

CAADP Working Group on Non-State Actor participation



Options paper: How to boost Non-State Actor participation in CAADP

Prepared for the working group by Ian Randall of Wasafiri Consulting
September 2010

Introduction	2
Background.....	2
The aim of this paper	2
Overarching themes from the stocktaking	3
Remarkable consensus.....	3
CAADP is boosting participation	3
Structural problems, needing long-term solutions.....	3
A caveat ~ balancing consultation with action	4
Issue 1: Representation, legitimacy and accountability of Non-State Actors	4
The problem ~ representatives not perceived as legitimate or accountable.....	4
Recommendation 1 ~ a transparent selection process.....	5
Issue 2: Resources for effective participation	6
The problem ~ inadequate resources.....	6
Recommendation 2 ~ grants for Non State Actors selected to represent their constituencies	6
Issue 3: Capacity for effective participation	7
The problem ~ partners lack skills for jointly creating and implementing policy	7
Recommendation 3a ~ CAADP Capacity Development Strategy to target weaknesses	8
Recommendation 3b ~ pool of policy experts.....	8
Issue 4: Agreed standards on quality participation	9
The problem ~ unclear expectations regarding participation	9
Recommendation 4 ~ guideline standards on quality participation	9
Issue 5: Leadership, co-ordination and advocacy	9
The problem ~ inclusion of Non State Actors has not been prioritised.....	9
Recommendation 5 ~ invest in leadership and co-ordination	10
Secondary issues	10
Culture of collaboration	10
Awareness of CAADP processes, especially in rural areas.....	10
The voice of women.....	11
Accountability platforms	11
Unresolved issues	12
Engaging parliamentarians	12
Engaging large private sector actors.....	12
Annex 1: Examples of good practice	13
Annex 2: Sample standards for quality participation	14
Annex 3: Summary of stocktaking activity	15
Annex 4: References	16

Introduction

Background

CAADP is Africa's plan to boost agricultural productivity and thereby tackle poverty and hunger. A key principle of the CAADP agenda is to ensure multi-stakeholder participation in the development and implementation of agricultural policy. This includes Non-State Actors such as Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), Farmer and Producer Organisations, Parliamentarians and the Private Sector.

The CAADP process mandates multi-stakeholder participation at each stage of the CAADP process¹ with key roles for Non State Actors in:

- Policy dialogue and planning ~ the voice of sector stakeholders such as the poor, farmers, or agribusinesses should enhance the quality of decision-making. Representatives of Non State Actors are expected to be members of the CAADP country team, to participate in the roundtable, to sign the compact, and input in to the development and technical review of the investment plan.
- Implementation ~ the country and regional strategies will require a broad alliance of sector stakeholders to engage in implementation in order to achieve results at scale
- Accountability ~ sector stakeholders have a vital role in holding CAADP partners to account for delivering on their commitments

The 6th Partnership Platform recognised that CAADP has not consistently achieved high quality inclusion of non-state actors at national, regional and continental levels. While there are success stories, the Partnership Platform has asked how to improve the quality of inclusion. This work is especially targeted at participation by poor or marginalised constituencies.

“Although stakeholder participation has become a standard part of the rhetoric, meaningful involvement of rural people's organizations is weak or inexistent throughout the system.” McKeon (2010)

In response to the 6th Partnership Platform conclusions, CAADP partners have formed a joint working group to undertake a stocktaking exercise and develop recommendations². The stocktaking exercise has been completed (see annex 3) including:

- surveys sent to Non State Actors, CAADP focal points and donor working groups across Africa
- interviews of expert stakeholders
- consultation workshops at FANRPAN AGM and for the working group
- desk research on best practice

The aim of this paper

This paper is based on analysis of input from the stocktaking exercise. It takes a position on the key issues and proposes solutions. This is intended to provide concrete options that prompt reaction and debate. It is not intended as a final solution. Furthermore it is only intended to prioritise key issues and broadly sketch solutions. Proposed solutions will need significant further design work before they are ready for implementation.

This paper will be circulated for comment that will feed in to a one-day action planning workshop in Johannesburg on 20th October 2010. The workshop will develop a set of proposed interventions to boost participation, and prepare an action plan for their further

¹ For example see NEPAD (2009) Accelerating CAADP country implementation: a guide for practitioners.

² For more background refer to the group's concept note “Plan for developing proposals to improve participation of Non-State Actors in the CAADP agenda”

development and delivery. These “validated” proposals and action plan will be presented to the 7th CAADP PP for endorsement.

