



Learning and capacity building clinic on the integration of scientific evidence in
NAFSIP programmatic documents

9-13 October 2017, Saly Portudal, Senegal

Conclusions and Recommendations

With the technical support and facilitation of Hub Rural and Africa Lead

1. The **“Learning and capacity building clinic on the integration of scientific evidence (analytic results of IFPRI/ReSAKSS) in NAFSIP programmatic documents in the ECOWAS region”** was jointly organized by ECOWAS and IFPRI, with the technical support of HUB RURAL and Africa Lead, from October 9 to 13, 2017, in Saly Portudal, Senegal. This workshop is a new step in the formulation process of the second-generation National Agricultural and Food and Nutrition Security Investment Plans.
2. In other words, the objective of the clinic was to create an opportunity allowing country teams to study and integrate in their NAFSIP_2 documents the analytical results obtained by the group of local experts gathered and supported by IFPRI.

I. Objective of the Clinic

3. The main objective of the clinic was to help ECOWAS Member States improve the quality of their NAFSIP_2 documents with the integration of scientific evidence through mutual learning and capacity strengthening.
4. More specifically, the clinic aimed to facilitate the integration of the results presented by the following reports:
 - a. The Report on Malabo Status and Profile Assessment: which reviews the changes occurred during the last NAIPs and evaluates the current status of the countries in each of the thematic areas of Malabo, thus providing a baseline to measure the performance achieved in reaching the agreed objectives;
 - b. The Report on Malabo’s Goals and Milestones: which describes the requirements to reach Malabo’s objectives related to agricultural growth, poverty reduction and eradication of hunger;
 - c. The Report on Policies and Program Opportunities: which studies the best practices in terms of policy instruments and strategic investments and identifies the opportunities for the countries to reach Malabo’s objectives.

II. Expected Results

5. In terms of results, the intention was that the 15 ECOWAS Member States would be able to:
 - a. conduct a sound status and profile assessment of their agricultural sector, which contributes to establish a vigorous baseline for NAFSIP_2 and facilitate a better appreciation of the performance achieved in Malabo’s thematic areas in the future;
 - b. correctly define the relevant objectives and key steps of NAFSIP_2 to reach Malabo’s objectives related to agricultural growth, poverty reduction and eradication of hunger;
 - c. identify the efficient policies and the program opportunities needed to reach Malabo’s objectives;

- d. benefit from the advice on shared best practices which can help make a country-specific analysis after the meeting.

III. Participants

6. The participants to the clinic were: the country teams (NAIP focal point, experts in charge of reviewing NAFSIP_2 documents, and experts in M&E); the experts group and the members of the NAFSIP_2 task force; and other technical partners. Only Côte d'Ivoire was not able to send participants to the clinic. The complete list of names of the participants is presented in Annex of these conclusions and recommendations.

IV. Opening Ceremony

7. Four speeches were delivered during the opening ceremony of the clinic:
 - a. In his welcoming address, the Executive Director of HUB RURAL, Dr. Yamar MBODJ, insisted on the objectives of the clinic. At this stage of the formulation process of the second generation NAFSIP, the challenge is to rely on scientific evidence to produce documents that will enable each of the fifteen ECOWAS countries to reach Malabo's objectives. He thanked IFPRI for its technical preparation and for the financial support to this clinic;
 - b. The Director of the Agricultural Forecasts and Statistics Department (DPSA, in French) of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Equipment (MARE) of the Republic of Senegal, Dr. Ibrahima MENDY, welcomed the participants and then insisted on the challenges of this learning and knowledge sharing clinic. He recalled the efforts deployed by Senegalese Authorities to accelerate the formulation process of NAFSIP_2;
 - c. The IFPRI Director for Africa, Dr. Ousmane BADIANE, after welcoming the participants, insisted on the role of his institution in the ECOWAS support mechanism for implementing the ECOWAP/CAADP. IFPRI works in collaboration with ECOWAS in this process since the first generation of NAIPs. IFPRI has gathered and trained more than 200 experts from 30 African countries to efficiently support the countries in the use of scientific evidence for the formulation of the second-generation NAFSIPs. Dr. BADIANE particularly applauded the fact that the greatest part of these experts were members of the African Growth and Development Policy Modelling Consortium (AGRODEP), initiated by IFPRI and inspired by the collaboration with ECOWAS during the preparation of the first generation of NAFSIPs. He ended his speech by thanking ECOWAS and the Member States, and HUB, RURAL for their availability and the trust they have placed in IFPRI;
 - d. In the name of the Director of Agriculture and Rural Development of ECOWAS, Mrs. Fatmata SEIWOH first thanked the States for their availability and for the efforts they dedicate to the formulation process of the second-generation NAFSIPs. She said that the clinic is an opportunity for the States to jointly review the technical supports, get familiar with the proposed analytical tools and share their experiences.

