = Wm/Tm*100*	WHO, DHS surveys, UNICEF MICS
3. Percent of female children 0-59 month of age that are wasted	Percent of female children 0-59 months of age with a weight for height Z-score of <-2 SD	Total number of male children 0-59 months of age (Tf) Number of male children 0-59 months of age that are wasted (Wf)	Waf = Wf/Tf*100	WHO, DHS surveys, UNICEF MICS

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***Prevalence of wasting (% of children under 5 old)*** (in %), is : W_t = **W**

Theme 3 — *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category **PC 3.5iv** **Food security and Nutrition**

1. Objective of the PC

Promote initiatives to improve nutritional status, and in particular, the elimination of hunger and child under nutrition in Africa, by bringing down stunting, underweight, wasting; improving dietary diversity for women and children; and reducing population undernourishment in children and adult food insecurity.

2. Performance Target

Bring down undernourishment to 5% or less, by the year 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 3(d) & the Africa Regional Nutrition Strategy (ARNS)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Prevalence of undernourished *(% of the country's population that is undernourished)* (U).	The PoU indicator is defined as the probability that a randomly selected individual from the reference population is found to consume less than his/her calorie requirement for an active and healthy life.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
Proportion of the population that is undernourished, U	The PoU indicator is defined as the probability that a randomly selected individual from the reference population is found to consume less than his/her calorie requirement for an active and healthy life. It is written as: $$PoU = \int_{x<MDER} f(x)dx$$ where f(x) is the probability density function of per capita calorie consumption. The parameters needed for the calculation of the indicator are: the mean level of dietary energy consumption (DEC); a cut-off point defined as the Minimum Dietary Energy Requirement (MDER); the coefficient of variation (CV) as a parameter accounting for inequality in food consumption; and a skewness (SK) parameter accounting for asymmetry in the distribution. The DEC as well as the MDER are updated annually, with the former calculated from the FAO Food Balance Sheets. The MDER is calculated as a weighted average of energy requirements according to sex and age class, and is updated each year from UN population ratio data. The inequality in food consumption parameters are derived from National Household Survey data when such data is available and reliable. Due to the limited number of available household surveys, the inequality in food access parameters are updated much less frequently over time than the DEC and MDER parameters.Source: Refinements to the FAO Methodology for estimating the Prevalence of Undernourishment Indicator ESS Working Paper No. 14-05, September 2014 http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4046e.pdf			FAO / National Statistics http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/FS

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year (t), the ***proprotion of the population that is undernousrished,*** is : **U**

Theme 3 — *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category **PC 3.5v Food security and Nutrition**

1. Objective of the PC

Promote initiatives to improve nutritional status, and in particular, the elimination of hunger and child under nutrition in Africa, by bringing down stunting, underweight, wasting; improving dietary diversity for women and children; and reducing population undernourishment in children and adult food insecurity.

2. Performance Target

Increase the proportion of women at reproductive age that attain the minimum dietary diversity by 50%, by the year 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 3(d) & the Africa Regional Nutrition Strategy (ARNS)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Growth rate of the proportion of Minimum Dietary Diversity-Women (ţMDDW)	Percent of women reaching the MDD-W. The indicator reflects the proportion attaining a minimum dietary diversity which is an indication of diet quality including micronutrient adequacy. it serves as a process indicator to reflect if programmes in place are influencing dietary patterns towards better nutrition status and thus of direct relevant to the CAADP process. Women of reproductive age are part of the first 1000 days of focus for ending child undernutrition.

4. Disaggregation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Proportion of minimum Dietary Diversity-Women (MDDW)	Is the proportion of women who receive foods from 5 or more in the food group of 10, described as below: MDD-W food groups 1. All starchy staple foods 2. Pulses (Beans and lentils) 3. Nuts and seeds 4. Dairy 5. Flesh foods (meat, poultry, fish) 6. Eggs 7. Dark green leafy vegetables 8. Other vitamin A-rich vegetables and fruits 9. Other vegetables 10. Other fruits MDD-Women are the ones who reflect consumption of at least five of ten foods group.	- Total number of women at reproductive age: W_T, as the denominator. - Number of women at reproductive age (15-49 yrs) that attain the minimum dietary diversity: W_{MDDW}, as the numerator.	MDDW= W_{MDDW}/W_T Specific Sampling methods is used to determine the proportion of the total sample (W_T) reaching MDD-W (W_{MDD-W}) expressed as a % of sample population. *Consumption of at least approximately 15 g is recommended a food group to "count", i.e., thus foods used only as a condiments are not counted.* *Consumption of foods from at least 5 food groups has been validated to be representative of a more nutrient adequate diet.*	DHS, WHO http://www.fao.org/nutrition/assessment/tools/minimum-dietary-diversity-women/en/ & http://www.fao.org/publications/sofi/2020/en/

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***Growth rate of the proportion of Minimum Dietary Diversity-Women (ţMDDW)*** (in %), is : $ţMDDW_t$ = **$(MDDW_t - MDDW_{2015}) \times 100 / MDDW_{2015}$**

Theme 3 — *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category **PC 3.5vi** **Food security and Nutrition**

1. Objective of the PC

Promote initiatives to improve nutritional status, and in particular, the elimination of hunger and child under nutrition in Africa, by bringing down stunting, underweight, wasting; improving dietary diversity for women and children; and reducing population undernourishment in children and adult food insecurity.

2. Performance Target

At least 50% of children 6-23 months that receive the minimum acceptable diet by the year 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaratio *Malabo Decl. 3(d). The Africa Regional Nutrition Strategy (ARNS)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Proportion of 6-23 months old children who meet the Minimum Acceptable Diet (MAD)	Percent in the age group 6-23 months reaching the minimum acceptable diet. This age group is critical to reducing stunting and the indicator will serve as a process indicator of improvements in diet quality and feeding practices towards better nutrition. Because its computation includes dietary diversity in the age group it will be possible to use it as a process indicator on linking agriculture programmes to observed changes in nutrition status indicators. This is important because agriculture is the main strategy targeted by the Malabo declaration to impact nutrition.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
Proportion of 6-23 months old children who meet Minimum Acceptable Diet, MAD	Composite indicator	Minimum dietary diversity for children: Proportion of children 6–23 months of age who receive foods from 4 or more food groups: The 7 foods groups used for tabulation of this indicator are: grains, roots and tubers; legumes and nuts; dairy products (milk, yogurt, cheese); flesh foods (meat, fish, poultry and liver/organ meats); eggs Part 1: Definitions 7; vitamin-A rich fruits and vegetables; other fruits and vegetables Minimum meal frequency: Proportion of breastfed and non-breastfed children 6–23 months of age who receive solid, semi-solid, or soft foods (but also including milk feeds for non-breastfed children) the minimum number of times or more. Minimum is defined as: 2 times for breastfed infants 6–8 months; 3 times for breastfed children 9–23 months; 4 times for non-breastfed children 6–23 months	Calculated differents for the following two fractions of the children (Proportion of breastfed children 6–23 months of age who had at least the minimum dietary diversity and the minimum meal frequency during the previous day)/(Breastfed children 6–23 months of age) and (Proportion of non-breastfed children 6–23 months of age who received at least 2 milk feedings and had at least the minimum dietary diversity, and the minimum meal frequency during the previous day)/(Non-breastfed children 6–23 months of age)	DHS, UNICEF MICS, WHO WB The sample universe for this indicator is last born children 6–23 months of age living with their mothers. https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators https://data.unicef.org/topic/nutrition/malnutrition/ https://databank.worldbank.org/source/world-development-indicators
1. Breastfed children 6–23 months of age who had at least the minimum dietary diversity and the minimum meal frequency during the previous day	Proportion Breastfed children 6–23 months of age in the sample who had at least the minimum dietary diversity and the minimum meal frequency during the previous day	- Total breastfed children in sample reaching both minimum diet diversity and minimum meal frequency ($BF_{MDD\&MMF}$); -Total breastfed children in sample (TBF)	The proportion ($BF_{MDD\&MMF}$/TBF)*100 is estimated for the breastfed children.	DHS, UNICEF MICS, WHO The sample universe for this indicator is last born children 6–23 months of age living with their mothers.
2. Non-breastfed children 6–23 months of age who had at least 2 milk feeds and the minimum dietary diversity not including the milk feeds and the minimum meal frequency during the previous day	Proportion of non-breastfed children 6–23 months of age in the sampmle who had at least 2 milk feeds and at least the minimum dietary diversity excluding the milk feeds and the minimum meal frequency during the previous day	- Total non-breastfed children in sample getting at least 2 milk feeds and reaching both minimum diet diversity and minimum meal frequency ($NBF_{2MF\&MDD\&MMF}$); - Total non-breastfed children in sample (TNBF)	The proportion ($NBF_{2MF\&MDD\&MMF}$/TNBF)*100 is estimated for the breastfed children.	

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***Poportion of 6-23 months old children who meet the Minimum Acceptable Diet*** (in %), is :

MAD = $(BF_{MDD\&MMF} + NBF_{2MF\&MDD\&MMF}) / (TBF + TNBF)$

Theme 3 — *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category **PC 3.5vii** **Food security and Nutrition**

1. Objective of the PC

Promote initiatives to improve nutritional status, and in particular, the elimination of hunger and child under nutrition in Africa, by bringing down stunting, underweight, wasting; improving dietary diversity for women and children; and reducing population undernourishment in children and adult food insecurity.

