

**Aide Memoire**  
**Preparatory Meeting on Pillar Experts Support to Country Process**  
**AU-IBAR, Nairobi 28 February 2011-1 March 2011**

## **1. Introduction**

The CAADP Pillar Expert Support meeting convened by the African Union Commission (AUC-DREA), NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency (NPCA) took place in Nairobi, Kenya from the 28 February to 1 March 2011. Additional to AUC and NPCA participants, the meeting was attended by representatives from the four CAADP Pillar Lead Institutions, namely Forum for Agriculture Research in Africa (FARA), Conference of Ministers of Agriculture in West and Central Africa (CMA/WCA), University of Zambia (UZ) and CILSS. Others participating were the University of Malawi Bunda College (coordinate for the FishNET expert pool), African Union International Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) – focal point institution on livestock. Forest institutions were also invited, but unable to attend ([Annex 1](#) gives participants' list).

## **2. Purpose of Meeting**

The meeting was convened with three core issues in mind, namely:

- a) To brief/up-date the Pillar lead institutions on progress with the “Pillar consultancy assignment”
- b) Prepare a simple, but, elaborate and concise joint roadmap/work plan to rally/mobilize and deploy expert support to the countries in the interim period, i.e. alongside the service agency and before the Pillar consultancy work is completed and outcome operationalised. This is consistent with the joint AUC-NPCA-RECs Planning Meeting outcomes which made key decisions on and emphasized the absolute necessity for:
  - Joint and coherent planning to improve on effectiveness, efficiency and appropriateness in delivering CAADP implementation support
  - Facilitate coordination
- c) Enlist input/comments on the planned “Service Agency” arrangement

Within the context of the second issue above, the workshop was also expected to enlist the experiences and lessons from the Pillar institutions on the expert support exercise undertaken in 2010 to support countries in the (i) formulation of the investment plans and (ii) in the technical reviews.

## **3. Workshop discussions and outcomes**

### **3.1 Briefing on the Pillar Consultancy exercise**

i. The meeting recalled the 5<sup>th</sup> CAADP PP (Abuja, November 2009) decision to examine and determine best possible and systematic arrangement for Knowledge-information-analytical skills support to CAADP implementation. The meeting noted that this review is not be an evaluation of the existing PIs but rather an open exercise to examine comprehensively the various factors and circumstances to build and manage an integrated and systemic architecture for Knowledge-information-analytical skills support – whereby the state and non-state institutions undertaking agriculture

development planning get systemic and systematic access to expert knowledge, information and analytical skills in a manner that is mutual with knowledge institutions on the other side

It was noted that the pillar consultancy will more specifically:

- i. Identify and highlight nature and form of the country needs with regard to knowledge-information-analytical skills in the design, implementation and evaluation of agriculture development programmes (i.e. the demand)
- ii. Synthesize key issues and features/principles and norms for a system/mechanism through which countries would have systemic and systematic access to knowledge-information-analytical skills
- iii. Identify systems and mechanisms by which the experts could be mobilized, organized including supported through some orientation and nurturing to enable them better (effectively and appropriately) respond to country knowledge, information and analytical skills needs in the CAADP implementation process

The Pillar consultancy will embrace a consultative approach and in this regard, the Pillar Lead Institutions will be critically instrumental in bringing to the consultations and dialogue their experiences from their work on developing the CAADP Pillar framework documents and managing experts used to support formulation and technical review of the investment plans.

### **3.2 CAADP Resource Group**

- i. Noting that the CAADP Resource Group is an important component in the arrangements to define and manage sustainable capacity development interventions for the country and regional CAADP teams. This is especially that strengthening and aligning work of the country CAADP teams is an important priority issues for 2011.
- ii. The Workshop edged NPCA to take immediate steps to constitute and operationalise the CAADP Resource Group.
- iii. The terms of reference for the CAADP resource group have been developed and validated at 2010-Kampala Capacity Development Workshop.
- iv. The Meeting agreed to have the CAADP Resource Group established within March 2010. This should allow organizing of an orientation seminar for the resource group in late March 2011 or early April. The orientation seminar will also adopt a road map to guide implementation of the resource group activities.