Work Progress

8. The activities of the clinic took place in plenary sessions and group workshops. Moderated by Dr. Yamar MBODJ, Executive Director of HUB RURAL, they were composed of: (i) speeches followed by debates, (ii) thorough analyses by the groups under the supervision of moderators delegated by Africa Lead, (iii) feedbacks of the group works, followed by plenary debates, (iv) clarifications brought by both the IFPRI team and ECOWAS.
9. The first category of communications introduced the countries' profiles. They aimed to establish the baseline situation of the fifteen ECOWAS Member States. They were made by: IFPRI's Director for Africa, [Dr Ousmane Badiane](#); the Director of the West and Central Africa Office, Dr Fofana Ismaël; and Dr Sunday ODJO. These communications focused on (i) [assessment and capacity strengthening analysis](#), (ii) [Country Malabo status assessment and profile, a regional synthesis and ECOWAS Malabo goals and Milestones report](#).

Link to the videos: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RwSK8x9s79E&list=PLGmfakKOvYINjRKTS1XsrptrvegK-rX1P>

10. These communications allowed the countries to particularly appreciate: (i) the baseline situation compared to the context in which they are developing the NAFSIPs, (ii) the existing gaps, and the efforts needed to achieve Malabo's objectives.
11. The debates which followed this first category of communications insisted on the quality and sources data used by IFPRI, which are often different from those of the countries. Although the differences are less important for the global indicators, the problem is very acute when it comes to data on intra-regional trade. Indeed, the analysis brought to light some information that, according to many participants, need to be better documented.
12. This first session ended with all the participants presenting very briefly their country status and progress in the NAFSIP formulation process.
13. Except for Côte d'Ivoire, which was absent, all the countries presented their status and progress assessment. Hub Rural completed the presentations with a review of the situation in Côte d'Ivoire. The formulation process is very active in this country, with a strong mobilization of the stakeholders, decision-makers and partners.

At the end of September 2017, the situation is as follows:

14. **Countries where the process is highly advanced.**
 - a. **Niger:** where the NAFSIP has been technically validated and adopted by: the Interdepartmental Orientation Committee which gathers Ministries in charge of implementing the i3N; the Strategic Program Multi-Sector Committee (CMPS, in French) working on the "creation of an environment conducive to i3N's implementation" and composed of the President of the Republic, the Prime Minister, the Ministers in charge of Food Security; the HC3N, and the other key actors. Its

implementation is on-going based on resources mobilized with the State and partners of the rural sector. A Round Table for the financing of the Economic and Social Development Plan (PDES, in French), which includes the PA 2016-2020 (NAIP Niger), will be organized in January 2018;