The paper is structured as follows:

- Overarching themes from the stocktaking
- Five priority issues each with proposed solutions
- Secondary issues that can be addressed through other interventions
- Unresolved issues needing further work

Overarching themes from the stocktaking

Remarkable consensus

The stocktaking exercise highlighted a strong and clear consensus on the issues. This was true of input from governments, the private sector, civil society, farmers’ organisations and development partners, who despite their different positions shared a common analysis. It was also true across countries and regions. The main difference was in tone, with Non State Actors themselves feeling deeply frustrated as they struggle to participate effectively.

CAADP is boosting participation

In every context CAADP’s stated commitment to a multi-stakeholder process is creating opportunities for participation that did not exist previously. Because of CAADP, Non State Actors can demand participation, and government representatives and development partners have a mandate to support this. In many places Non State Actor participation is adding considerable value to the quality of policy dialogue, planning, implementation and accountability.

Although this paper focuses on the problems and as such makes numerous negative generalisations, it should be remembered that CAADP has delivered significant improvements and there are many examples of pioneering best practice that challenge the generalisations. See annex 1 for examples of best practice.

Structural problems, needing long-term solutions

While CAADP opens the door to participation by Non State Actors in the planning and implementation of agricultural policy, there remain systemic challenges that deeply undermine the quality of participation:

Table 1: Survey ratings of participation	None	Poor	Adequate	Good	No info
CSOs/ NGOs	0%	57%	21%	21%	0%
Farmers Orgs	7%	50%	29%	0%	0%
Private Sector	0%	71%	21%	7%	0%
Parliamentarians	7%	50%	21%	0%	21%
Women’s Orgs	7%	57%	0%	0%	36% ³
TOTAL	4%	57%	19%	9%	11%

- weak representation, legitimacy and accountability of Non-State Actors.
- limited resources and capacity for effective participation
- no agreed standards for quality participation
- low prioritisation of Non-State Actors by the institutions leading CAADP
- culture of distrust rather than collaboration
- lack of knowledge or understanding of CAADP amongst Non-State Actors

³ Only the second round of questionnaires added in women’s organisations as a category.

These are discussed in detail later. However, too often their cumulative effect is for participation to be ritual rather than substantive; for Non-State Actors to feel frustrated, marginalised and disillusioned; for pressured government staff to question the value of efforts to include Non-State Actors; and ultimately for CAADP to miss out on knowledge, experience and engagement that is greatly needed to transform African agriculture in order to tackle poverty and hunger.

During stocktaking, respondents encouraged CAADP partners to take an ambitious long-term perspective in addressing these structural problems. With CAADP rolling out rapidly, it is tempting to solely focus on short-term solutions such as pumping money in to capacity building. However, unless the more fundamental issues are addressed then gains will be short-lived, and the opportunity will be missed to address a core development challenge of how to bring in Non State Actors as full partners in the transformation of African agriculture.

A caveat ~ balancing consultation with action

Finally it is worth noting the sentiment that at a moment when CAADP is poised to trigger a great deal of positive action across Africa, efforts to boost the quality of participation should be implemented in a way that accelerates action rather than traps everyone in endless rounds of dialogue.

“What we need now is action. Too much consultation will end up spoiling what we have gained.” Andrew Naudi, Permanent Secretary, Malawi Ministry of Agriculture

Issue 1: Representation, legitimacy and accountability of Non-State Actors

The problem ~ representatives not perceived as legitimate or accountable

In every country there are countless Non-State Actors engaged in the agricultural economy, including CSOs, co-operatives, commodity associations, INGOs, agribusinesses, consumer groups, unions, and the farmer’s themselves. “Overlapping, competition, lack of coherency and misinformation” is common between these groups.⁴

Faced with such complexity, government representatives have a difficult choice when inviting participation in the CAADP process. With time and resources limited, they generally invite a selection of the more articulate and well-known stakeholder organisations based in the capital city. Hence CAADP representatives gain their influence by government patronage, rather than through any genuine accountability to the broader community of Non-State Actors. As such, these representatives lack the legitimacy they need to be respected and heard; they lack incentives to really communicate and consult with their constituencies; and Non-State Actor participation in CAADP ends up a ritual rather than a substantive exercise. For example, one stocktaking respondent described how in Senegal the government simply selected one farmer’s organisation and one CSO, leaving the others feeling excluded and divided.