2. Performance Target

Reduce the level of food insecure Individuals by 50%, by the year 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 3(d) & the Africa Regional Nutrition Strategy (ARNS)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Prevalence of moderate and severe food insecurity in the population based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)	The prevalence of food insecurity is the proportion of individuals, in the total population, who live in households that are classified as "food insecure". "Food insecurity" in this context means facing difficulties in regularly obtaining food of sufficient quality and quantity. The data needed to compute the indicators are simple yes/no answers to questions about the respondents' own experiences, or those of others in their household. These data must be analyzed using a statistical model (Rasch model) to verify their internal consistency and to test the quality of each item. Once their quality and internal consistency is verified, they can be used to compute estimates of the prevalence of food insecurity at moderate and severe levels, in a way that ensures comparability across countries. This is achieved thanks to calibration against the FIES global reference scale of severity.FAO provides technical support and software tools needed to compute the indicator, based on the available data.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
Proportion of moderate and severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)	The prevalence of food insecurity is the proportion of individuals, in the total population, who live in households that are classified as "food insecure". "Food insecurity" in this context means facing difficulties in regularly obtaining food of sufficient quality and quantity. Given specific thresholds that defines "moderate" and "severe" levels of severity, each houshold is assigned a probability to be food insecure, based on the result of the Rasch model. The prevalence in the population is then estimated as the weighted average of these probabilities across all households included in a representative sample of the population.	Data can be collected using the Food Insecurity Experience Scale survey module (FIES-SM) developed by FAO, or any other experience-based food security scale questionnaires. Individual and household-referenced versions of the survey module are provided in English, French, Spanish and Arabic. The FIES-SM (individual version) has been adapted and translated into more than 170 languages and dialects and can be downloaded at http://www.fao.org/in-action/voices-of-the-hungry/using-fies/en/. The available estimates can be downloaded at http://www.fao.org/economic/ess/ess-fs/ess-fadata/it/#.XHeaj-hKjcs $$Prob(x_{h,i} = 1 \mid a_h, b_i) = F(a_h - b_i) = \frac{e^{a_h - b_i}}{1 + e^{a_h - b_i}}$$	The data is analysed through the Rasch model, which postulates that the probability of observing an affirmative answer by respondent i to question j, is a logistic function of the distance, on an underlying scale of severity, between the position of the respondent ai and that of the item bj. Additional information can be found at http://www.fao.org/in-action/voices-of-the-hungry/en/#.XHecjehKjcs	National Statistical Authorities FAO http://www.fao.org/in-action/Voices-of-the-Hungry/ http://www.fao.org/3/i4830e.pdf

5. Indicator Computing

Two FIES-based indicators can be used for national and global monitoring purposes. Note that the first indicator is an estimate of the sum of the moderately food insecure and the severely food insecure segments of the population.
• FImod+sev The proportion of the population experiencing moderate and severe food insecurity (SDG indicator 2.1.2) • FIsev The proportion of the population experiencing severe food insecurity

Theme 3 *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category **PC 3.6i** **Food Safety**

1. Objective of the PC

Strengthen preparedness and functionality of food safety systems at national level, for an increased performance of each AU Member State in protecting the health of consumers and the environment, and in offering quality foods to national and international markets.

2. Performance Target

Operational and functional food safety systems that meet international best practices established *(reac h 100% for the Food Safety Systems Indicator , **FSSI**)* **by 2025.**

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 3(d), 5(a,b)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Food Safety Systems Indicator (**FSSI**).	FSSI is an **indicator** that captures the country performance in establishing food safety systems that meet international best practices (which are aligned to CODEX and are evidence based) to support achievement of food safety in the country. The perquisites/foundation or key characteristics of well functioning food safety systems include: *-a food safety law or act that is in use; -established food safety institutions that may include an agency, an effective coordination mechanism (interaction with other relevant sectors such as environment and trade) with regulators and implementers of the food safety control; - national standards and guidelines set with an effective enforcement or corrective/incentive programmes to ensure food is safe; -robust national monitoring and control programmes for priority hazards in priority foods or commodities, with reliable data that should form the basis for setting standards and policies supported by functional and reliable laboratory system; and - a mechanism for consumers and private sector engagement* ; amongst other.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Existence of legal or policy and institutional frameworks on food safety, $FSSI_1$	It is a food safety, policy, law or act that is promulgated in the country in strong partnership with stakeholders. Existence of food safety standards that is based on risk assessments conducted in country, this is identifying the commodities in the country presenting a higher health risk for consumers due to exposure. *This parameter is weighed at w_1 = 20%*	- Existence of a national food safety policy, act or law updated int he last 10 years and covering the entire food chain (choose one among 4 options), Lw_1 - *Existence* of risk-based food safety standards for at least 5 priority commodities (choose one among 4 options), Lw_2 - Existence of competent regulatory institutions with clear mandates and coordination mechanisms (choose one among 3 options), Lw_3	- Lw_1 *i s is estimated with option a=0%, option b=33.3%, option c=66.7% and option d=100%* - Lw_2 *i s estimated with option a=0%, option b=33.3%, option c=66.7% and option d=100%* - Lw_3 *i s estimated with option a=0%, option b=50%, option c=100%* *Existence of Legal or policy and institutional frameworks on food safety, is estimated with:* $FSSI_1 = average\ (Lw_{(i)})$	National competent authorities, Codex contact point
2. Quality of monitoring and surveillance programmes, $FSSI_2$	This measures food contaminant monitoring which is a statistically based sampling, processing and analysis of samples to provide information on the occurrence and levels of chemical residues or microbiological hazards in pre-defined, sample populations. Data from monitoring programmes will inform serveillance programmes. *This parameter is weighed at w_2 = 30%*	- Existence of a risk-based and coordinated monitoring/surveillance plan (choose one among 4 options) , MS_1 - Existence of national epidemiological database/system for storing information on food borne diseases (prevalence, incidence, mortality), (choose one among 3 options), MS_2 - Existence of a food safety response system with standard operating procedure, tracebility and recall systems (choose one among 4 options), MS_3 - Participation in reliable Food Safety information notification systems (e.g INFOSAN etc), (choose one among 2 options), MS_4	- MS_1 is estimated with option a=0%, option b=33.3%, option c=66.7% and option d=100% - MS_2 *i s estimated with option a=0%, option b=50%, option c=100%* - MS_3 *. is estimated with option a=0%, option b=33.3%, option c=66.7% and option d=100%* - MS_4 *- is estimated with option a=0%, option b=100%* *The Quality of Monitoring, surveillance, control and response programmes for food safety hazards and outcomes, is estimated with:* $FSSI_2 = average\ (MS_{(i)})$	National competent authorities; ministries, Codex contact point
3. Laboratory infrastructure, analytical capacity and laboratory performance, $FSSI_3$	This measures the presence of competent laboratories that are capable of producing reliable results to support effective enforcement (and monitoring) of compliance to food safety regulations. *This parameter is weighed at w_3 = 30%*	- Existence of national assessment of in-country laboratory capacity (either through national programmes or accreditation processes) (choose one among 2 options), Lab_1 - Demonstrable government programme to build, equip (including human resource) and sustain competent laboratories, Lab_2= *Average* $(Elt_{(i)})$ The minimum elements in government progrms in lab capacity are: *--> Elt 1: - Existence of national training programme for the qualification of laboratory analysts (choose one among 2 options)* *--> Elt 2: - Existence of national laboratory standards qualification/ accreditation programme (choose one among 3 options)* *--> Elt 3: - Existence of nationa l budget to support laboratory infrastructure and instruments maintenance as well as operational and CAPEX requirements (choose one among 3 options)* - Existence of competent laboratories (government, official or private) and their demonstrable fitness for purpose; Lab_3= *Average*$(Elt_{(i)})$ The minimum elements of competent labs capacity are: *--> Elt 1: - Existence of fo od testing laboratory (choose one among 2 options)* *--> Elt 2: - Existence of laboratory capability (infrastructure and instrumentation) (choose one among 2 options)* *--> Elt 3: - Existence of suitably trained people (Capacity) relative to the food safety regulations, (e.g at best the lab MUST b e able to measure the analyte in the specific matrix as stipulated by the food law (choose one among 2 options)* *--> Elt 4: - Existence of accredited laboratories in food analysis (choose one among 3 options)* *--> Elt 5: - Participation in an accredited Proficiency Test Scheme and inter-laboratory comparison programmes (choose one among 2 options)*	- Lab_1 *is estimated with option a=0 and option b=100%.* - Lab_2 is in (%) the number of the minimum elements (of the n listed) that are reflected in the government programme divided by n *- Elt 1 :* is estimated with option a=0 and option b=100%. *Elt 2 :* is estimated with option a=0 and option b=50% and option c=100%. *Elt3:* is estimated option a=0 and option b=50% and option c=100%. - Lab_3 *is in (%) the number of the minimum elements (of the n listed) that are reflected in competent laboratories divided by n* *Elt 1: is estimated with option a=0 and option b=100%.* *Elt2: is estimated option a=0 and option b=50% and option c=100%..* *Elt3: is estimated with option a=0 and option b=100%.* *Elt4: is estimated option a=0 and option b=50% and option c=100%.* *Elt 5: is estimated with option a=0 and option b=100%.* *The Laboratory infrastructure, analytical capacity and laboratory performance, is estimated with:* $FSSI_3 = average\ (Lab_{(i)})$	National competent authorities; ministries, Codex contact point
4. Existence of programmes to facilitate/encourage compliance to food safety standards, $FSSI_4$	This parameter measures government programs for food safety capacity building for various stakeholders along the food continuum (GAP, GMP, HACCP, etc.); the availability and public access of food safety information; existence of public or industry-driven incentive programmes *This parameter is weighed at w_4 = 20%*	- Existence of national capacity building programmes in GAP, GMP, GHP;$Prog_1$ = *Average* $(Elt_{(i)})$ The minimum elements in national capacity building programs are: *--> Elt 1: Existence of Cacpcity building on GAP, (choose one among 2 options)* *--> Elt 2: Existence of capacity building on GMP, (choose one among 2 options)* *--> Elt 3: Existence of Capacity buiding on GHP, (choose one among 2 options)* - Existence of capacity building programmes in recognized quality management systems i.e HACCP, ISO; $Prog_2$ - Existence of national Food Safety awareness raising programmes/activities; $Prog_3$ = *Average* $(Elt_{(i)})$ *The minimum elements in national awareness programs/activities are:* *--> Elt 1: Workshops, (choose one among 2 options)* *--> Elt 2: Television/Radio programmes, (choose one among 2 options)* *--> Elt 3: National campaigns, (choose one among 2 options)* *--> Elt 4: Billboards, (choose one among 2 options)* - Existence of national support/incentive for industry and producers (including private sector/SMEs), $Prog_4$ *(choose one among 2 options)*	- $Prog_1$ = *Average (Elt(i))* *-Elt1 :* is estimated with option a=0% and b=100%. *-Elt2 :* is estimated with option a=0% and b=100% *-Elt3 :* is estimated with option a=0% and b=100% - $Prog2$ is estimated with option a=0% and b=100%. - $Prog_3$ *Average (Elt(i))* *-Elt1 :* is estimated with option a=0% and b=100% *-Elt2 :* is estimated with option a=0% and b=100% *-Elt3:* is estimated with option a=0% and b=100% *-Elt4 :* is estimated with option a=0% and b=100% - $Prog_4$ is estimated with option a=0% and b=100% The Existence of Programmes to facilitate compliance to food safety standards, is estimated with: $FSSI_4 = average\ (Prog_{(i)})$	Ministries, Codex contact point