- b. **Mali:** where the NAFSIP has been technically validated and adopted by: the National Executive Committee on Agriculture (CENA, in French) chaired by the Prime Minister; and the High Agricultural Council (CSA, in French) chaired by the President of the Republic. However, the country has decided to structure the implementation around regional five-year plans. The process will result in an operational plan for 2017-2020, which will be validated at every level (regional, national). At the end of September, only 4 administrative regions out of 11 have been consulted. The process may be delayed due to budgetary and security constraints;
 - c. **Benin, Burkina Faso and Côte d'Ivoire:** which have performed a technical validation of their draft NAFSIP documents. They are preparing the policy adoption, which is expected to take place in November;
2. **Countries which are at the second stage of the process** (i.e. operations and priorities definition stage) and still have to technically validate their draft document.
 - a. **Guinea, Nigeria and Togo:** which have a consolidated draft document and are preparing the technical validation which will be performed between the end of October and mid-November;
 - b. **Liberia, Senegal and Sierra Leone:** which have first versions of the documents and are ready to start the consultations with the stakeholders and to finalize the costing, and the economic and financial analysis. These countries are planning a technical validation and a policy adoption before the end of November 2017.
 3. **Countries which are still in the beginning of the process** (some of them have launched the process):
 - a. **Cabo Verde, The Gambia and Ghana:** who are well into the analysis, consultation and preparation process for their draft document. Cabo Verde and The Gambia are planning to adopt their documents before the end of November;
 4. **Only one country is lagging behind: Guinea-Bissau.** The country is still at the stage of constituting the thematic groups. The technical preparation activities should have been carried out faster because the country only has to update parts of a document that has been reviewed two years ago.
 5. The second session was dedicated to the presentation by the experts of the technical tools conceived to improve the quality of the NAFSIPs. The communications mainly focused on:
 - a. Making NAIPs climate –Smart;
 - b. Institution architecture workshops to support NIAP2, development process;
 - c. Inclusive growth and value chain development for the NIAPs;
 - d. NAIP appraisal guidance for component 4 Food Security and Nutrition;
 - e. Agricultural Research & Development in West Africa, challenges to take up regarding investments;
 - f. Gender mainstreaming in NAIPS: how can the strategy look like;

- g. Regional trade policies and Program opportunities among African countries.
6. All these communications were meant to highlight the quality standards in the different countries and how they have been integrated in the available NAFSIP documents.
 7. A first series of participants' reactions allowed to appreciate the relevance of these tools and their great utility for high quality NAFSIPs. Above all, it allowed the countries to make a first assessment of the efforts needed for an appropriate integration of these tools in the second-generation NAFSIPs.

V. Group Work

8. In order to make deeper analyses and strengthen the integration of scientific evidence in the NAFSIPs, the countries have been divided into three groups. The first group included Nigeria, Ghana, The Gambia, Sierra Leone and Liberia. The second group was composed of Benin, Togo, Cabo Verde, Niger and Guinea Bissau. And the third group: Senegal, Mali, Guinea, Burkina Faso.
9. The group activities have been moderated by experts recruited by Africa Lead and IFPRI. The works consisted in: thorough analyses of the countries' profiles, analysis of the integration level of the tools in the available NAFSIPs, and a census of the available and useful data sources.
10. At the end of the group works, each country restituted the results, insisting on the points of agreement and disagreement, and submitting recommendations for a better integration of these evidence into the NAFSIP documents for each of the considered points: (i) global profile, (ii) inclusive global growth of the value chains, nutrition and food security, (iii) gender, intra-regional trade, climate-smart agriculture, institutional mechanism, mutual accountability.

Download link to countries communications:

www.hubrural.org/IMG/pays.zip

11. **For Benin**, there is a consensus on most of the analyses. However, there are some discrepancies on the poverty threshold in rural areas fixed at 40.4% whereas it is at 43.6% (EMICOV, 2015), and on the participation level of non-State actors which seems to have been under-evaluated. It was also noted that the analyses on growth trends in actual food consumption expenditure, nutrition and food security, gender and intra-regional trade, need to be deepen. Finally, the participants asked that the analyses be scaled up to cover inclusive growth, value chains, and institutional mechanisms that have not been completed.
12. **For Burkina Faso**, there is a consensus on the analyses of agricultural investments, growth and poverty reduction, mutual accountability and institutional architecture. However, the sticking points relate to: data on public expenditures in agriculture; lack of analysis of inclusive growth and value chains; export products of the country. It has also been highlighted that gender analyses do not cover all the dimensions and do not show the real image, and that data on nutrition available at national level are different from those presented in the report. Furthermore, the participants expressed their wish

that data on irrigated lands be reviewed and analyses be made on mutual accountability and on research & development.