### **3.3 Service Agency**

- i. The meeting was briefed on the plan for a service provider – the Service Agency (from April 2011). The use of the Service Agency, yet to be recruited, is an interim measure to facilitate identification, recruitment and deployment of Pillar experts to countries at this time before the “Pillar consultancy work” is concluded and recommendations operationalised.

- ii. The Service Agency will more specifically:
  - Facilitate the processing of recruitment and contracting of technical experts identified to provide technical assistance to countries and RECs
  - Provide administrative and logistical support (contract negotiations, processing of honorariums, travel logistics -hotel, ticketing and Per-diems) to the contracted technical experts to facilitate effective deployment on assignments.
  - Provide relevant feedbacks to the implementation Task Team to inform/verify decisions that the recruited experts have fulfilled the terms of their contracts.
- ii. The meeting also agreed that the Joint AUC-NPCA-RECs work programme will be the primary source of information on country roadmaps and therefore basis for deployment of technical experts.
- iii. The identification and engagement of the Service Agency will be done through a competitive and transparent process based on agreed criteria and ToR. However the strategic and technical oversight of the Service Agency will be the responsibility the *'Task Team/Technical Expert Support Working Group'* constituted by AUC, NPCA, RECs, ReSKASS, Knowledge Institution Representatives, Development Partners (DP) and WB.
- iv. The meeting welcomed the plan on the Service Agency, edging that it was important that this arrangement help address the challenges faced during the identification, management and deployment of experts last year.

### **3.4 2010 Priorities for CAADP implementation**

- i. The Mission reviewed the priorities for CAADP implementation in the year 2011 and agreed on areas of focus and technical support requirements in formulation and review of IPs. In this regard, the meeting emphasized the need and importance (a) to ensure the momentum at country level is sustained; (b) ensure credibility and integrity of the CAADP process; (c) embrace transformation and value to CAADP in addressing and strengthening medium to long-term strategic issues in respond to country demands.
- v. More specifically, the meeting recommended the following thematic issues for the 2011 priority result areas:
  - Increased investment financing with special focus on strategies and efforts to unlocking private financing into Africa's agriculture investments
  - Supporting the transformation and demonstrating value added of the CAADP process to the national agricultural and rural development efforts.
  - Strengthening CAADP Teams as community of practice and change agents in advancing CAADP implementation
  - Strengthening capacity at AUC, NPCA and RECs
  - Communicating CAADP through increasing use of national and regional instruments that are available to the media

- Support review of IPs to strengthen regional integration dimensions of the country CAADP implementation.

### **3.5 Issues and lesson from 2010 Technical Support exercise**

- i. The meeting discussed and draw on lessons learnt from 2010 CAADP implementation with regard to the role of technical experts in support of the post compact CAADP implementation. Detailed articulation of the 2010 experiences/lessons is presented in the **Annex 2**.
- ii. The meeting was informed that in response to the diversified demand in the investment priorities being defined by member states, the constitution of the technical expert support team will be expanded to include other strategic areas such as livestock, climate change, fisheries, forestry, gender, youth employment and programme development.
- iii. Need to ensure relevant TORs and guidelines for expert support are available both to the experts and to the country CAADP teams
- iv. There will be need to review all the ToR and ensure clear and specific guidelines including in non-pillar disciplines

### **3.6 Sharing-Learning CAADP PP Agenda for the 7th CAADP PP**

- i. The mission discussed the draft agenda for the 7<sup>th</sup> CAADP PP meeting scheduled in Yaoundé, Cameroon 23-25 March 2011, which is link to the broader implementation action plan for 2011. The meeting observed the need to orient the CAADP PP more towards sharing done by country players and stakeholders (instead of having more presentations by regional and continental players)
- ii. The Business Meeting will focus on joint planning and Mutual Accountability and present the results of the ongoing piloting of the Mutual Accountability Framework (MAF) and associated reporting on CAADP monitoring and evaluation
- iii. The meeting was also informed of availability the opportunity to for any interested Pillar institutions to exhibit or organize side event in the margins of the PP Meeting

#### **4. General synthesis of decisions and action points**

##### **4.1 The “Pillar consultancy assignment” briefing**

- i. The Meeting was delighted that this exercise has finally commenced, noting that the consultative nature of the methodology was important.
- ii. The Meeting noted the special role and responsibility of the Pillar institutions to inform this consultation on their own experiences over the last 3-4 years from developing of the pillar framework documents through to deployments of experts to support country processes.