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year, the ***Food Safety Systems Indicator*** in %, is : $FSSI = \sum(FSSI_i \times w_i)_{i=1\ to\ 4}$

Theme 3 — *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category **PC 3.6ii** **Food Safety**

1. Objective of the PC

Strengthen preparedness and functionality of food safety systems at national level, for an increased performance of each AU Member State in protecting the health of consumers and the environment, and in offering quality foods to national and international markets.

2. Performance Target

Reach at least 50% for the *Food Safety Health* *Indicator* (FSHI), by 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 3(d)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Food Safety Health Indicator, % (**FSHI**).	FSHI is an indicator that combines country performance in reducing: -cases of foodborne illnesses due to exposure to contaminated food; -cases of foodborne deaths; -cases of liver cancer caused by dietary exposure to aflatoxin

4. Disaggregation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Rate (%) of reduction of foodborne diarrheal diseases, $FSHI_1$ This parameter is weighed at w_1 = 40%	It is the reduction, expressed in percentage of its value of the baseline year 2015, of the number of cases of diarrheal diseases per 100,000 people attributed to foodborne causes	--> To estimate the number $FBDD_t$ of foodborne diarrheal disease per 100,000 people per year: - Total population in a given year TP_i - Number of cases of diarrheal disease per year, $NCDD_i$	The foodborne diarrheal disease per year per 100,000 people is estimated with: $FBDD_t = (NCDD_i \times Ma_i \times Mu_i) * 100,000/TP_i$ Ma_i - Multiplier to correct for attribution to foodborne causes, Mai=0.4; Mu_i -Multiplier to correct for underreporting, *Mui* =(To be provided) Then the rate of reduction $FSHI_1$ of the cases of foodborne diarreal is, **$FSHI_1 = (1-(FBDD_t/FBDD_{2015}))*100$**	DHS; WHO data; National statistics;
2. Rate (%) of reduction of deaths in children under five years age due to foodborne diarrheal diseases $FSHI_2$ This parameter is weighed at w_2 = 40%	It is the reduction, expressed in percentage of its value of the baseline year 2015, of the number of cases of diarrheal deadths per 100,000 children under five	--> To estimate the number $FBDM_t$ of foodborne diarrheal mortality per 100,000 in children less than 5: - Total population of children in a given year TPC_i - Number of cases of diarrheal mortality per year for children under 5, $NCDM_i$	The foodborne diarrheal mortality per year per 100,000 children under 5 is estimated with: $FBDM_t = (NCDM_i \times Ma_i \times Mu_i) * 100,000/TPC_i$ Mai - Multiplier to correct for attribution to foodborne causes, Mai=0.4; Mui -Multiplier to correct for underreporting, Mui=(To be provided) Then the rate of reduction $FSHI_2$ of the cases of foodborne diarreal mortality in children under 5 is, **$FSHI_2 = (1-(FBDMt/FBDM2015)) *100$**	National statistics; UNICEF
3. Rate (%) of reduction of the cases of liver cancer (Hepatocellular Carcinoma) caused by dietary exposure to aflatoxin, $FSHI_3$ This parameter is weighed at w_3 = 20%	It is the reduction, expressed in percentage of its value of the baseline year 2015, of the cases of liver cancer (Hepatocellular Carcinoma) caused by dietary exposure to aflatoxin. Human exposure to dietary aflatoxins can cause liver cancer (hepatocellular carcinoma) in humans independently, and interact with chronic hepatitis B virus (HBV) infection to increase the cancer risk. The 83rd meeting of Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA) review of evidence confirmed this.	--> To estimate the number of liver cancer (Hepatocellular Carcinoma) cases due to dietary exposure per year per 100,000 people , $FBHCC_t$ - Total population in a given year TP_i - Number of cases of liver cancer (Hepatocellular Carcinoma) per year $NHCC_i$	The foodborne HCC cases per year per 100,000 people is estimated with: $FBHCC_t = (NHCC_i \times Ma_i \times Mu_i) * 100,000/TP_i$ Mai - Multiplier to correct for attribution to foodborne causes, Mai=0.3; Mui -Multiplier to correct for underreporting, Mui=(To be provided) Then the rate of reduction $FSHI_3$of the cases of foodborne liver cancer (Hepatocellular Carcinoma) is, **$FSHI_3 = (1-(FBHCC_t/FBHCC_{2015})*100$**	IARC, DHIS and national statistics on liver cancer

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year, the ***Food Safety Health*** ***Indicator*** in %, is : $FSHI = \sum(FSHI_i \times w_i)_{i=1 \text{ to } 3}$

Theme 3 *Ending Hunger*

Performance Category **PC 3.6iii** **Food Safety**

1. Objective of the PC

Strengthen preparedness and functionality of food safety systems at national level, for an increased performance of each AU Member State in protecting the health of consumers and the environment, and in offering quality foods to national and international markets.

2. Performance Target

Reach at least 50% for the *Food Safety Trade Indicator* (FSTI), by 2025

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 3(c), 5 (a,b)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Food Safety Trade Indicator, % (**FSTI**).	FSTI is an indication of a reduction on food safety concerns related to food trade. It expresses efforts of the country in reducing the proportion of regional and international trade violations related to food safety, for all the food commodities subjected to trade. In so doing, it not only boosts trade but also contributes to strengthening cash reserves to overcome food shortages and to raising incomes to improving access to food.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Rate of reduction in unit rejection of food commodities due to food safety violation (non-compliance) disaggregated by type of violation, $FSTp_1$	This is a measure of the percentage reduction, expressed in percentage of its value of the baseline year 2015, in the rate of rejection of export shipments of food commodities due to non-compliance to food safety standards of importing countries, disaggregated by type of violation. TYPE OF VIOLATION 1 refers to the food safety hazard that caused highest number of export rejections for the country, in a given year, regardless of the nature (i.e. this may be aflatoxin levels in exported food, biological contaminants, rejections due to sub-quality,...); TYPE OF VIOLATION 2 refers to the food safety hazard that caused the second highest number of export rejections for the country, in a given year, regardless of the nature; TYPE OF VIOLATION 3 refers to the food safety hazard that caused the third highest number of export rejections for the country, in a given year, regardless of the nature. OTHER TYPES OF VIOLATIONS represents the total number of rejections due to types of violations that are not considered under type 1, 2 and 3. In the data collection template, countries should indicate the violation type and the number of rejections. The unit rejection is a calculated value which will allow comparison acros countries	- Total number of shipments of food commodities exported per year TNS_t - Total value of shipment of food commodities exported per year TVS_t - Number of rejected shipments based on food safety related trade violations in exported food commodities per year, $TR_t = \sum(TR_{v(i)})$ *- Please specify the violation type (i.e. aflatoxins, salmonella etc.) and the number of rejections for each question below.* *--> Violation type 1 and number of rejection* TR_{V1} *--> Violation type 2 and number of rejection* TR_{V2} *--> Violation type 3 and number of rejection* TR_{V3} *--> Other violations and number of rejections* TR_{V4}	Unit rejection rate which is the number of rejections per USD 1 million export URR= (TRt/TVSt)*USD1,000,000; -The total number of rejection will be computed as the sum of rejections for violations 1 to 4 using the following formula: ' $TR_t = \sum(TR_{v(i)})$ ' -The Unit rejection rate which is the number of rejections per USD 1 Million export will be computed as the (total number of rejections due to food safety trade violations divided by the total value of export in USD per year) multiplied by USD1,000,000 using the following formula - $URR = TR_t / TVS_t * USD\ 1{,}000{,}000$ The rate of rejection for each violation type per year is calculated as the ratio of the respective rejected shipments to the total shipments exported: ' $RR_{V1}=TR_{V1}*100/TNS$ $RR_{V2}=TR_{V2}*100/TNS$ $RR_{V3}=TR_{V3}*100/TNS$ $RR_{V4}=TR_{V4}*100/TNS$ ' The total rate of rejection per year will be computed: ' $TRR_t = \sum(RR_{v(i)})/TNS$ Then the rate of reduction in unit rejection rates FST is, **$FST = (1-(URR_t/URR_{2015}))*100$**	Ministries, trade notification systems