13. **For Cabo Verde**, consensus has been achieved on the analyses of food and nutritional security, gender, mutual accountability and institutional mechanisms, agricultural investment, growth and poverty. The disagreements are on the analyses of inclusive growth and value chain development, regional and intra-African trade, climate-smart agriculture and resilience to face climate change. The participants also expressed their doubts concerning all the statistical data used for the analyses.
14. **For Mali**, there is a consensus on a number of diagnosis points and analyses. But the disagreements are numerous and focus mainly on the analyses of poverty and malnutrition, gender, climate-smart agriculture to face climate change, and resilience. Indeed, the participants have noted that these analyses do not reflect the realities described in the country. They indicated that the data used for these analyses vary from one report to another and that the population of the country is under-estimated.
15. **For Niger**, there is a consensus on the driving role of the sector in national economy. However, there is a disagreement on the quality of the database used for the analyses. It is particularly necessary to review the gender analysis because the data processed in this report refer to only one out of the 63 departments of the country. The participants also expressed their wish that the nutrition analysis be completed. They asked for an update of analysis data on climate-smart agriculture and a study on inclusive growth and value chain development, along with a document on the comparative advantages of the country in terms of intra-regional trade.
16. **For Guinea**, there is a consensus on all the presentations made by IFPRI experts. The disagreement points refer to: the growth objective of the country; the share of irrigated lands by crop; and the access to agricultural advisory services. Concerning these topics, the participants have indeed noted differences between the data presented and those included in other documents of the country (e.g. PNDES, PNDA and NAFSIP). They called for more precision on certain groups of products considered in the analysis of regional trade.
17. **For The Gambia**, there is a consensus on the data and results of the analysis of growth and poverty reduction objectives, and the results in terms of transformation of agriculture. These objectives and results are consistent with those included in the NAIP. The disagreement points are on data concerning private investment in the sector. Participants would like these data to be verified.
18. **For Ghana**, there is a consensus on the following points: the quality of data used for the analysis of poverty reduction and hunger eradication; the conclusions on poverty and hunger; the necessity to reduce inequality gap; the need to focus on rural areas to reduce poverty; most of the conclusions relating to regional trade; nutrition and food security; gender; value chain development; climate-smart agriculture; and mutual accountability. However, there is a disagreement on the share of agricultural public expenses that does not correspond to the one indicated in Ghana's AgPER report. Participants also expressed a disagreement on the projections made for rice imports.
19. **For Liberia**, the consensus points refer to: the general objectives; nutrition and food security; gender; value chain development; climate-smart agriculture; and mutual accountability. The disagreement

points relate to the data on regional trade and the overly aggregated nature of the considered categories of products. Participants also noted the incompleteness of data on women's access to information on credit, the need to verify certain data on value chain development and the absence of JSR mechanisms.