Similarly, development partners⁵ wishing to support Non-State Actor participation often channel support to these same organisations. This can further distort their lines of accountability⁶ and perceived legitimacy as they get labelled “donor darlings”.

These issues are mirrored at the regional and continental levels. The regional farmers’ organisations are perhaps the strongest example of well-organised representatives, but

⁴ Melief & van Wijk (2008)

⁵ Development partners struggle with this across all sectors. World Bank (2005)

⁶ See Mahoney and Beckstrand (2009); Tembo et al. (2007); Wang (2006); and Igoe (2003).

even their legitimacy and accountability is questioned with the majority of their finance coming from donors, and their constituencies often dominated by unions of wealthier farmers rather than poor smallholders⁷. Nonetheless, their relatively strong legitimacy and accountability to national organisations means they played a vital role as a bridge between the continental and national process on behalf of their constituency. For example, it is often these regional farmers' organisations who have contacted the national farmers organisations to inform them of that the CAADP process is underway in their country and connect them to the government focal point.

This issue of representation is the most fundamental challenge because until it is resolved it is difficult to know where to target interventions on other issues.

Recommendation 1 ~ a transparent selection process

This paper recommends establishing an open and transparent process whereby the broader Non-State Actor community in each country selects organisations to represent their interests. Representative organisations for each constituency (e.g. farmers, women, consumers, private sector) could be elected for 2 or 3 year terms. Once elected they would receive the resources and capacity development to serve their constituency by:

- Participating in the CAADP country team
- Disseminating information to their constituencies
- Consulting their constituency on policy proposals
- Representing the interests of their constituency as members of the CAADP Country Team
- Ground-truthing M&E data
- Holding CAADP partners accountable

The process of selection would strengthen or effectively establish a network within each constituency. Such networks have been shown to be critical in helping bring weaker voices in to policy-making by achieving economies of scale⁸. While establishing such a network, understanding and managing power relations are key challenges to ensuring that any representation is genuinely representative⁹.

This recommendation is directly inspired by the Cotonou Task Force of Non-State Actors in Ethiopia. The Cotonou process demands Non-State Actor participation in policy processes, and faced identical challenges to those of CAADP, and it was unclear who would engage in tripartite discussions between the government, EC and Non-State Actors. A General Assembly of Non-State Actors elected the Task Force and with considerable success it has become the only organised structure through which civil society engages in dialogue with government.¹⁰

The government has a vital role in convening and supporting the selection process without influencing its outcome. By actively supporting the selection process, the resulting bodies are founded on a basis of partnership and trust between government and Non-State Actors. Such partnership has been key to many of the examples of best practice cited during stocktaking, and is cited in research a key factor for Non-State Actors to influence policy¹¹. The

"RECs are the ideal institutions to promote dialogue and collaboration between civil society and the state" Lindiwe Sibanda, CEO, FANRPAN

⁷ McKeon (2010)

⁸ Perkin & Court (2005)

⁹ Perkin & Court (2005)

¹⁰ Mengistu (2008)

¹¹ Perkin & Court (2005)

Regional Economic Communities also have a vital role in supporting governments to manage this process effectively, and will need to manage a parallel process at the regional-level.

The selection process could be cascaded up to the regional and continental level, with national representatives electing regional ones, and regional ones electing the continental.

At the regional level, FANRPAN (Food, Agriculture, and Natural resources Policy Analysis Network) presents a valuable model. Within Southern Africa, FANRPAN has networked together country level platforms of civil society organisations engaged in the sector. FANRPAN then works with its membership to “develop the necessary capacity to better communicate and reach out to a greater number of people and constituencies of CAADP, as well as create more visibility, instil ownership and preparedness for CAADP implementation in the region as a whole.” FANRPAN is a key partner for COMESA on behalf of Non State Actor constituencies, reaching out to its membership for information sharing, consultation and lesson learning regarding CAADP.

Significant finance would be required to support the recommended selection process. If money was made available, the CAADP Multi-donor Trust Fund is well positioned to manage the finance.

Issue 2: Resources for effective participation

The problem ~ inadequate resources

Non State Actors lack the financial resources to participate in CAADP effectively, especially those who represent the interests of poor or less powerful constituencies. They require finance for:

- Staff time
- Travel expenses to attend meetings
- Awareness campaigns for their constituencies
- Policy research so they can present evidence-based positions during policy dialogue
- Consultation exercises

“We have requested in many meetings for support to Farmers’ Organisations, but it hasn’t been forthcoming - we hope it will this time” Stephen Muchiri, CEO, East African Farmers’ Federation

Without such resources, their participation is inconsistent, reactive, lacking in confidence and not based on meaningful consultation.