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year, the ***Food Safety Trade Indicator*** in %, is : *FSTI = FST*

Theme 4 — *Eradicating Poverty through Agriculture*

Performance Category **PC 4.1i** **Agricultural GDP and Poverty Reduction**

1. Objective of the PC

Sustain annual agriculture sector growth by ensuring higher contribution to GDP and to poverty reduction.

2. Performance Target

Sustain annual agricultural GDP growth of at least 6%, from the year 2015 to the year 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 4(a)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Growth rate of the agriculture value added, in % (tAgVA).	Percentage change of agriculture value added within a specific time period. Agriculture corresponds to the divisions 1-5 of the International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC, revision 3) and includes forestry, hunting, and fishing, as well as cultivation of crops and livestock production (WDI, World Bank, 2016).

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1.a Agriculture value added, in current local currency unit (lcu) (AgVAcu)	Total agriculture value added is the net output of a sector after adding up all outputs and subtracting intermediate inputs. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or depletion and degradation of natural resources. The origin of value added is determined by the International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC), revision 3.	Agriculture value added, in local currency unit (AgVA)		National Statistics WDI
1.b Agriculture Value Added Deflator (AgVAdef)	The AgVA deflator is a tool used to measure the level of price changes over time so that current prices can be accurately compared to historical prices	Agriculture value added Deflator (AgVAdef)		National Statistics WDI
1.c AgVA deflator base year (AgVAdef-2015)	The baseline value (AgVAdef-2015) of the the Agriculture value added deflator, in 2015.		AgVAdef-2015	National Statistics WDI
2. Baseline value ($AgVA_{2015}$) of the Agriculture value added, in local currency unit (lcu)	The baseline value ($AgVA_{2015}$) the Agriculture value added, in 2015.		$AgVA_{2015}$	National Statistics WDI
3. Annual growth rate of Agriculture value added, in % (tAgVA)	Annual growth rate measures the percentage change of the agriculture value added between two consecutive years, (i) and (i-1), i >= 2016		$tAgVAi = 100*(AgVA_i - AgVA_{i-1})/AgVA_{i-1}$	National Statistics
4. Average annual Growth rate of Agriculture value added, in % (aAgVA)	For a given year (i), the average growth rate is calculated over the entire performance years n; n includes i, and excludes the base year 2015.		$aAgVA_i = Average(tAgVA_i)_n$	WDI

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***Growth rate of the agriculture value added*** (in %), is : $aAgVA_t$

Theme 4 — *Eradicating Poverty through Agriculture*

Performance Category **PC 4.1ii** **Agricultural GDP and Poverty Reduction**

1. Objective of the PC

Sustain annual agriculture sector growth by ensuring higher contribution to GDP and to poverty reduction.

2. Performance Target

Ensure that agriculture growth contribute to at least 50% to the overall poverty reduction target, from the year 2015 to the year 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 4(a)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Stand-by *for more research*	

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source

5. Indicator Computing

Theme 4 — *Eradicating Poverty through Agriculture*

Performance Category **PC 4.1iii** **Agricultural GDP and Poverty Reduction**

1. Objective of the PC

Sustain annual agriculture sector growth by ensuring higher contribution to GDP and to poverty reduction.

2. Performance Target

Reduce poverty level by at least 50%, at national poverty line, from the year 2015 to the year 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 4(a)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Reduction rate of poverty headcount ratio, at national poverty line (% of population), **dpovN**	National poverty rate is the percentage of the population living below the national poverty line. National estimates are based on population-weighted sub-group estimates from household surveys (WDI, 2016). Note: The country will report on it but won't be used to compute the overall score for commitment 4 to avoid double counting with PC 4.1iv.

4. Disaggregation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Population size (Pops)	Number of people living in the country	Population size		National statistics
2. National poverty line (NPL)	National poverty treshold. People below the poverty line are considered poor	Number in local currency		National statistics WDI
3. Number of people under the poverty line (NPoor)	Number of people whose incomes are below the national poverty line			National statistics WDI
4. Poverty headcount ratio at national poverty lines (% of population), (phrN)	National poverty headcount ratio is the percentage of the population living below the national poverty lines. National estimates are based on population-weighted subgroup estimates from household surveys.	Poverty headcount ratio (phrN), at national poverty lines (% of population). The baseline value uses the most recent estimate over the year 2015.	phrN=100xNpoor/Pops	National statistics WDI

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***Reduction rate of poverty headcount ratio, at national poverty line*** is:

dpovN = 100 x ($phrN_{t-1}$ - $phrN_t$)/ $phrN_{t-1}$

Theme 4 — *Eradicating Poverty through Agriculture*

Performance Category **PC 4.1iv** **Agricultural GDP and Poverty Reduction**

1. Objective of the PC

Sustain annual agriculture sector growth by ensuring higher contribution to GDP and to poverty reduction.

2. Performance Target

Reduce poverty level by at least 50%, at international poverty line, from the year 2015 to the year 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 4(a)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Reduction rate of the poverty headcount ratio at international poverty line (% of population), **dpovl**	International poverty rate is the percentage of the population living below the international poverty line at $1.90 a day (2011 PPP).

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Population size (Pops)	Number of people living in the country	Population size		National statistics
2. Poverty International poverty line (INPL)	National poverty treshold. People below the poverty line are considered poor	Number in local currency		National statistics WDI
3. Number of people under the poverty line (INPoor)	Number of people whose incomes are below the international poverty line			National statistics WDI
1. Poverty headcount ratio (phrl), at international poverty lines (% of population).	International poverty headcount ratio is the percentage of the population living below the international poverty lines at $1.90 a day (2011 PPP)	Poverty headcount ratio (phr), at international poverty lines (% of population). The baseline value uses the most recent estimater for the year 2015.	phrl=100xIntPoor/Pops	National statistics WDI

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), ***the Reduction rate of poverty headcount ratio, at international poverty line*** , is

dpovl = $\mathbf{100 \times (phrl_{t-1} - phrl_t) / phrl_{t-1}}$

Theme 4 *Eradicating Poverty through Agriculture*

Performance Category **PC 4.1v** **Agricultural GDP and Poverty Reduction**

1. Objective of the PC

Sustain annual agriculture sector growth by ensuring higher contribution to GDP and to poverty reduction.

2. Performance Target

Contribute to poverty reduction by reducing the gap between the wholesale price and farmgate price, by 50% from the by the year 2025, from the year 2015.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 4(a)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Reduction rate of the gap between the wholesale price and farmgate price (**ţfgws**)	This indicator address the concern with the prices that retailers pay to wholesalers. High market margin can result from high transaction costs, including transportation, existence of monopoly or cartel, information asymmetry, etc. The objective is to reduce the transaction costs so that smallholder famers can benefit from low market margin. Low market margin implies profitability of agricultural enterprises for smallholder farmers. Hence, the rationale and the need for narrowing the gap between farmgate price and wholesale price.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Average weighted farm gate price , WFgP	Prices paid to producers by brokers, aggregators, wholesalers and other market agents.	Mean monthly farm gate prices for previous 12 months for each of the five priority commodities at production area (for farmgate price) .	A weighted mean is computed from the monthly means of the five commodities. It is calculated using Farm gate sale value (FgSi) for the weight.	Commodity price tracking systems
2. Average weighted Wholesale/Market Price, WsP	Intermediary prices paid during transactions among brokers, aggregators and wholesalers. We are concerned with the prices that retailers pay to wholesalers.	Mean monthly wholesale prices for previous 12 months for each of the five priority commodities at central market (for whole price). Note: For both average weighted farm gate prices and average weighted wholesale prices a number of disbursed markets should be tracked.	A weighted mean is computed from the monthly means of the five commodities. It is calculated using Wholesale/Market Value (WsVi) for the weight.	Commodity price tracking systems
3. Gap between the wholesale price and farmgate price, Gfgws	This expresses in percentage to the wholesale price, the difference between the wholesale price and farmgate price.	- FgP - WsP	Gfgws = 100* (FgP - WsP)/WsP	

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***Reduction rate of the gap between the wholesale price and farmgate price (in %),*** is :

$ţfgws_t$ = ($Gfgws_t$ - $Gfgws_{2015}$/ ($Gfgws_{2015}$)

Theme 4 — *Eradicating Poverty through Agriculture*

Performance Category — **PC 4.2 Inclusive PPPs for commodity value chains**

1. Objective of the PC

Promote approaches via PPP arrangements to link smallholder farmers to value chains of priority agricultural commodities.