20. **For Guinea-Bissau**, there is a consensus on the methodology and the indicators. However, these disagreement points have been highlighted: lack of accuracy of the data on priority products, population, growth of the agricultural sector, exports of agricultural and food products.
21. **For Senegal**, the agreement points relate to thematic areas developed in two IFPRI reports. These reports can be integrated in the NAFSIP document (namely in the assessment, justification, strategic orientation identification sections) for the identification of priority sectors and for the establishment of trends in nutrition. However, the disagreement points concern the quality of statistical data on public financing, poverty, gender and trade (import and export). It was also pointed out that national data have been overlooked, and the analysis of Senegal's foreign trade was not enough accurate.
22. **For Sierra Leone**, the agreement points concern a number of results obtained on global growth, poverty, and Malabo's objectives. There is however a disagreement on data quality; the participants consider that these data deserve careful analysis and validation at national level. The remark is valid for data relating to: nutrition and food security, inclusive value chain development, trade, CSA, and mutual accountability.
23. **For Togo**, there is a global consensus on the methodology and analyses of the country's baseline situation and on the perspectives for 2025. However, there are some disagreement points: lack of data relating to inclusive growth and value chain development; estimate of the poverty level in the agricultural sector, non-conformity of the value of Gini indicator in the profile report (0.285) with the one indicated in the ATOR Report (0.3800). Participants expressed their wish that the analysis indicators for CSM and resilience, like the HDI (0.473 in 2013), be updated. They also said that the national statistics on irrigated and cultivated surfaces, available for the period 2010-2016, should be used. It is also necessary to compare the average share of the GDP allocated to social protection with national data.
24. **Nigeria** approves a large part of the analyses made by IFPRI on all the aspects. However, the country would like that the data sources be specified, that informal trade be documented, that the 2016-2025 nutrition strategy be considered, that food security be better documented, and that youth employment be considered. Globally, the data used must be reviewed.
25. After the presentations, IFPRI representatives specified the appropriate approach for a better use of data and information made available to the States to improve the quality of their NAFSIPs. The experts (specialized in nutrition and food security, trade, gender, CSA, inclusive growth and value chains) who have been called out by the States have brought complementary indications for a better appropriation of the data. They committed to further their relationship with the countries in order to produce consensual and quality analyses. The countries expressed their wish that national data be given a good place.

26. The representative of the M&E Unit of the Directorate of Agriculture and Rural Development presented the first results of the biennial review of Malabo's commitments implementation status. Participants were able to learn about their country's position in terms of level of achievement of Malabo's objectives. The communication sparked methodological debates, to which the ReSAKSS brought clarifying elements.

VI. General Conclusions and Recommendations

27. The countries recognize the interest and utility of this clinic that actually strengthened their analytical capacities and their integration of scientific evidence for a better quality of the NAFSIP documents, their communication and advocacy with national leaders, TFP and all the stakeholders on the importance of the agro-sylvo-pastoral sector and the fish industry in poverty reduction, food and nutrition security, job creation, economic, social and environmental impacts of NAFSIPs' implementation.

28. The elements of consensus are very strong on countries' profiles and on analyses of the objectives, targets, and milestones. The disagreements noted here and there can be reduced if the countries transmit the most recent data highlighted during the discussions, and with a close collaboration between IFPRI teams and the country teams.

29. In this perspective, the workshop recommends:

- **that the countries:**

- ✓ promptly transmit to IFPRI the recent data they claim to have;
- ✓ reconstitute at national level the conclusions and recommendations of the Saly Clinic, with country reports (profile, strategic analyses) and the synthesis of the reactions of the countries (agreement/disagreement points, strategies to minimize disagreements and integrate the consensus in NAFSIP or implementation documents);
- ✓ develop and implement an urgent strategy to take into account country profiles and strategic analyses before the end of 2017.

- **that IFPRI:**

- ✓ promptly transmit the reports to the countries, after correcting the too obvious differences;
- ✓ define a support strategy for the countries to help them finalize and adopt their documents by the end of 2017, and to help them in the implementation process;
- ✓ prepare for each country 3 scenarios: the status quo of the current actions; the implementation of the NAFSIPs (as they become available); the complete implementation of the Malabo's commitments. IFPRI should also help the countries in their decision-making process.

30. Finally, **the participants ask ECOWAS and the TFPs at national and regional level** to promptly help:

- ✓ IFPRI get financial means allowing the institute to ensure the mobilization of local experts in order to better meet the pressing needs of the countries and help them finalize, adopt and prepare their round-

- tables or business meetings by the end of 2017 (adoption) and the first quarter of 2018 (round-tables or business meetings);
- ✓ the country teams get the necessary resources to implement their urgent strategies of integration of the country profiles and strategic analyses before the end of 2017;
 - ✓ Hub Rural in its supervision and assistance work, animation of the process, under the direction of ECOWAS.