##### **4.2 Coordination and joint work programmes**

- i. Against the challenges in deployment of experts to support countries processes as experienced last year (i.e. 2010), the meeting emphasized as absolute necessity the need to have coherent and systematically managed joint work programmes. This is essential as an instrument to guide mobilization and systematic management of expert support to the CAADP implementation process. NPCA should ensure this is done and followed through. The inter-pillar team will be a key player in this exercise.
- ii. As part of the efforts to ensure knowledge sharing and effective communication on CAADP activities to all stakeholders, NPCA agreed to facilitate establishment of an information portals on CAADP activities where experts can access/share information.
- iii. Edged strengthening the inter-pillar co-ordinations, to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in delivering CAADP implementation support to countries and RECs through joint programming

##### **4.3 Enhanced quality of expert services to countries**

- i. The meeting emphasized the need to strengthen the expert teams especially with regard to expertise which will not ordinarily be accessed through the four pillar disciplines
- ii. Considering the diversity and multiplicity in technical needs and requirements by country the mission agreed to engage experts that have diversified backgrounds in programme formulation and review is to ensure that experts deployed can provide technical support in diverse areas of expertise.
- iii. The meeting agreed to undertake joint orientation/nurturing seminars for the technical experts and provide appropriate ToR and guidelines for experts (in various country support activities and technical reviews)

##### **4.4 The 2011 programme focus**

- i. Based on country-based roadmap developed through the RECs, (**Annex 3**), each Pillar Institution agreed to develop a detailed plan how they will participate to respond to the indicated country needs. This should detail number and form of experts required at what period and for which countries.

ii. The PIs also discussed and agreed on individual strategic plans developed to enhance advancing the 2011 implementation process.

iii. The meeting further agreed on the need for a joint effort to focus on showing tangible results in CAADP implementation that we can clearly show the outcome of the process based CAADP implementation.

#### **4.5 Interim work programmes and related funding support**

i. The mission agreed on the engagement of the Service Agency and requested NPCA to ensure relevant capacity in NPCA to facilitate and coordinate activities between the service agency and knowledge Institutions

ii. Pillar Institutions agreed to update and provide detailed well costed activities planned for 2011 and a proposed list and contacts of experts that could be considered to future engagements.

iii. NPCA and AUC agreed to raise the issue of funding/financing support for pillar activities with the World Bank and the MDTF Partnership Committee

#### **4.6 The CAADP Partnership Platform Meeting**

i. The meeting recommended and encouraged any PI interested in organizing a side event during the 7<sup>th</sup> PP to communicate that by completing the appropriate forms to be provided by NPCA.

#### **4.7 Other issues and Next steps**

i. NPCA will finalize and share with PIs the TORs of Technical Experts.

ii. Considering the fact that PIs are coordinating strategic technical expert support to countries and having noted that AUC has commenced recruitment of Pillar experts, the mission called on the AUC to facilitate a dialogue with PI and clarify the role of the newly recruited AUC Pillar experts, to ensure clarity of roles and avoid duplication of efforts.

iii. **Annex 4** provides what was finally agreed as immediate next steps



NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency  
Agence de Planification et de Coordination du NEPAD