2. Performance Target

Establish and/or strengthen inclusive public-private partnerships (PPP) for at least five (5) priority agricultural commodity value chains with strong linkage to smallholder agriculture, by 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 4(b)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Number of priority agricultural commodity value chains for which a PPP is established with strong linkage to smallholder agriculture, (**Nc**)	A priority agricultural commodity value chain for which a PPP is established with strong linkage to smallholder agriculture, is the priority value chain for which the extent to which smallholder farmers actively participate in its markets, is very high. This extent can be observed through measures such as the high number of smallholders supplying products through target groups to target buyers, or through the volume of sales (in term of value) between smallholders and target buyers at famgate level. It is actually the level of integration of smallholders in a priority value chain that can easily be measured through the volume of trade involving smallholders in the market of a specific value chain. *FAO (2016) defines agri-PPPs as "formalized partnerships between public institutionsand private partners (e.g. agribusinesses, farmer associations and NGOs) designed to address sustainable agricultural development objectives, whrere the public benefits are clearly defined (e.g. rural emplyment and income generation, food safety and food security, environmental protection, etc), investment contributions and risk are shared, and active roles exist for all partners at various stages throughout the PPP project lifecycle." The BR will specifically look at the "Agribusiness PPP" that is a collaboration facilitated by corridor centres between an agribusiness firm and farmers, e.g. partnership built around contract farming.*

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Priority commodity value chains, PC_i	Commodity value chains (whether staple crops, cash crops or other agricultural commodities such as livestock or aquaculture products) on which government places priority.	PC_i	List of the known proirity commodities of the country. list $\{Pc_i\}$	Government policy documents, NAIPs
2. Percent of volume of sales at farmgate level as part of the Total Volume of Sales of the priority commodity *i* , t_{smhi}	It is the volume of sales (in term of value) attributed to smallholders as a share of the total volume of sales at "farmgate level" for each of the priority commodity *I*, PC_i .	- Total volume of sales for the priority commodity, V_{Ti} - Volume of sales at farmgate level, V_{smhi}	$t_{smhi} = V_{smhi.} * 100 / V_{Ti}$	Industry data
3. Percentage of smallholders as part of the total suppliers, supplying that market of the priority commodity *i* , n_{smhi}	Share of smallholders that have been involved in supplying that market of the priority commodity value chain.	- Number of smallholders integrated into the value chain of the priority commodity *i* , N_{smhi} - Total suppliers that are supplying the market of the value chain of the priority commodity $_i$, N_{Ti}	$n_{smhi} = N_{smhi} * 100 / N_{Ti}$	
4. Priority commodity value chains for which a PPP is established with strong linkage to smallholder agriculture, Pcsmhi	It is the priority agricultural commodity value chain for which the volume of sales (in term of value) attributed to smallholders is at least 50% of the total volume of sales of the value chain; and the smallholders represent more that 50% of the total suppliers.	(t_{smhi} ; n_{smhi}) for each of the PC_i	list $\{PCsmh_i\} = \{PC_i$ / (t_{smhi} x n_{smhi}) >= 25% }	

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(i), ***the Number of priority agricultural commodity value chains for which a PPP is established with strong linkage to smallholder agriculture*** , is **Nc = count (list $\{PCsmh_i\}$) .**

Theme 4 — *Eradicating Poverty through Agriculture*

Performance Category **PC 4.3** **Youth job in agriculture**

1. Objective of the PC

Engage youth in agricultural sector development to contribute to reduce level of unemployment and poverty.

2. Performance Target

Create job opportunities for at least 30% of the youth in agricultural value chains, from the year 2015 to the year 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 4(c)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Percentage of youth that is engaged in new job opportunities in agriculture value chains, (**ţYth**)	Youth here refers to the mature young of 15-34 old age range. The percentage in the indicator refers to the share of the total number of that group of age that has been given a new job in agriculture, with a counting starting from the year 2015, and this do not include the youth already working in agriculture. Approach for creating job for youth may include improving the skills profile, employability and entrepreneurship for the youth to closing the skills gap in the sector to boost private business initiated the youth. Creating skills development opportunities for youth (female and male) to access technical and vocational education and training (TVET) in agricultural value chains is therefore key to trigger private initiatives by the youth.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Total number of youth at working age in the country, TN_{Yth}	Population of 15-34 old age range in the country, considered as of mature young at working age.	Demographic data		National bureau of statistics
2. Number of youth that is engaged in new jobs in agricultural value chains, (cumulative counting from the year 2015), AgN_{Yth}	The youth (male and female) that is offered new job opportunities in agricultural value chains are those: - who do any agriculture related work as paid employees for any agriculture entreprise or SME ($AgN_{yth}E$); - who work as self-employed in their own business or profession or on their own farm ($AgN_{yth}SE$); - who work 15 hours per week or more as unpaid workers in a family-operated enterprise ($AgN_{yth}FE$).	Cumulative number of the new jobs created within sub sectors related to agriculture for the youth by existing entreprises. This include "paid employment; "self-employment". AgNYth = $AgN_{yth}E + AgN_{yth}SE + AgN_{yth}FE$	Sum of all reported numbers from all entreprises	1.Enterprise Survey 2.Establishment Census 3.Integrated Business Enterprise Survey 4.Integrated Household Living Conditions Survey 5. National Agriculture Survey

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***percentage of youth that is engaged in new job opportunities in agriculture value chains*** , is :

$ţYth_t = AgN_{Yth} * 100 / TN_{Yth}$

Theme 4 — *Eradicating Poverty through Agriculture*

Performance Category **PC 4.4** **Women participation in Agriculture**

1. Objective of the PC

Promote initiatives that facilitate preferential entry and participation for women in gainful and attractive agri-business opportunities.

2. Performance Target

Ensure that 20% of rural women have access to productive assets, including land, credit, inputs and financial services and information (empowered) by 2023.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 4(d):* *In the FTYIP of the AU Agenda 2063 (Ref: Asp.6/Goal.17/PA.1/trg.2)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Proportion of women that are empowered in agriculture, **ţWE**	Women empowerment in agriculture will be measured accordingly with the five domains of empowerment (5DE) in agriculture. These domains are: *(1) decisions about agricultural production* , *(2) access to and decision-making power about productive resources* , *(3) control of use of income* , *(4) leadership in the community* , and *(5) time allocation* .

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Total number of women engaged in agriculture, Ntw	Total number of women that engaged in agriculture	Nw from country statistics		
2. Proportion of women that make Decisions about agricultural production, $ţDE_1$	Production: Sole or joint decisionmaking over food and cash-crop farming, livestock, and fisheries as well as autonomy in agricultural production.	Number of women that have: a) Input in productive decisions and b) Autonomy in production, NDE_1	$ţDE_1 = NDE_1 / Ntw$	
3. Proportion of women that have Access to and decision-making power about productive resources, $ţDE_2$	Resources: Ownership, access to, and decisionmaking power over productive resources such as land, livestock, agricultural equipment, consumer durables, and credit	Number of women that have: a)Ownership of assets, b)Purchase, sale or transfer of assets, c)Access to and decisions about credit, NDE_2	$ţDE_2 = NDE_2 / Nw$	
4. Proportion of women that have Control of use of income, $ţDE_3$	Income: Sole or joint control over income and expenditures	Number of women that have Control over use of income, NDE_3	$ţDE_3 = NDE_3 / Ntw$	
5. Proportion of women that are in leadership in the community, $ţDE_4$	Leadership: Membership in economic or social groups and comfort in speaking in public	Number of women that have: a) Group member and b) Speaking in public, NDE_4	$ţDE_4 = NDE_4 / Nw$	
6. Proportion of women that have Time allocation for leisure, $ţDE_5$	Time: Allocation of time to productive and domestic tasks and satisfaction with the available time for leisure activities	Number of women that are able to manage their time amongst: a) Workload and b) Leisure, NDE_5	$ţDE_5 = NDE_5 / Ntw$	
7. Number of women empowered in agriculture, NwE	The proportion of rural women that are empowered can be generated for the country using mathematical set method to provide the overall proportion of women that meet at least 4 of the above-mentionned 5 domains *(or appox. 80% of the reported domains of availed data)* .	Use mathematical set method *(using individual numbers to avoid double counting)* to generate the total number of women that meet at least 4 of the 5 domains *(or appox. 80% of the reported domains of availed data)* : NwE	*$NwE = f(NDE_1, NDE_2, NDE_3, NDE_4, NDE_5)$*	

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the **proportion of rural women that are empowered in agriculture**, is **ţWE = NwE / Ntw**

Theme 5 — *Intra-African Trade in Agriculture Commodities*

Performance Category **PC 5.1** **Intra-African Trade in agriculture commodities and services**

1. Objective of the PC

Promote intra-African trade in agriculture commodities and services.