VII. Closing Ceremony

31. The closing ceremony was punctuated by four speeches:
32. The representative of AGRA, Mr. Fadel NDIAME thanked ECOWAS for agreeing to associate AGRA to this learning and capacity strengthening clinic aimed at improving the content of the National Agricultural and Food and Nutrition Security Investment Plan. He highlighted the need to establish a mechanism, insisted that countries must take the leadership, following the example of Ghana which is developing the Planting for Food and Jobs Program for the youth. He said that AGRA is interested in supporting the process and intends to take steps to implement the MOU between AGRA and ECOWAS.
33. Mr. Abdrahamane DICKO of USAID welcomed the organization of the clinic in the perspective of supporting the countries in improving their NAFSIPs. He insisted on two important elements that the participants must not forget:
 - a. The role and implication of the private sector in the formulation and, above all, in the implementation of the NAFSIPs. He invited the participants to urge the States to create favorable conditions for a better implication of the private sector in the implementation of the NAFSIPs;
 - b. The need to promptly proceed to the implementation of the plan to convince stakeholders of the importance of the development of the agro-sylvo-pastoral and fishing sectors as an instrument of the fight against poverty.
34. He praised the dynamism of the group and invited the States to do their best to involve the Technical and Financial Partners in the process.
35. The representative of IFPRI, Dr. Samuel BENIN, welcomed the consensus on the necessity of relying on scientific evidence to build NAFSIPs that can help the countries reach Malabo's objectives. He congratulated IFPRI team for the huge preparatory work done beforehand. He said that he is convinced that the commitments of USAID, IFPRI, ECOWAS and the States, will be respected to allow the region to have at the end very high quality NAFSIPs.

36. The representative of the Director of Agriculture and Rural Development of ECOWAS expressed her satisfaction with the promising results to which the clinic's work has led. She urged the States to persevere in the improvement of the quality of their NAFSIPs.
37. In his closing remarks, Mr. Alassane SECK, representative of the Director of DPSA first congratulated the participants for the work done. He thanked ECOWAS, IFPRI, Africa Lead, Hub Rural, for the various types of support given to the countries in the formulation process of their NAFSIPs. He finally wished the participants a good return to their respective countries before closing the discussions of the clinic.

Download link to all the communications

www.hubrural.org/IMG/priasan_saly_2017.zip

AGENDA

Day 1: October 9 (Plenary)

08:30	Opening	ECOWAS/Hub Rural
08:45	IFPRI/ReSAKSS Resources for NAIP 2.0	IFPRI/ReSAKSS
09:00	Update on NAIP 2.0 Revision	Countries
11:00	Break	
11:30	Countries Malabo Status Assessment and Profile	IFPRI/ReSAKSS
13:00	Break	
14:00	Countries Malabo Goals and Milestones	IFPRI/ReSAKSS
16:00	Break	
16:30	Policy and Program Opportunities	IFPRI/ReSAKSS
17:30	Adjourned	

Day 2-4: October 10-12 (Group Sessions)

09:00	Preparation for Group Sessions (Plenary)	IFPRI/ReSAKSS
09:30	Group Sessions I	Countries/IFPRI/ReSAKSS
11:00	Break	
11:30	Group Sessions II	Countries/IFPRI/ReSAKSS
13:00	Break	
14:00	Group Sessions III	Countries/IFPRI/ReSAKSS
15:30	Break	
16:00	Group Sessions IV	Countries/IFPRI/ReSAKSS
17:30	Adjourned	

Day 5: October 13 (Plenary)

09:00	Progress Report I	Countries
11:00	Break	
11:30	Progress Report II	Countries
13:00	Break	
14:00	Progress Report III	Countries
16:00	Break	
16:30	Wrap-Up/Next Steps	ECOWAS/Hub Rural
17:00	Closing	ECOWAS/Hub Rural