Currently, financial support is mostly only made available for travel expenses to meetings where the government or development partners want Non-State Actor participation. This reactive approach takes power away from Non-State Actors, undermines their efforts to organise a consistent engagement strategy, and reinforces the perception of government tokenism and donor patronage.

Recommendation 2 ~ grants for Non State Actors selected to represent their constituencies

This paper recommends a fund is established to distribute grants in support of Non State Actors participating in CAADP. The fund would be available to organisations who have been selected by a key constituency to represent their interests. Upon selection (as per recommendation 1), each organisation would prepare a plan and budget for their engagement with CAADP over the upcoming 2 to 3 years, which would then be submitted to the fund.

The plans would be tailored to the specific context and constituency, so for example if in The Gambia sensitisation on CAADP to district-level farmers was a priority then it could be included. Such an approach would be consistent with research that shows programmes to support Non State Actors must build in flexibility to support adaptation to the specific political, cultural and economic contexts¹².

The fund should be managed on a continental or regional basis to provide some independence from national agendas and politics, and ensure consistent levels of due diligence. National focal points for the fund could support the NSA with their applications and provide some local level of oversight.¹³

Current policy research in to donor funding for civil society¹⁴ highlights a problem that the mandate and accountability of civil society gets distorted, because recipients reorient themselves towards donor interests rather than their constituencies. Recommendation 1 would help mitigate this by ensuring that selection by your constituency is the primary pre-condition for financial support. This linking of finance also creates a key incentive for the effective roll out of recommendation 1.

Issue 3: Capacity for effective participation

The problem ~ partners lack skills for jointly creating and implementing policy

Governments and Non State Actors have historically distanced themselves from each other, with governments focussed on policy development and Non-State Actors focussed on implementation. The co-creation and implementation of policy is a new way of doing business and neither side has the necessary skills or experience yet.

Representatives of Non State Actors lack the skills of advocacy, policy-making, negotiation, consultation, and budget tracking and analysis. They also lack the knowledge on technical aspects of agricultural policy, and struggle to access the latest evidence from which to formulate an informed position.

Government representatives often have a deeply entrenched mindset and way of working that sees policy as the exclusive realm of civil servants and politicians. They are unconvinced by the value of multi-stakeholder participation and do not have the facilitation skills to manage it effectively.¹⁵

"The way we are asked to participate ~ it is like a game" Ishmael Sungi, CEO, SACA

Generally weak management skills undermine the process further. Non State Actors complain that meetings and documents are circulated too late for them to prepare. And then they struggle to participate when there are so many lengthy meetings that are not always relevant.

¹² Foresti (2007)

¹³ This approach would mostly mirror a similar carefully thought through fund that is currently being designed to support Non State Actor participation in the APRM . See Tangney (2010)

¹⁴ See Mahoney and Beckstrand (2009); Tembo et al. (2007); Wang (2006); and Igoo (2003).

¹⁵ McKeon (2010)

Recommendation 3a ~ CAADP Capacity Development Strategy to target weaknesses

The CAADP Capacity Development Strategy is under development. This will develop a framework through which the numerous capacity building initiatives can be targeted at the stakeholders and skills most in need.

While the strategy will have a much broader agenda than Non State Actor participation, this paper has recommendations for building the capacity of two key groups of change agents for CAADP: the Non-State Actor organisations selected to represent their constituencies; and the government representatives.

Non State Actor representatives require capacity development in:

- Knowledge of the CAADP process
- Communication and sensitisation
- Advocacy
- Negotiation
- Consultation
- Policy-making processes
- Budget analysis and tracking
- Technical knowledge of policy issues e.g. climate change

Government representatives require capacity development in:

- The value and methods of participatory policy-making
- Effective management of meetings and processes

Ideally some of these capacity building efforts would be conducted jointly so as to strengthen relationships and build mutual understanding. Regional trainings and initiatives would have the benefit of economies of scale, and potential for lesson learning across countries.