2. Performance Target

Triple intra-African trade in agricultural commodities and services, by the year 2025 from the year 2015.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 5(a)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Growth rate of the value of trade of agricultural commodities and services within Africa,% (ţIAT).	Total agricultural imports from and export to African countries are expressed in terms of value, in constant US dollars. They cover all movements of agricultural goods and services between the country and other African countries, during the reference period. They include commercial trade, food aid granted on specific terms, donated quantities and estimates of unrecorded trade. Agricultural services, which include food services, cover the below two components: (i) Services incidental to agriculture, forestry and fishing, under Waste treatment and de-pollution, agricultural and mining services, and (ii) Food and beverage services, under hotels and restaurants (including catering). "Services incidental to agriculture, forestry and fishing includes services that are incidental to agriculture, such as the provision of agricultural machinery with crew, harvesting, treatment of crops, pest control, animal boarding, animal care and breeding services. Services in hunting, trapping, forestry and logging and fishing are also included here, as are veterinary services" (United Nations, 2010).

4. Disaggregation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Value of intra-African trade - imports (M_i) and exports (X_i) for agriculture goods and services, in current US dollars.	Total value of agricultural goods and services traded (imports and exports) by African countries from African sources in current US dollars.	Agricultural products (Standard International Trade Classification or SITC sections 0, 1, 2, 4 minus 27 and 28 in section 2) - Food: food and live animals, beverages and tobacco, animal and vegetable oils, fats and waxes, oilseeds and oleaginous fruit (SITC sections 0, 1, 4 and division 22), of which: - Fish (SITC division 03), and - Other food products and live animals, beverages and tobacco, animal and vegetable oils, fats and waxes, oilseeds and oleaginous fruit (SITC sections 0, 1, 4 and division 22 less division 03). - Raw materials: hides, skins and furskins, raw, crude rubber (including synthetic and reclaimed), cork and wood, pulp and waste paper, textile fibers and their wastes, crude animal and vegetable materials, n.e.s. (SITC divisions 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29).		**National statistics** UNCTAD WTO UNECA RECs
2.Unit value of imported (p_{Mi}) and exported (p_{Xi}) agriculture products	C.I.F. and F.O.B. prices of agricultural products traded among African countries.	Data of international trade are usually in US$. Prices of internationally traded commodities are also in US$.		National statistics UNCTAD WTO
3. Trade (import or export) value indexes (pmx)	Composite prices of agricultural products traded (imports or exports) among African countries.	$$pmx = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(P_{Mi} * \bar{M}_i^{2010} + P_{Xi} * \bar{X}_i^{2010})}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\bar{M}_i^{2010} + \bar{X}_i^{2010})}$$		
4. Value of intra-African trade (imports and exports) for agriculture goods and services, in constant US dollars 2010 (IAT)		i)- Value of intra- African imports for agriculture goods, IAMg ii)- Value of intra- African imports for agriculture services, IAMs iii)- Value of intra- African exports for agriculture goods, IAXg iv)- Value of intra- African exports for agriculture services, IAXs	$$IAT = \frac{\sum_i (Mi + Xi)}{pmx}$$ *IAT = IAMg + IAMs + IAXg + IAXs*	

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***Growth rate of the value of trade of agricultural commodities and services within Africa,*** (%), is : $ţIAT_t$ **= (IAT_t - IAT_{2015}) *100 / IAT_{2015}**

Theme 5 — *Intra-African Trade in Agriculture Commodities*

Performance Category **PC 5.2i** **Intra-African Trade Policies and institutional conditions**

1. Objective of the PC

Create and enhance regional and continental policies and institutional conditions and support systems to simplify and formalize the current trade practices to permit the achievement of trippling intra-African trade; including the promotion of the African Common position on agriculture-related international trade negotiations and partnership agreements.

2. Performance Target

Fully establish trade facilitation measures by reaching 100% of Trade Facilitation Index by 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 5(b).*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Trade Facilitation Index (**TFI**)	Trade facilitation involves the reduction of transaction costs associated with institutional/non-tariff barriers. This will enhance trans-border movements of goods and services. Establishment of trade facilitation in this case include all the interrelated measures that go beyond the agriculture sector, but contribute significantly to trade of agriculture commodities and services.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Physical infrastructure (PI)	Physical infrastructure captures the availability and quality of transport infrastructure required to facilitate the within -country- and cross border movement of goods	1. Quality of roads 2. Quality of airports 3. Quality of seaports 4. Quality of raiways	Normalize each indicator as 0-100 and find simple average of all four indicators	World Economic Forum (WEF) Global Competitiveness Index (GCI)
2. Information and communication technology (ICT)	Information and communication technology measures the quality and extent of use, absorption, and procurement of information and communication technologies in an economy	1. Firm level technology absorption 2. FDI and technology transfer 3. Availability of latest technology 4. Government procurement of advanced technology 5. Individuals using internet 6. Fixed telephone lines 7. Internet subscription	Normalize each indicator as 0-100 and find simple average of all seven indicators	World Economic Forum (WEF) Global Competitiveness Index (GCI) (http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_TheGlobalCompetitivenessReport2019.pdf)
3. Border administration (BA)	Border administration quantifies the ease of trading across borders as well as the level of transparency and efficiency of customs formalities and administration at a country's border.	1. Number of documents to export 2. Number of Days to export 3. Costs to export 4. Number of documents to import 5. Number of Days to import 6. Costs to import	Normalize each indicator as 0-100 and find simple average of all six indicators	World Bank's (WB) Doing Business (DB). (https://www.doingbusiness.org/content/dam/doingBusiness/media/Profiles/Regional/DB2020/SSA.pdf)
4. Bilateral Agricultural trade related agreements (ATA)	Proportion of countries with bilateral agricultural trade related agreements (in %) A bilateral agreement is assumed between any pair of countries within a Regional Economic Commmunity (REC).	- Number of countries with bilateral agricultural trade related agreements (NTA)	ATA = NTA/54*100	Ministry of Agriculture Ministry of Trade Ministry of Foreign Affairs
5. Immigration (IM)	Ease of entry into country (in %)	Sum all: - Number of countries with visa free entry (NVF) - Number of countries with visa on arrival (VA).	IM = (NVF+VA)/54*100	Immigration Department

5. Indicator Computing

For each year(t), the Trade Facilitation Index, is **TFI = (PI + ICT + BA + ATA + IM)/5**

Theme 5 — *Intra-African Trade in Agriculture Commodities*

Performance Category **PC 5.2ii** **Intra-African Trade Policies and institutional conditions**

1. Objective of the PC

Create and enhance regional and continental policies and institutional conditions and support systems to simplify and formalize the current trade practices to permit the achievement of intra-African trade target; including the promotion of the African Common position on agriculture-related international trade negotiations and partnership agreements.

2. Performance Target

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 5(b)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Indicator of Food Price Anomalies (IFPA)	The indicator of food price anomalies (IFPA) identifies market prices that are abnormally high by evaluating growth in prices over a particular month over several years, taking into account seasonality in agricultural markets and inflation. The IFPA is an indirect indicator of the proper functioning of food commodity markets and the accessibility of timely market information, including food prices.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
2. Indicator of Domestic Food Price Anomalies (IFPA)	The IFPA is the normalized difference of the weighted summation of the quarterly and annual compound growth rates of prices from their historical mean, for a predefined period of time.	Monthly food consumer price indices and general consumer price indices	$IFPA_t = 0.4\left(CQGR_{yt} - \overline{CQGR_t} / \hat{\sigma}_{CQGR_t}\right) + 0.6\left(CAGR_{yt} - \overline{CAGR_t} / \hat{\sigma}_{CAGR_t}\right)$ Where CQGR and CAGR are the quarterly and annual compound growth rates. Details in Annex	National Statistics Insitutues, FAO

5. Indicator Computing

If the IFPA in year y and month t is greater and equal to one, the price of the observed period is considered abnormally high.

Theme 6 — *Resilience to Climate Variability*

Performance Category **PC 6.1i** **Resilience to climate related risks**

1. Objective of the PC

Promote initiatives of building resilience of production systems and reduce vulnerabilities of African livelihoods to climate variability and other related risks.

2. Performance Target

Ensure that at least 30% of farm, pastoral, and fisher households have improved their resilience capacity to climate and weather related risks, by the year 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 6(a)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Percentage of farm, pastoral, and fisher households that have improved their resilience capacity to climate and weather related shocks (ţRAgHh).	Resilience refers to the ability of people, households, communities, countries and systems to mitigate, adapt to and recover from shocks and stresses in a manner that reduces chronic vulnerability and facilitates inclusive growth.