Attendance List

Nº	Names	Organization / Country	E-mail
1	Deroe A Weeks	Ministry of Agriculture Liberia	Tetadee0719@gmail.com
2	Henry A Roberts	CAADP /Liberia	haugustjr@gmail.com
3	Dennis Wiagbe Jr	Ministry of Agriculture Liberia	jdmne12@gmail.com
4	NICÁCIO JOSÉ PEREIRA	ECOWAP&CAADP Guinee Bissau	nicaciaojpereira@hotmail.com
5	Issa Jandi	Secretariat to the Plan Guinee Bissau	issajandi@hotmail.com
6	Japereira Aníbal PEREIRA	Consultant /Guinee Bissau	japereira_djo@yahoo.com.br
7	Jean-Luc FABER	Ministry of Agriculture Guinea	elsabang@yahoo.fr
8	Atigou BALDE	Ministry of Agriculture Guinea	batigou@yahoo.fr
9	Alpha Bacar BARRY	Ministry of Agriculture Guinee	alphabacarb@gmail.com
10	Nuhu Ibrahim	Ministry of Agriculture Ghana	nuhuibrahim@yahoo.com
11	Faisal Munkaila	Ministry of Agriculture Ghana	faisaliner@gmail.com
12	David Modzakah	Ministry of Agriculture Ghana	ssepenou@gmail.com
13	Yamar Mbodj	Hub Rural	yamarm@hubrural.org
14	Ousmane Badiane	IFPRI	O.BADIANE@CGIAR.ORG

15	AGUEMON, Dossa	Ministry of Agriculture Benin	aguemondossa@yahoo.fr
16	Edah Justin	Ministry of Agriculture Benin	justinedah79@gmail.com
17	Chakpo Codjo Charles	Ministry of Agriculture Benin	charben3@yahoo.fr
18	Sidibe Amadou	Burkina Faso	amadou.sidibe@outlook.fr
19	SOME Gustave	SP/CPSA/Burkina Faso	gustavesome@yahoo.fr
20	Ouedraogo Joachim	SP/CPSA Burkina Faso	j.ouedraogo@spcpsa.bf
21	Goncalves Clarimundo	Ministry of Agriculture Cabo Verde	Clarimundo.Goncalves@maa.gov.cv
22	Vicente Adelina	Ministry of Agriculture Cabo Verde	Adelina.S.Vicente@maa.gov.cv
23	Monteiro Elida	Ministry of Agriculture Cabo Verde	Elida.Monteiro@maa.gov.cv
24	Abdoulie Touray	Ministry of Agriculture The Gambia	laye20002001@yahoo.com
25	Momodou Jabang	Ministry of Agriculture The Gambia	modoumbyejabang@gmail.com
26	Momodou Sowe	Ministry of Agriculture The Gambia	mwsowe@gmail.com
27	Greenwell Matchaya	ReSAkss	G.Matchaya@cgiar.org
28	Fatmata Seiwoh	ECOWAS	fseiwoh@ecowas.int

29	AMOUTI Nicabou A	Ministry of Agriculture Togo	yamoutijeremie@gmail.com
30	Agouda Affeyitom	Ministry of Agriculture Togo	affeyitom50@gmail.com
31	Goumbane Todlman M	Ministry of Agriculture Togo	tgoumbane@gmail.com
32	Mr. Joseph Koroma	Ministry of Agriculture Sierra Leone	jopaygie@yahoo.com
33	Mustapha Nyallay	Ministry of Agriculture Sierra Leone	mustaphanyallay001@gmail.com
34	Mr Thomas Ekundayo Chypper Palmer	Ministry of Agriculture Sierra Leone	chypperpalmer@gmail.com
35	Sheryl Hendriks	University of Pretoria South Africa	sheryl.hendriks@up.ac.za
36	Getaw Tadesse	IFPRI	g.tadesse@cgiar.org
37	Sunday Odjo	IFPRI	s.odjo@cgiar.org
38	Anatole Goundan	IFPRI	a.goundan@cgiar.org
39	Magne Lea Vicky	IFPRI	L.V.magnedomgho@cgiar.org
40	Leysa Maty Sall	IFPRI	l.m.sall@cgiar.org
41	Mariam Amadou Diallo	IFPRI	m.diallo@cgiar.org
42	Julia Collins	IFPRI	j.collins@cgiar.org
43	Ismael Fofana	IFPRI	i.fofana@cgiar.org