## Annex 1: List of Mission Participants

NAME	TITLE	Institution	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Mr. Martin Bwalya	Head, CAADP	NPCA	<a href="mailto:Bwalyam@nepad.org">Bwalyam@nepad.org</a>
Mr. Komla Bissi	Senior Agribusiness Advisor	NPCA	<a href="mailto:komlab@nepad.org">komlab@nepad.org</a>
Dr. Janet Edeme	Ag. Head of Division, Rural Economy, DREA	AUC	<a href="mailto:edemeJ@africa-union.org">edemeJ@africa-union.org</a>
Miss Yemessrach Assefa	Economist/CAADP Implementation Expert	AUC	<a href="mailto:yemessrachA@african-union.org">yemessrachA@african-union.org</a>
Dr. Simplicie Nouala	Chief Animal Production Officer	AU-IBAR	<a href="mailto:simplice@au-ibar.org">simplice@au-ibar.org</a>
Dr N'Guetta Austin	Project coordinator Livestock	AU-IBAR	<a href="mailto:nguetta.bosso@au-ibar.org">nguetta.bosso@au-ibar.org</a>
Dr. Saley Moussa Abdoulaye	Food Security Officer	CILSS/INSAH	<a href="mailto:abdoulaye@insah.org">abdoulaye@insah.org</a>
Mahalmoudou Hamadoun		CILSS/INSAH	<a href="mailto:mahalmoudou.hamadoun@cilss.bf">mahalmoudou.hamadoun@cilss.bf</a> <a href="mailto:mahalmoudou@yahoo.fr">mahalmoudou@yahoo.fr</a>
Prof. Emmanuel Kaunda	Network Coordinator Afri-Fishnet	University of Malawi Bunda College	<a href="mailto:ekaunda@yahoo.com">ekaunda@yahoo.com</a>
Mr. Ndiaye Doudou	Renforcement des Capacités	CMA/WCA Pillar II	<a href="mailto:dndiaye@cmaoc.org">dndiaye@cmaoc.org</a>
Mr. Makane Guissé	Expert Infrastructure CMAOC	CMA/WCA Pillar II	<a href="mailto:makanekg@yahoo.fr">makanekg@yahoo.fr</a> ; <a href="mailto:mguisse@cmaoc.org">mguisse@cmaoc.org</a>
Mr. Abraham SARFO	Value Chain and Finance Expert	CMA/WCA Pillar II	<a href="mailto:sarforo@gmail.com">sarforo@gmail.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:asarfo@cmaoc.org">asarfo@cmaoc.org</a>
Mr. Nicholas Sabwa	Regional Trade Expert	CMA/WCA Pillar II	<a href="mailto:nsabwa@cmaoc.org">nsabwa@cmaoc.org</a>
Dr. Emmanuel Tambi	Director, Advocacy and Policy	FARA	<a href="mailto:etambi@fara-africa.org">etambi@fara-africa.org</a>
Miss Idowu Okheren Ejere	CAADP Technical Assistant	FARA	<a href="mailto:eidowu@fara-africa.org">eidowu@fara-africa.org</a>



NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency  
Agence de Planification et de Coordination du NEPAD