4. Disaggregation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Total number of farm, pastoral, and fishery-based households, NagHH	It is the total number of farm, pastoral, and fishery-based households in a sample representative to the data availed by the country agriculture statistics		NagHH	Country statistics, and/or FAO
2. Number of farm, pastoral, and fishery-based households that have improved their resilience capacity to climate variability and related risks, NRagHH	Farm, pastoral, and fisher y-based households that are resilient are considered here as the households that are able to recover from natural and human-induced shocks. The household resilience capacity can be measured with the FAO's Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis (RIMA) model. As resilience is a context-specific concept, dimensions change depending on the context. FAO considered dimensions of resilience into two categories which include physical dimensions (i.e. income and food access; access to basic services; assets; social safety nets; incidence of climatic shocks), and capacity dimensions (adaptive capacity)	Data from resilience analysis in the country for analysing household resilience using the FAO's RIMA model can be used to estimate the number of households that have improved their resilience to climate variability and related risks. With the RIMA model, a resilient household is appreciated through the household resilience index, Ri. Household data collection exercises are required for at least 2 points in time between 2016 and 2025. The exercises should be performed in order to facilitate a panel data analysis. The data collected will be assessed to identify changes in resilience capacity to climate variability and related risks at the household level, using the RIMA model. The RIMA model can estimate changes in household resilience capacity (Ri) throughout time. It can facilitate comparisons between countries based on the percentage of households in each country who have experienced an improvement in resilience capacity during the designated time frame.	NRagHH	Country statistics, and/or FAO
3. Household resilience capacity index, R_i	RIMA is a multidimensional index that captures resilience capacity and its determinants. RIMA is an analytical package of econometric tools, which examines the following factors: Exposure to shocks; Income and livelihood diversification; Productive and non-productive assets endowment; Access to social safety nets; Access to basic services; Household adaptive capacity	Latent variables to estimate a household resilience capacity Ri include: o Access to basic services (ABS) o Assets (AST) o Social Safety Nets (SSN) o Adaptive Capacity (AC) o Ri = f(ABS, AST, SSN, AC)	Ri is function of the listed parameters as shown in the formula here: Ri = f(ABSt, ASTt, SSNt, AC,)	Countries and/or FAO

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year (t), the percentage of farm, pastoral and fishery-based households that have improved their resilience to climate and weather related shocks (in %) is: ţRAgHht= NRagHH/NagHH*100

Theme 6 — *Resilience to Climate Variability*

Performance Category **PC 6.1ii** **Resilience to climate related risks**

1. Objective of the PC

Promote initiatives of building resilience of production systems to reduce vulnerabilities of the livelihoods of African population to climate variability and other related risks.

2. Performance Target

Ensure that at least 30% of agricultural land is placed under sustainable land and water management including Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) practices.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 6(a)* *...In the FTYIP of the AU Agenda 2063 (Ref: Asp.1/Goal.7/PA.1/trg.1)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Share of agriculture land under sustainable land and water management including CSA practices (**SSLWM**).	Sustainable land and Water management (SLWM) is the adoption of land use systems that through appropriate management practices, enables land users to maximise the economic and social benefits from the land while maintaining or enhancing the ecological support functions of the land resources (TerrAfrica). SLWM combines technologies, policies, and activities aimed at integrating socioeconomic principles with environmental concerns, so as to simultaneously: maintain and enhance production (productivity); reduce the level of production risk, and enhance soil capacity to buffer against degradation processes (stability/resilience); protect the potential of natural resources and prevent degradation of soil and water quality (protection); be economically viable (viability); and be socially acceptable, and assure access to the benefits from improved land management (acceptability/equity).

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Agriculture area under SLWM including CSA (ASLWM)	Area of land that is under SLWM practices *Agronomic measures* : measures that improve soil cover (e.g. green cover, mulch); measures that enhance organic matter / soil fertility (e.g. manuring, use of fertilizers); soil surface treatment (e.g. conservation tillage); subsurface treatment (e.g. deep ripping). *Vegetative measures* : plantation / reseeding of tree and shrub species (e.g. live fences; tree crows), grasses and perennial herbaceous plants (e.g. grass strips) and use of climate smart seeds. *Structural measures* : terraces (bench, forward / backward sloping); bunds banks / level, graded); dams, pans; ditches (level, graded); walls, barriers, palisades. *Management measures* : change of land use type (e.g. area enclosure); change of management / intensity level (e.g. from grazing to cut-andcarry); major change in timing of activities; control / change of species composition.	Identifed agriculture areas in the country under each SLWM including CSA practice, $ASLWM_j$	Sum of all the recorded areas under different SLWM practices $ASLWM = \Sigma(ASLWM_j)$	TerrAfrica and countries
2. Agricultural Land (L1)	In compliance with the classification proposed by the World Census of Agriculture 2020 (WCA 2020), land is considered 'agricultural land' according to its use (FAO, 2017). In particular, agricultural land includes: land under temporary crops; land under temporary meadows and pastures; land temporarily fallow; land under permanent crops; land under permanent meadows and pastures. (SDG 5.a.1 definition)	Identified agriculture areas of the country, L1	Total Agricultural Land L1	FAO STAT

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the **share of agriculture land under SLWM including CSA practices is** $SSLWM_t$ = (**ASLWM /L1**)*100

Theme 6 — *Resilience to Climate Variability*

Performance Category **PC 6.2** **Investment in resilience building**

1. Objective of the PC

Enhance investments for resilience building initiatives to protect households and vulnerable social groups, as well as vulnerable ecosystems.

2. Performance Target

Create permanent investment budget-lines and enabling environment to respond to spending needs on resilience building initiatives, especially for disaster preparedness plans, functioning early warning and response systems, social safety nets, and weather-based index insurance, from 2015 to 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 6(b)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Existence of government budget-lines and enabling enviroment to respond to spending needs on resilience building initiatives (EI_{RB})	Government budget line on resilience building initiatives refers to the budget line to cover spending including spending on benefits and on administrative costs. The indicator captures both the recurrent and capital program budget and can be based on data to be captured from program records. Enabling environment refers to policies, strategies, rules and regulations.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Existence of policies and strategies regarding disaster preparedness and risk management, EI_{RB1}	The policies, strategies, rules and regulations create the enabling environment for preparedness to respond effectively to disasters for its full implementation.	- Availability of the policy documents at national and/or regional level	EI_{RB1} is estimated by: - "0" if No - "100%" if Yes	
2. Existence of government budget-lines for Early warning and response systems including social safety nets, EI_{RB2}	The Budget-linesshould reflect resource needs to adequately fund early warning and response systems.	- Availability of well functioning and funded Disaster Risk Management institutions and No. of vulnerable households served by social protection schemes;	EI_{RB2} is estimated by: - "0" if No - "100%" if Yes	
3. Proportion of vulnerable households covered by index insurance and/or social protection schemes, EI_{RB3}	Existence of index insurance and/or social protection scheme and proportion of households who either subscribe weather based index insurance or served by social protection	- Number of households covered by weather based index insurance or social protection schemes, z, - Total number of vulnerable households and households at risk, Z	EI_{RB3} is the Head count or proportions, and is calculated with the formula: z/Z*100	

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), the ***Existence of government budget-lines and enabling environment to respond to spending needs on resilience building initiatives*** (in %), is : $\mathbf{EI_{RB} = Average\ (EI_{RBi})_{i=1\ to\ 3}}$

Theme 7 — *Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results*

Performance Category **PC 7.1** **Country capacity for evidence based planning, impl. and M&E**

1. Objective of the PC

To encourage countries to increase capacity to generate, analyse and use data, information, knowlegde and innovations.

2. Performance Target

Reach at least 69 for the Index of capacity to generate and use agriculture statistical data and information (ASCI), by 2025.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration:	*Malabo Decl. 7(c),* *target set as average of the 10 best ranked countries in the Africa Country Assessment report.*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Index of capacity to generate and use agriculture statistical data and information (ASCI) for the current review period (2020-2021).	ASCI (Agricultural Statistics Capacity Indicator) is a multidimensional indicator that measures a country's capacity to produce timely and reliable agricultural and rural statistics and provides evidence on the current level of development of national agricultural and rural statistics systems. It is a composite index assessing four dimensions, each comprising an aggregation of a number of different elements/components. The four dimensions are: i) the institutional infrastructure; ii) the resources; iii) the statistical methods and practices and iv) the availability of statistical information. The indicator has been developed in the framework of the Global strategy to develop Agricultural and rural Statistics and is used in other regions in the world.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Agricultural Statistics Capacity Indicator, ASCI	It is a composite index assessing four dimensions of statistical capacity at national level in the field of agriculture.	Data provided by countries (through a specific questionnaire) every two years. Baseline available for 2013 and new indicator to be collected in 2017 . Countries can use directly the already calculated Index availed by the AfDB for the Biennial Report.	Scores are computed by AfDB and published according to the overall methodology available at: http://www.gsars.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Guidelines_Country-Assessment_FINAL.pdf	Countries/ AfDB

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year(t), ASCI can be reported as already computed and available at the link above.

Theme 7 — *Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results*

Performance Category **PC 7.2** **Peer Review and Mutual Accountability**

1. Objective of the PC

Establish mechanisms and systems to measure, track and report performance of Member States with respect to progress on key commitments agreed upon.