Recommendation 3b ~ pool of policy experts

The paper recommends the formation of a standing pool of policy experts that are accessible to Non State Actors in need of policy research and evidence-based position papers. Capacity building efforts could then focus more on process skills, rather than expecting Non State Actors to have much more than a basic knowledge of technical policy areas.

A clearinghouse institution would be required to match policy needs with expertise. This could be a single entity or a set of regional institutions. The pool of policy experts gathered together for the technical reviews provide a good foundation from which to build.

Finance for each piece of policy research would come from resources allocated to each organisation (as per recommendation 2), thereby reinforcing their autonomy and accountability. Some core finance may be required to establish the pool of experts and the clearinghouse function.

This idea for a pool of experts supported by a clearinghouse has already been proposed in order to meet the needs of all African stakeholders involved in CAADP. Issues relating to the capacity of Non State Actors merely add weight and additional focus to the existing proposals.

Issue 4: Agreed standards on quality participation

The problem ~ unclear expectations regarding participation

CAADP makes high-level statements mandating the participation on Non-State Actors throughout the planning and implementation of agricultural policy¹⁶. However there are few detailed recommendations on what this means in practice, beyond an expectation that Non-State Actors will attend the roundtables and sign the compacts. The most detailed prescriptions by CAADP are focussed on intra-government processes or on relationships with donors. The technical review process does include specific assessment criteria on the quality of “stakeholder consultation” and that aims “To assess the extent to which the investment plan is likely to have the full support and ownership of the main stakeholders”¹⁷ but again details are lacking.

This lack of clarity or guidance means governments are unclear on how to fulfil the commitment to a multi-stakeholder process, and Non State Actors have no standards through which to hold their government counterparts accountable for meaningful inclusion¹⁸. As a result, participation can become a box-ticking exercise, with meeting invitations arriving at the last minute, and consultation documents arriving too late to prepare responses.

Recommendation 4 ~ guideline standards on quality participation

This paper recommends establishing a simple set of guideline standards that define the expected quality of participation. These should then be integrated into CAADP process by:

- Inclusion in CAADP guides
- A basis for judging the “stakeholder consultation” criteria during technical reviews of investment plans
- Use in trainings on the CAADP process as part of capacity building
- Linking with any accountability indicators developed for the CAADP M&E Framework

A sample set of possible guideline standards are included in annex 2. Although if all recommendations in this paper are adopted in some form then a more detailed guide would be required including specific advice on the selection process and accessing resources. NPCA is ideally positioned to develop and disseminate any guidelines.

Issue 5: Leadership, co-ordination and advocacy

The problem ~ inclusion of Non State Actors has not been prioritised

To date, leadership on CAADP has come primarily from the AUC, NPCA, RECs and Development Partners. They are all essentially government institutions and under pressure to deliver progress quickly have instinctively prioritised working with national governments to drive the agenda forward. Engaging with Non State Actors has simply not been a priority. For example, there are very few staff with specific role to liaise with

¹⁶ For example a key CAADP strategy is stated as: “Alignment of development efforts and strategies [...] will be achieved through jointly agreed agendas and priorities, joint responsibility for the agreed results, mutual engagement and commitment in the development process by public, private and CSO sectors and development partners moving together in a constructive and accountable manner.” NEPAD (2009) Accelerating CAADP country implementation: a guide for practitioners.

¹⁷ NEPAD (2010)

¹⁸ McKeon (2010)

Non State Actors, and beyond the regional farmers' organisations the CAADP mailing list has very few Non State Actors.

The strongest examples of Non State Actor participation have come when individuals from RECs or country governments have genuinely exercised leadership in reaching out. The ECOWAP technical review is cited as a good example of this. Research further emphasizes the need for strong co-ordination leadership and advocacy if the complex networks of Non State Actors are to be effectively brought in to policy processes and implementation¹⁹.

Recommendation 5 ~ invest in leadership and co-ordination

This paper recommends hiring dedicated personnel at NPCA (and potentially in each REC) with the mandate to co-ordinate Non-State Actor involvement. Their responsibilities would include:

- Establishing and maintaining an inventory of Non-State Actors with an interest in CAADP
- Communicating actively with Non-State Actors on CAADP and opportunities for engagement
- Ensuring the implementation of recommendations to boost participation
- Supporting country governments in effectively promoting Non State Actor engagement in national processes

Secondary issues

The stocktaking also highlighted a set of secondary issues. They are all important, but are presented here as secondary issues because they should be resolved by careful design of the above preceding recommendations to tackle the main five issues.