## Annex 2: Articulating the 2010 experiences/lessons – Compiled from the submissions from the Pillar Institutions

Aspects	2010 experiences	Suggestions/propositions
1. Guidelines for the (i) country support and the (ii) technical review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not too much differences between the support and technical review criteria and guidelines</li> <li>- The time allowed for Technical review in most of the countries was not allow enough for the review</li> <li>- Sometime time allocated for the review is too short to meet all key stakeholders.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Guidelines need refinement</li> <li>- Both country support and technical review need more time</li> <li>- Elaborate guidelines as modules during the orientation workshop</li> <li>- Need for mechanism to check if the recommendations made are incorporated into the investment plans</li> </ul>
2. Expert teams – considering the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recruitment (criteria for assessment of CVs; decision making; communication and information flow; administrative and contractual issues; etc...)</li> <li>• Orientation and nurturing for the expert teams               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Timing and duration</li> <li>- Content and orientation programme</li> <li>- Resource persons</li> <li>- Materials/templates and documents made available to the experts teams</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Composition and quality of the expert teams</li> <li>• Quality of the individual experts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recruitment process not clear and understood</li> <li>- Orientation workshop too short (duration) and no enough preparation time between the orientation and the pillar experts support/review to the countries</li> <li>- Content of the orientation need to be elaborated in details with modules ;</li> <li>- One-off activity</li> <li>- Mixed teams with languages barriers in some countries (e.g. Cape Verde); short of experts in areas such as consistency, budget, costing, M&amp;E, and cross cutting issues (gender, climate change, etc.)</li> <li>- Often individual experts very narrowed focus (e.g. fish), not enough team work experience; no accountability of some experts and therefore no ways to assess the individual performance</li> <li>- Some Pillar 4 expert s were rejected by the World Bank, no explanation was provided by the bank. That it will be important the PI should be part to the final selection of the process for experts</li> <li>- The amount of time allowed for the orientation especially for West African countries was not adequate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recruit experts on model of cv elaborated by the service agency; need for experts with interdisciplinary, multicultural team work approaches</li> <li>- Orientation workshop at least a week, modules developed based on criteria and guidelines for the support and technical review, pillar framework document, practical exercise as how to operate in a country (approach, methodology, meetings, etc.)</li> <li>- At least a week between the orientation workshop and support and review in the countries; provide all teams with necessary and appropriate in-country IP documents and other relevant document to allow sufficient preparation;</li> <li>- assign support/review to team prior at the end of the orientation workshop and request team to work remotely (with a team leader) the week before going in the country;</li> <li>- The orientation workshop should not be a one-off activity, rather an ongoing capacity development process;</li> <li>- There is a need to develop capacity of experts in areas such as gender, consistency, budgeting, etc.</li> <li>- Assign countries according to expert language proficiency, but also harness possibilities of mixed (French/English) teams as to share experiences (value addition)</li> <li>- Ensure at least 1 expert in areas such as consistency, budget, costing available in the team;</li> <li>- Have CAADP country team representation attend the</li> </ul>



NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency  
 Agence de Planification et de Coordination du NEPAD

Aspects	2010 experiences	Suggestions/propositions
		<p>orientation workshop together with experts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide guidelines as on how remunerations for experts are determined</li> <li>- There is need for more clarity on information and submission of the report as required for payment for the assignment.</li> <li>- Inter-pillar orientations require good time to ensure pillars are well oriented. It will be good to provide orientation to all pillar experts who will be available for the review</li> <li>- Need to have experts that have a diverse background to cover up for areas that experts could be provided</li> <li>- Communication of the needs of the countries must to be improved and country requirements need to come early to ensure the experts are aware and they can prepare for it</li> <li>- Orientation should include experience sharing and debriefing</li> <li>- Background documents for Technical Reviews should be made available to experts prior to review</li> <li>- Sometime time allocated for the review is too short to meet all key stakeholders</li> <li>- Need to ensure that experts are deploy to countries related to their expertise</li> </ul>
<p>3. Country expert support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timing and duration</li> <li>• Political and technical buy-in by the countries and appreciation of value (as per feedback from countries)</li> <li>• Preparedness of the country to receive and engage the team</li> <li>• Documentation/preparation of support report and processing of this report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not enough time to work/interact with country team</li> <li>- Country not well prepared to receive the support team (often contact and/or focal point not aware of the whereabouts of the CAADP team)</li> <li>- ToR are broad, no clear delineation between support and review ToR</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support team to spend at least 5 working days in the country assigned.</li> <li>- Develop very specific ToR for the support team with the contribution of the CAADP country focal point;</li> <li>- Need for a better country preparation to receive the CAADP team (agenda sent out)</li> <li>- Avoid duplication of the ToR and ensure that experts have a clear understanding of their role as support team</li> <li>- Ensure coordination and harmonization of expert support and the knowledge support provided by the UN and other agencies (e.g. FAO)</li> <li>- Need to identify the best time to go in for the support to ensure countries are ready to receive support</li> </ul>
<p>4. Independent technical review</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not enough time to work/interact with country</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review team should spend at least 5 working days in the</li> </ul>



NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency  
 Agence de Planification et de Coordination du NEPAD