2. Performance Target

Foster alignment, harmonization and coordination among multi-sectorial efforts and multi-institutional platforms for peer review, mutual learning and mutual accountability, *(reach 100% for the Existence of inclusive institutionalized mechanisms and platforms for mutual accountability and peer review, ECI)* **by 2018.**

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 7(b)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Existence of inclusive institutionalized mechanisms and platforms for mutual accountability and peer review (ECI) for the current review period (2020-2021).	This indicator measures the existence of an institutionalized mechanism and platform for mutual accountability, supporting evicence-based review and dialogue in the implementation of the NAIP and other agricultural related commitments.

4. Disaggragation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Adherence to mutual accountability principles: AMAP	This parameter assesses the extent to which a country's review process follows the six key principles of mutual accountability (MAP): i) Shared vision, objectives and strategies ii) Agreed performance indicators iii) Evidence-based analysis iv) Inclusive of key stakeholders v) Transparent dialogue vi) Commitment to implement recommendation from review	Number of mutual accountability principles satisfied (MAPS) by the country	AMAP = (MAPS/6)*100	CAADP focal person: country review mechanism, country JSR or other annual agricultural sector review report
2. Existence of mutual accountability mechanism and platform: EMAP	This parameter assesses the extent to which a country's review mechanism follows the twelve (12) best practices (TBP) of a robust review mechanism. A country needs to have: 1. Review/JSR Steering Committee 2. Review/JSR Secretariat 3. Review/JSR Terms of Reference 4. Financial and human resources 5. Broad group of relevant stakeholders for the review or JSR 6. Assessment of existing agricultural policy dialogue and review processes; data quality and analytical capacities 7. Commissioned review/JSR relevant studies 8. Review/JSR review Team 9. Review /JSR Report 10. Review /JSR validation meeting 11. Action Plan 12. Experiences to share with other countries	Number of best practices satisfied (BPS) by the country	EMAP = (BPS/12)*100;	CAADP focal person: country review mechanism, country JSR or other annual agricultural sector review report
3. Coverage of agricultural review report: CARR	This parameter assesses the coverage of the country's review report focusing on the six key areas of assessment (KAA): i) Development results ii) Agriculture sector performance iii) Financial and non-financial commitments including by NSAs iv) Policy implementation v) Assessment of linkages vi) Review recommendations	Number of key areas covered by the country's review report (NKAA)	CARR = (NKAA/6)*100	CAADP focal person: country review mechanism, country JSR or other annual agricultural sector review report

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year, the ***Existence of inclusive institutionalized mechanisms for mutual accountability and peer review*** , is :

ECI = (AMAP + EMAP+ CARR) / 3

Theme 7 — *Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results*

Performance Category **PC 7.3** **Biennial Agriculture Review Process**

1. Objective of the PC

Institutionalize the use of the Biennial report to serve mutual accountability platforms, experiences sharing amongst African countries on agricultural development issues, and promote lessons learnt for performing on Malabo Declaration..

2. Performance Target

Conduct a biennial Agriculture Review Process that involves tracking, monitoring and reporting progress made in implementing the Malabo Declaration, by availing the regular country Biennial Report to the AU Assembly.

Reference in the Malabo Declaration: *Malabo Decl. 7(a)*

3. Performance Indicator

Indicator	Definition / Explanation
Country Biennial Report submission (BR).	Report prepared using under the strategic guidance provided by the AUC and NPCA in collaboration with the RECs, and using the Reporting Template (eBR) that has been availed on this purpose. The BR is the final report that has included amendments after validation : - at national level with a stakeholders' group established for this purpose (eg. country Joint Sector Review, JSR-like process) - at subregional level led by the RECs.

4. Disaggregation

Parameter/ Unit	Definition	Data required	Computing Methods	d. Source
1. Draft country Biennial Report	It is draft Country Biennial Report that has been validated at country level, and has been reviewed with national stakeholders' amendments using existing mutual accountability platforms (eg. JSR and JSR-like process).	Availed Draft 1 that is submitted officially. Data on number of stakeholder constituencies present; i. Government; ii.CSOs; iii. Private Sector;iv. Research and knowedge organizations; v. Farmer Organizations; vi.Development partners/donors	Count the number of stakeholder groups involved at the report valiadation meeting for the submitted report. BR1=(the count of stakeholder groups/6)*25%; Where the report was not validated, the BR1=0	
2. Quality of the Draft Biennial Report	Number of parameters reported out of the total parameters proposed in the Template of Country Report.	n = number of parameters reported by the country N = total number of parameters reflected in the country reporting format	**$BR_2 = BR_1 + (25\% * n/N)$** , as cumulated with the former steps.	
3. Revised Draft country BR	It is the draft Country Biennial Report that has been reviewed at regional level, and which has taken into account amendments on data harmonization and alignment.	Participation of the country in the REC's technical review process. Participation can be in any prescribed/agreed form	- **$BR_3 = (BR2 + 25\%)$**, when the report is reviewed by the REC, and the country has participated in the discussion and taken into account all suggested amendments if any (or when the REC has reviewed the report and has no suggested amendment). - **$BR_3 = (BR2 + 12.5\%)$**, when the report is reviewed by the REC, and the country has participated in the discussion and has taken into account some of the suggested amendment if any. - **BR_3** = (BR_2 + 0%)when the report is reviewed by the REC, and the country has not participated in the discussion or not taken into account some of the suggested amendment if any.	
4. Submission to the AUC/NPCA through RECs	It is when the Country follows the endorsed process of submitting the final Biennial Report to the AUC/NPCA through the RECs.	Report submitted to the REC by the Country.	**$BR_4 = BR_3 + 25\%$** , as cumulated value with the former steps if this step is fully reached, and **$BR_3 + 0$** if it is not.	

5. Indicator Computing

For a given year of the BR exercise, the Country Biennial Report submission, is assessed as: ***BR*** **$= BR_k$**, *whereas k is the step reached.*

TECHNICAL GUIDELINES for preparing Country Report on progress made in implementing the Malabo Declaration

Theme 5	*Intra-African Trade in Agriculture Commodities*	
Performance Category	**PC 5.2ii**	**Intra-African Trade Policies and institutional conditions**

BORDER ADMINISTRATION

Doing business	**BR Technical guidelines**
-	Number of documents to export
Time to export: Border compliance (hours) Time to export: Documentary compliance (hours)	Number of Days to export
Cost to export: Border compliance (USD) Cost to export: Documentary compliance (USD)	Costs to export
-	Number of documents to import
Time to import: Border compliance (hours) Time to import: Documentary compliance (hours)	Number of Days to import
Cost to import: Border compliance (USD) Cost to import: Documentary compliance (USD)	Costs to import

PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Global competitiveness Report	**BR Technical guidelines**
Road Connectivity 0-100 (best) Quality of road Infrastructure 1-7 (best)	Quality of roads
Rail road Density km/square km Efficiency of train services 1-7 (best)	Quality of railways
Airport connectivity score Efficiency of air transport services 1-7 (best)	Quality of airports
Liner shipping connectivity 0-100 (best) Efficiency of seaport services 1-7 (best)	Quality of seeports

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

Global competitiveness Report	**BR Technical guidelines**
a. Mobile Cellular Telephone Subscriptions per 100 pop	1. Firm level technology absorption
b. Mobile-Broadband Subscriptions per 100 pop	2. FDI and technology transfer
c. Fixed-Broadband Subscriptions Internet per 100 pop	3. Availability of latest technology
d. Fibre-Broadband Subscriptions Internet per 100 pop	4. Government procurement of advanced technology
e. Internet Users % adult p[opulation	5. Individuals using internet
	6. Fixed telephone lines
	7. Internet subscription

Theme 5	*Intra-African Trade in Agriculture Commodities*	
Performance Category	**PC 5.2ii**	**Intra-African Trade Policies and institutional conditions**

The **IFPA** for a particular year *y* in month *t* is the following weighted sum of quarterly and annual IFPA:

$$IFPA_t = \alpha\left(\frac{CQGR_{yt} - \overline{CQGR_t}}{\hat{\sigma}_{CQGR_t}}\right) + (1-\alpha)\left(\frac{CAGR_{yt} - \overline{CAGR_t}}{\hat{\sigma}_{CAGR_t}}\right)$$

$CQGR_{yt}$ and $CAGR_{yt}$ are the quarterly and annual compound growth rates in year y and month t respectively

$\overline{CQGR_t}$ and $\overline{CAGR_t}$ are weighted means of the quarterly and annual compound growth rates in month t

$\hat{\sigma}_{CQGR_t}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{CAGR_t}$ are weighted standard devaitions of the quarterly and annual compound growth rates in month t

α establishes the relative importance of the quarterly compound growth rate anomalies to the year-on-year price variations. (http://www.fao.org/giews/food-prices/research/detail/en/c/235685/)

The thresholds for the $IFPA_y$ are expressed as the normalized difference of the compound growth rate of prices from their historical mean for the predefined period of time. And three ranges are established: 1) a less than half a standard deviation difference from the mean is considered normal; 2) a difference that is half but less than one standard deviation is considered moderately high; 3) a difference from the historical mean that is at least one standard deviation greater than the mean is considered abnormally high.

$$0.5 \leq IFPA_y < 1 \quad Moderately\ High$$
$$IFPA_y \geq 1 \quad Abnormally\ High$$
$$-0.5 \leq IFPA_y < 0.5 \quad Normal$$