Culture of collaboration

There is often a weak culture of collaboration between Non State Actors and governments, with relationships characterised by distrust, misunderstanding and antagonism. This culture will only change as both parties make positive efforts towards working together. Interventions can be designed to support this new way of working, for example by the government convening meetings that are then chaired by a Non State Actor²⁰; or by holding joint capacity building workshops.

"Let's promote partnership!" Lucy Muchoki, CEO, PANAAC

Awareness of CAADP processes, especially in rural areas

The CAADP process, under whatever name it operates in a country, rarely achieves a high profile beyond a relatively narrow group of stakeholders. These are generally well-educated and based in the capital. Rural stakeholders for whom CAADP is often most significant, are excluded by distance, cost of travel, education, and a simple lack of accessible information.

Stocktaking respondents who attempt to bridge the gap between poor producers and policy makers (e.g. Action Aid) find their efforts frustrated by a complete lack of

¹⁹ Perkin & Court (2005)

²⁰ As an example of best practice in forging a sense of partnership and trust, one respondent cited a CAADP private sector working group convened by the Kenyan government but chaired by a private sector organisation.

awareness of the policy process. They must start by raising awareness in order that they can then gauge opinions.

The media can be a powerful tool in raising awareness of CAADP and reaching out to the public or targeted constituencies. In Liberia, the radio was harnessed to reach out to rural stakeholders.

Recommendations 1 & 2 give responsibility and resources to a representative organisation to reach out to their constituency in terms of sensitisation and awareness raising. This should appropriately bridge the gap, and gives Non State Actors the mandate to address weaknesses themselves rather than simply complaining to the government. Regional organisations are demonstrating that they have a key role to play in reaching out with information and support to national level actors within their constituencies e.g. Farmer's Organisations and FANRPAN.

A possible further recommendation would be to develop a standard communication toolkit that could be used for outreach purposes, and leveraging the media. There is also a case for a stronger media communication campaign at the continental level. NPCA's communication officer is currently developing such a strategy. It will be important that the campaign clearly communicates opportunities for Non State Actors to get in engaged if they wish to.

The voice of women

Although the majority of African farmers are women, not one respondent judged the quality of participation by women in the CAADP process as adequate. One CAADP country team, cited as typical, has 5 women out of 30 members.

Recommendation 1 could help tackle this issue by mandating that one of the representative organisations is selected on behalf of women stakeholders, thereby embedding the voice of women in to the CAADP process at the country, regional and continental levels.

Accountability platforms

Some Non State Actors wish to take an active role in holding CAADP partners accountable for fulfilling their commitments. To date, the platforms for accountability have been ambiguous. The recently validated CAADP Mutual Accountability Framework²¹ should resolve this. At country, regional and continental levels, it proposes that annual M&E reports are interrogated by a coalition of stakeholders to produce a Mutual Accountability report that reviews the performance of CAADP partners against their commitments. Each member of the stakeholder coalition (which is largely expected to be made up by the CAADP country team) will be responsible to consult and represent their constituency.

The implementation of recommendation 1, will significantly strengthen the Mutual Accountability Framework by ensuring that Non State Actors have genuine legitimacy and accountability to represent the interests of their constituencies.

²¹ AUC/ NPCA (2010)

Unresolved issues

Finally, there are two issues highlighted by the stocktaking exercise but for which no solutions emerged. They both warrant further work.

Engaging parliamentarians

Stocktaking respondents were largely unaware of any engagement by Parliamentarians in the CAADP process. Most respondents had no contact with parliamentarians from which to develop an opinion. The only occasion people could see for engagement was when investment plans or policy reforms get passed through legislative chambers.

Members of the NSA Working Group believe that parliamentarians have a key role to play, and they should have active relationships with civil society on issues of food and agriculture. One option is for CAADP to mandate that parliamentarians select a representative to join the CAADP country team, and that there are fora in which Non-State Actors engage with interested parliamentarians e.g. in dialogue with an agricultural parliamentary sub-committee. Furthermore the RECs may have a key role to play in helping raise the understanding and awareness of CAADP by parliamentarians.

Further research is required to fully understand the value possible from the engagement of parliamentarians, the barriers to participation, and to develop recommendations.

Engaging large private sector actors

This stocktaking deliberately focussed on boosting participation by stakeholders who lack the resources or power to engage, and as such did not specifically examine large private sector actors. The general perception is that large private sector actors are not investing time in CAADP processes because they are not clear on the value they will receive by participating. However, if managed well, the CAADP agenda could benefit considerably from the knowledge and finance that big business can bring to African agriculture.