Aspects	2010 experiences	Suggestions/propositions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timing and duration</li> <li>• Political and technical buy-in by the countries and appreciation of value (as per feedback from countries)</li> <li>• Preparedness of the country (various players and stakeholders, e.g. DP) to receive and engage the team.</li> </ul>	<p>team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Country not well prepared to receive the review team (often contact and/or focal point not aware of the whereabouts of the CAADP team)</li> <li>- ToR are broad, no clear delineation between support and review ToR</li> <li>- Review follows straightforward the support team and therefore, no enough time given to the country to incorporate comments from the support team</li> </ul>	<p>country assigned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop very specific ToR for the review team with the contribution of the CAADP country focal point;</li> <li>- Need for a better country preparation to receive the CAADP team (agenda sent out)</li> <li>- Avoid duplication of the ToR and ensure that experts have a clear understanding of their role as review team</li> <li>- Organize the review at least a week after the support to allow the country team to integrate and take into consideration the comments from the support team</li> <li>- Recommended that a member of the country teams be part of the expert orientation to ensure consistency with the roadmap and TORs of the review team</li> <li>- At least a week between the support and the review mission. Need to clarify the role of the support team and that of the Review team.</li> </ul>
<p>5. The technical review report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Format/template</li> <li>• Preparation of the report</li> <li>• Management of Technical Review Reports (dissemination, ownership, etc...)</li> <li>• Country understanding of the value/purpose of the Report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No feedback from countries after the technical review and the report sent to the countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to find ways for feedback between the country and the command center after the review and once the review report has been sent to the country</li> <li>- Whilst the template was considered useful, it is recommended that some flexibility be allowed in the use to the template to take into consideration dynamics in country specific issues.</li> <li>- Countries should be made to understand the importance of the review process.</li> </ul>
<p>6. The business meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparations (scheduling of the Business Meeting – e.g. time between technical review and Business Meeting)</li> <li>• Preparations (what should could be done and how to prepare for the BM (substantively))</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not enough preparation</li> <li>- Often business meeting remains solely the responsibility of the country, not much implication of NPCA/ECOWAS at regional level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need for better preparation</li> <li>- Need for more implication in both the organization and running of the business meeting of NPCA, ECOWAS, etc.</li> <li>- Some countries did not understand the process properly.</li> <li>- Others called for the Business meeting just after compact signature.</li> <li>- Need for Pillar representation during the business meeting to clarify emerging issues and support countries to develop appropriate roadmaps.</li> </ul>



NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency  
 Agence de Planification et de Coordination du NEPAD

Aspects	2010 experiences	Suggestions/propositions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparations (who responsible for what in the preparation of the BM)</li> <li>• Preparation (meeting format (program), preparation of the Meeting inputs)</li> <li>• Responsibilities of the various institutions (AUC, NPCA, RECS, ADWGs) in the preparation and handling of the BM</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need for enough time between IP review and Business meeting.</li> </ul>
7. ToR for the country expert support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not enough time to thoroughly explained them to the support team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need for more time to allow expert understand and master the support ToR during the orientation workshop</li> </ul>
8. ToR for the technical review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not enough time to thoroughly explained them to the support team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need for more time to allow expert understand and master the support ToR during the orientation workshop</li> <li>- The TORs was detailed but not enough time for the experts to deliver on the TORs.</li> <li>- It is important that the country teams participate in the Technical review process</li> </ul>
9. The post-business meeting roadmap <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Format of the template</li> <li>• Preparation support</li> <li>• Who should prepare and at what stage is it prepared</li> <li>• implementation of the roadmap.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No enough feedback from the country after the business meeting and the roadmap elaborated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to involve pillar institutions in monitoring of country roadmaps</li> <li>- Countries should be well informed on the need to build consensus and develop road maps</li> <li>- Need to clarify the role of all stakeholders in the post business meeting road map.</li> <li>- Need to make time to support the development of the roadmap</li> <li>- Business meeting to be tailored toward consensus on a roadmap.</li> </ul>
10. Role of RECs in support to the formulation and review of IPS – general observations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RECs role extremely important in mobilizing the countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RECs continue to mobilize countries</li> <li>- Need for effective communication between RECs, NPCA and technical and knowledge institutions whilst RECs continued to provide coordination role.</li> </ul>



NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency  
 Agence de Planification et de Coordination du NEPAD

### Annex 3: Joint Framework for Expert Support to CAADP Implementation

Country CAADP Post-Compact Roadmap (Priority list based on country readiness)

What is happening in the country	Countries					Remarks
	April	May	June	July	Aug	
1. Stocktaking support and initial baseline analysis	Cameroon; CAR; Lesotho	Djibouti;	Madagascar; Chad; Angola; Namibia;	Gabon; Egypt	Mauritania; Botswana	
2. National priorities and initial IP development – pre compact			CAR; Cameroon; Djibouti;	Madagascar; Chad; Angola; Namibia;	Gabon	
3. COMPACT SIGNING	Congo DR;	Seychelles	Mozambique;	Lesotho		
4. Finalise and formalise the country Post-compact Roadmap (incl Tech Lead Institution; Financing; etc...)	Congo DR	Seychelles	Mozambique;	Lesotho		
5. Expert support to development of the national investment plan - Regional Integration - Budgeting and costing - Consistence and strategic growth options (strategy growth pathway) - Capacity development and education - Gender; youth and employment - Private sector opportunities	B/Faso; Zambia;		Congo DR	Seychelles	Mozambique; Lesotho	
6. Formulation/finalisation of NA&FSIP (in readiness for technical review) including specialised inputs, e.g. costing, M&E, ...	Tanzania;	Guinea; Zambia; Swaziland; Burundi; B/Faso;			Mozambique;	
7. TECHNICAL REVIEWS		Tanzania;		B/Faso; Guinée; Zambia;	Swaziland;	



NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency  
 Agence de Planification et de Coordination du NEPAD

What is happening in the country	Countries					Remarks
	April	May	June	July	Aug	
8. Preparation for the Business Meeting – technical and operational engagement/ consultations with all stakeholders		Tanzania; Malawi		B/Faso;		See Information Note
9. BUSINESS MEETING / agreement on national post-business meeting roadmap		Malawi	Tanzania		B/Faso;	
10. Refinement and operationalisation of the post-business meeting roadmap		Malawi; Mali;	Tanzania		B/Faso;	
11. Specialised programme development support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional Integration</li> <li>- Budgeting and costing</li> <li>- Consistence and strategic growth options (strategy growth pathway)</li> <li>- Capacity development and education</li> <li>- Gender; youth and employment</li> <li>- Private sector</li> </ul>		Sierra Leone; Togo; Niger; Nigeria; Ghana	Rwanda; Cape Verde;	Senegal; Uganda; Guinea Bissau;		
12. Specialised programme financing support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Climate change</li> <li>- Fish and aquaculture</li> </ul>		Uganda; Ethiopia Nigeria	Ethiopia;	Kenya; Sierra Leone; Togo; Niger;	Senegal	
13. Implementation support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- M&amp;E and MAF</li> </ul>	Rwanda, Ghana, Tanzania	Zambia, Senegal	Sierra Leone,			
14. Implementation support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy review and financing instruments and tools – e.g. PER, CB analysis; MTEF</li> <li>- CAADP Team expert support (e.g. exposing the CAADP teams and stakeholders to Pillar Framework tools)</li> </ul>		Ghana, Rwanda	Nigeria; Ethiopia			



NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency  
Agence de Planification et de Coordination du NEPAD

## Annex 4: Next Steps

Action Description		Timeframe	Responsible Entity/Official
1	TORs for inter-pillar groups to be circulated	Tuesday March 1	Martin
2	PI to send comments on the 7 <sup>th</sup> PP Programme	Thursday March 3	PIs
3	NPCA to engage with inter-pillar experts institutions to come up with the TORs of how the inter pillar groups are going to work together.	Friday, March 4	NPCA, PIs
4	All PI to send comments on the 2011 defined priority areas.	Friday, March 4	PIs
5	Submission of list of expert to NPCA	Monday, March 7	PIs
6	Send 2011 revised work programme with detailed budgets go NPCA.	Friday, March 11	PIs
7	Final version of work plan sent to NPCA	Monday 13 March	PIs