44	Pape Alassane Mbaye	Senegal Rural Hub	alassanem@hubrural.org
45	Dr. Fatima Kabiru Aliyu	Ministry of Agriculture Nigeria	fatka2013@gmail.com
46	arimi Mamadou ELH Ousmane	HC3N	arimi.mamadou@gmail.com
47	Paraiso Vincent Moussa	HC3N	phazo222@yahoo.fr
48	Moriba SAMAKE	Ministry of Agriculture Mali	samakemoriba45@yahoo.com
49	Mme Korotoumou TOURE	Ministry of Agriculture Mali	inalatop@yahoo.fr
50	abdoulaye Baba ARBY	Ministry of Agriculture Mali	abdoulayearby@yahoo.fr
51	Jean Jacques Mbonigaba Muhinda	AGRA/RO-WA	mbonjac@yahoo.fr
52	John Azu	Africa Lead	johnazuu@yahoo.com
53	Jane Gleason	Africa Lead	Jane_Gleason@dai.com
54	Nana Amoah	Africa Lead	Nana_amoah@dai.com
55	Alassane Seck	DAPSA/MAER SENEGAL	alassaneseck2000@yahoo.fr
56	Amadou Ndiaye	CEP-MEPA	ahmadounjaay@gmail.com
57	Mariame Maiga	CORAF	maigamame@gmail.com
58	Soule Bio Goura	Rural Hub	Soulebe@hubrural.org

59	Abdoulaye Seye	Senegal Rural Hub	abdoulayes@hubrural.org
60	Joshua Ajetomobi	University of swaziland	jsegun2002@yahoo.com
61	Dahouda Djele	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and hydraulics TOGO	ddjele@yahoo.fr
62	Daniel Sakyi	KNUST GHANA	dsakyi2003@yahoo.com
63	r. Mahyao ADOLPHE	CNRA Cote d'Ivoire	mahyaoadolphe@yahoo.fr
64	Olawale Emmanuel Olayide	University of Ibadan Nigeria	waleolayide@yahoo.com
65	naemeka chukwuone	University of Nigeria Nsukka	nmaemeka.chukwuone@unn.edu.ng
66	Samuel Benin	IFPRI	s.benin@CGIAR.ORG
67	Francois J Cabral	UCAD	Joecabral7@gmail.com
68	Michel Seck	Africa Lead	Seck-michel@yahoo.fr
69	Gnambi Sonko	Africa Lead	sgnamni@yahoo.fr
70	Amadou Drame	Africa Lead Senegal	Amadou-drame@dai.com
71	Dr Adamou Danguioua	HC3N NIGER	adamou_dang@yahoo.fr
73	Mbaye Yade	IITA /ReSAKSS WA	M.Yade@cgiar.org
74	Seydou R. KABORE	CILSS	seydou.kabore@cilss.int

75	Marie Jeanne DIOUF	IFPRI	m.j.diouf@cgiar.org
76	SIDE CLAUDE STEPHANE	FAO	claudeside@fao.org
77	UWONU AFIWA KAFUI	WILDAF –AO TOGO	wildaf_ao@yahoo.com
78	CHEIKH AHMADOU BAMBA NGOM	CORAF	ab.ngom@coraf.org
79	MANSON NWAFOR	ReSAKSS/IITA	m.nwafor@cgiar.org
80	LHASSAN CISSE	FAO/ GOL LIBERIA	alhassan.cisse@fao.org
81	AGUNLOYE OLAJIDE O. M.	FMARD NIGERIA	climate.kelvin@gmail.com
82	AINEMBABAZI JOHN HERBERT	AGRA	HAinembabazi@agra.org
83	IBRAHIM MOHAMED	FMARD NIGERIA	mohtakai2@gmail.com
84	IBRAHIM MENDY	DAPSA SENEGAL	dapsmendy@gmail.com
85	FLEUR WOUTERSE	IFPRI SENEGAL	f.wouterse@cgiar.org
86	FADEL NDIAME	AGRA/WARO	fndiame@agra.org
87	Abdrahamane DICKO	USAID/WA	abdicko@usaid.gov