Further work is required to consider how to make CAADP attractive to large private sector actors. In the meantime, this paper's recommendations should nonetheless strengthen the proposition.

Paper prepared by Ian Randall, Wasafiri Consulting.
ian@wasafiriconsulting.com
September 2010.

Annex 1: Examples of good practice

All respondents during stock-taking shared examples of good practice regarding the involvement of Non State Actors in the planning and implementation of development policy, and many of those examples were with reference to CAADP. Here is a selection:

Representation and legitimacy

- The Cotonou process committed the AU and EU to include Non-State Actors in policy processes. In Ethiopia it was unclear who would represent civil society and the private sector. A General Assembly of Non-State Actors elected the “Cotonou Task Force” and with considerable success it has become the only organised structure through which Non State Actors engage in dialogue with government.²²
- In Zambia, the Agricultural Consultative Forum includes over 46 organisations including many civil sector organisations. They meet every month for multi-stakeholder dialogue on burning issues in agriculture. Each time they meet, a summary note with recommendations is passed to the cabinet for consideration. This forum is also the country node for FANRPAN which provides support, and is able to engage with issues at a regional level.

Partnership

- As part of the CAADP process in Kenya, the government has convened thematic working groups including on the private sector. This working group is chaired by a member of PANAAAC, an agri-business alliance, which fosters a strong sense of ownership and partnership.
- During structural adjustment in Zambia, the government realised it needed to engage in partnership with civil society in order to effectively manage the difficult changes. It convened a body of Non State Actors but ceded the chair and ownership to the body’s membership. The body eventually became completely independent, but the government’s role in inception means that the body continues to enjoy influential and trusting relations with the government.

Influence

- In Tanzania the Agricultural Non State Actor Forum (ANSAF) was specifically organised to input in to policy making on behalf of civil society and the private sector. ANSAF has actively engaged with the CAADP process, and is reported to have successfully strengthened the emerging strategy and investment plan.
- In Zambia, the National Farmer’s Union had not been consulted during the CAADP policy planning process. When called to the roundtable for signing on behalf of farmers, the Union refused and is reported to have held up the process for two years while genuine consultation and dialogue takes place.

Accountability

- In Niger, Non State Actors and the government form joint teams to undertake field visits and programme reviews of their Clean Water initiative.

Capacity building

- Development partners recently funded a training to brief CSOs and farmer organisations on the CAADP approach and help them define their strategy and role as they engage with the CAADP process and government partners. The training was delivered by ACORD in Ouagadougou and was reported as of considerable value.

Capacity support from INGOs

- In Ghana, as in many countries, Action Aid is actively supporting networks of local CSOs to help them understand CAADP and influence the government.

Sensitisation

- In Liberia, radio stations were commissioned to broadcast information on the CAADP process, thereby raising awareness in distant rural areas.

²² See Mengistu (2008)

Annex 2: Sample standards for quality participation

The following list offers a sample of possible standards against which to evaluate the quality of participation. They are adapted from a draft scorecard proposed for the USAID Feed the Future programme.

Standards	Indicators
1. Consultations are more than a one-off activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The holding of consultations is a rolling process that involves stakeholders in the planning, implementation and evaluation stages of investments and policy reform. Government recognizes the value of seeking input from Non State Actors for decision-making purposes
2. Consultations are inclusive/ representative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultations includes all interests/sectors connected with food security (e.g. women, small producers, CSOs, private sector, public sector institutions, technical experts, donors, and others) Consultations maximized the participation of local organizations/institutions
3. Consultations are transparent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expectations about the outcome of the consultations are known beforehand. Minutes of meetings are recorded and provided to the participants
4. Consultations are participatory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consultations employed professional facilitators skilled in participatory methodologies The agenda and consultation process was developed with the participation of key representatives from major stakeholders
5. Consultations provide feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updates on actions taken as a result of the consultations is provided to participants There is an outreach program to provide the public with the main discussion points and outputs of the consultations
6. Consultations are two-way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultations were venues for government to both provide and solicit information Consultations employed participatory methodologies like workshops and focus group discussions to actively obtain inputs from participants
7. Consultations are held regularly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultations are held regularly (e.g. quarterly) to inform the plan, provide updates and receive feedback about implementation, evaluate impact, etc. There is a specific agency responsible for scheduling and organizing consultations
8. Consultations encourages the competition of ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dissenting voices are accepted and recorded Critical feedback changed policy or programme design or implementation
9. Consultations managed efficiently	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invitations and pre-reading arrive with enough time for participants to prepare (e.g. 3 weeks) Meetings are on time and roughly stay on the agenda
10. Consultations demonstrate impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is evidence that the consultations informed the planning and implementation of FTF investments There is evidence that the consultations had an impact on policymaking

Annex 3: Summary of stocktaking activity

The content of this options paper is based upon input from a stocktaking exercise which gathered input on the barriers to participation, best practices and opportunities. It achieved this through a survey by email, expert interviews, consultation workshops and desk research.

Stocktaking survey

The stocktaking survey was distributed in French and English to:

- CAADP country focal points
- regional Non State Actors on NPCA's email list
- Donor Working Groups in countries that are advancing with CAADP
- Action Aid country offices who are actively supporting CSOs in engaging with CAADP
- Selected INGOs

We received responses from respondents with a regional perspective, and from respondents in the following countries: Nigeria, Mozambique, Ghana, Gambia, Senegal, Togo, Niger, Liberia, and Tanzania.

Expert interviews

Extended semi-structured interviews were undertaken with the following expert stakeholders:

- Lindiwe Sibanda, CEO, FANRPAN
- Ishmael Sunga, CEO, and Benito Eliasi SACAU
- Lucy Muchoki, CEO, PANAAC
- Jennifer Tangney, Consultant, APRM
- Alangeh Romanus Che, Member of the Executive Office, PROPAC
- Martha Byanyima, CAADP focal point, COMESA
- Lynette Chen, CEO, NEPAD Business Foundation

Further less formal input was gathered in dialogue with members of the working group.

Consultation workshops

- The NSA working group met in Midrand, South Africa for an initial brainstorming workshop. 15 participants included representatives from AUC, NPCA, INGOs, and Development Partners.
- At the FANRPAN AGM, a consultation workshop was held with 250 participants from 14 countries across Southern Africa.

Desk research

Please see the references in annex 4 for a list of documents consulted.

Annex 4: References

AUC/ NPCA (2010) Communique of the CAADP Mutual Accountability Framework: Stakeholder Validation Workshop

Foresti, M. et al, 2007, 'Voice for accountability: Citizens, the state and realistic governance. Initial findings from an innovative evaluation of donor interventions' ODI Briefing Paper.

Igoe, J., 2003, 'Scaling up Civil Society: Donor Money, NGOs and the Pastoralist Land Rights Movement in Tanzania', *Development and Change*, Volume 34, Issue 5, pp. 863-885

Mahoney, C. and Beckstrand, M. J., 2009, 'Following the Money: EU Funding of Civil Society Organisations', Paper prepared for the 11th European Studies Association conference, Los Angeles: 23-25 April

McKeon, N., 2010, Promoting Involvement of Producer Organisations in the Design and Formulation of Agricultural Investment Programmes in Africa ~ TCI Discussion Paper, FAO.

Melief, S. & van Wijk, P. 2008, Order out of Chaos: Mapping the Complexity of Pan African Civil Society, Oxfam Novib

Mengistu, T., 2008, 'The role of NSAs in light of the Cotonou Agreement: the case of Ethiopia" National Stakeholders Conference at Lilongwe, Malawi

NEPAD, 2009, Accelerating CAADP country implementation: a guide for practitioners

NEPAD, 2010, CAADP Post Compact Review: Guidelines

Perkin, E. and Court, J., 2005, 'Networks and Policy Processes in International Development: a literature review', Overseas Development Institute

Tangney, J. (2010) 'A landscape survey for the creation of a mechanism to support Civil Society and Media participation in the African Peer Review Mechanism'

Tembo, F. et al., 2007, 'Multi-Donor Support to Civil Society and Engaging with 'Non-traditional' Civil Society: A Light-Touch Review of DFID's Portfolio', Overseas Development Institute, London

Wang, S., 2006, 'Money and Autonomy: Patterns of Civil Society Finance and their Implications', *Studies in Comparative International Development*, Volume 40, Number 4, pp. 3-29

World Bank, 2005, World Bank- Civil Society Global Policy Dialogue Forum.(Washington D.C. 20-22 April 2005), Summary Report. Washington, D.C, World Bank.