



Department of Agriculture, Environment and Water Resources

Directorate of Agriculture of Rural Development

## **ECOWAS Regional Joint Sector Review 2018**

### **Inception Workshop Summary Report**

Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire, 26-27 March 2018

#### **Introduction**

The 2018 ECOWAS Regional Joint Sector Review (JSR) inception workshop was held from the 26 to 27 March 2018 in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire under the auspices of the ECOWAS Directorate of Agriculture and Rural development of the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Water Resources in collaboration with ReSAKSS-West Africa.

The participants of the workshop constituted members of the Advisory Committee of Agriculture and Food (ACAF) mainly the Ministries of Agriculture (NAIP / CAADP Focal Point) of ECOWAS, the African Union Commission (AUC), the ECOWAS Commission and Parliament, regional and international technical institutions (FAO, CILSS, CORAF/WECARD, Africa Rice, IFDC, ReSAKSS, IFPRI, ECOAGRIS, Hub Rural), donor partners (USAID), socio-professional organizations, civil society (AFAO, ENDA CACID, APSS, Action AID, NANTS) among others, the private sector (Federation of the Chambers of Commerce), support institutions and programs (AGRA) and resource persons.

The workshop discussions and group work centered on the following documents:

- The ECOWAP/CAADP M&E Mechanism
- Findings of the 2015 Regional Joint Sector Review Assessment
- Draft Terms of Reference for the operationalization of the RJSR Steering Committee
- Draft Terms of Reference for the implementation of the RJSR

With recent increase in interest in the use of JSRs in the agriculture sector in Africa, ECOWAS has gradually been preparing for its first JSR. The aim of this workshop was to reach a consensus on the roadmap for the implementation of the regional JSR. The objective was to recap the

findings of the regional JSR assessment that was conducted in 2015, use that as a basis for planning the JSR, establish sub-committees for the implementation of the RJSR and develop a road map for the implementation of the JSR.

The results expected at the end of the meeting were:

1. Regional JSR sub-committees are established with clear terms of references
2. A confirmed road map for the implementation of the JSR.

These results were achieved through the participative consultative processes with various stakeholders from the member states and participating institutions. Presentations were made to provide participants with the context of the 2015 JSR assessment findings and set the stage for the 2018 regional JSR. After meticulous and thorough deliberations the following consensus points were reached for each of the sessions:

### **Overview of the ECOWAP M&E Mechanism**

Participants acknowledged the information presented on the need for a regional framework for M&E, salient features of the proposed regional M&E framework, its key concepts, the institutional framework and structure of the regional M&E System as well as a definition of the M&E system's products.

### **Roles and responsibilities of the ACAF in relation to ECOWAP M&E**

The participants raised questions regarding the following points:

- The need to clarify the role of the private sector in developing the budget for the regional JSR.
- The methodology to improve data collection of the NSA level.
- The need for ECOWAS to support some member states facing challenges with collecting nutrition data as well as the high number of indicators.
- The clarity of roles and responsibilities of NGOs in supporting civil society in M&E processes.
- The recommendation for ECOWAS to support sub-national capacity building initiatives in each country towards M&E activities.
- The way NSA and development partners are integrated in ECOAGRIS and the ECOWAP M&E system to allow data to be entered into one holistic system.

The participants agreed that:

- The ACAF has representation from all the major agriculture stakeholder groups
- There have been successful biennial review efforts and the JSR can build on this momentum for success
- There is a need for training in data collection at the regional level.
- M&E is expensive and partners other than donors, need to be involved and to contribute
- Private sector along with other donors and stakeholders need to play a role in monitoring results.
- Country SAKSS and ECOAGRIS units are available to provide support to NSAs for data collection. For instance, an NGO paid for a workshop in Nigeria to build the capacity of NSAs for data collection.
- The ACAF's mandate among others is to review the regional annual performance report.

- There is a need to activate the operationalisation of the ACAF and identify ways in which the private sector can better contribute to the ACAF.

At the end of the discussion, the participants reached a consensus on the challenges in data collection and management in the region yet agreed that progress is being made.

### **Overview of the 2015 RJSR Assessment Findings**

The participants raised questions regarding the following points:

- The need for a comparative country analysis on JSR performance in the region
- The need for ECOWAS support to member states to develop reporting guidelines
- The frequency and periodicity of the regional JSR.

A participant suggested that:

- Since the Biennial Review is conducted every odd year (2017, 2019, etc.) and presented every even year (2018, 2020, etc.); that the regional JSR should be organized every even year (2018, 2020, etc.).

The organizing team confirmed that the periodicity of JSRs has been settled by stakeholders in the ECOWAP M&E mechanism of 2016 and that the JSR should be undertaken once a year.

### **Presentation and discussion of the ToRs for the JSR and each sub-committee**

The participants questioned:

- The importance of including the questions to be addressed regularly in the JSR
- The extent to which ECOWAS adopts the general JSR guidelines in implementing the regional JSR
- A “Lessons Learned” event will be organized at the CAADP Partnership Platform meeting to address what worked and what needs to be improved for the Biennial Review process and develop best practices for the CAADP M&E implementation.
  - This will be a great opportunity for ECOWAS to attend and draw from the lessons presented to improve the regional JSR process.
- How the JSR can be used as a tool to validate data from the countries in the Biennial Review process.
- The need to review ways to improve data collection in the field.

The participants agreed that:

- There needs to be a way to establish a trend of variables being monitored
- Frequency of regional JSRs should be standardized and communicated.

### **ToRs Review and Discussion**

The participants were pre-assigned groups to discuss and review the following draft ToRs:

- JSR ToR
- JSR Steering Committee
- Technical Review Committee
- Resource Mobilization Committee

The contributions from each group were presented in plenary and included in the annex of this document. The participants highlighted the following points for improvement and clarification such as:

- Policy review should also analyze the consistency of trade and industrial policy with the agriculture policy while caution must be taken not to analyze them (trade and industrial policy).
- The composition of the Steering Committee and the technical committee to include other key stakeholder groups.
- Specific institutions should be assigned and clear expectations and responsibilities delineated.
- Clarity around the deliverables of the entire JSR process and the JSR validation workshop
- Provide a clear strategy for resource mobilization on the regional level as well as the implementation of this strategy.
- Clarity on the sources of financing for the ECOWAP and the JSR process.

The technical organizing team addressed the comments and contributions highlighted in plenary. The team presented the responses in plenary the morning of the second day as detailed in the table below:

**Table 1.0: Finalization of the JSR ToRs**

<b>Feedback from Group Work discussions</b>	<b>Recommendations from the RJSR Workshop Team</b>	<b>Justifications</b>
<b>Draft Terms of Reference (ECOWAS 2018 RJSR) SECTION C – APPROACH</b>		
<b>Need to include ECOWAS Parliament in the list of Stakeholders</b>	Agreed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ECOWAS Parliament’s mandate in legislator matters</li> <li>• The process of policy ratification is accelerated when parliament is involved from the commencement</li> </ul>
<b>Need to include Representatives of AUC/NPCA to the Stakeholder list</b>	Agreed	Due to their oversight role, AUC can always follow the process
<b>Draft Terms of Reference (ECOWAS 2018 RJSR) SECTION C – TECHNICAL COMMITTEE</b>		
<b>More clarity on the Technical team that would support the JSR and the Experts to handle other issues</b>	Follow the normal reporting procedures and guidelines (AToR & ECOWAP M&E Report in line with Malabo) and issues that will be commissioned for special studies	Refer to the list of issues that would require commissioning of studies and their corresponding Researchers/other partners
<b>Are we establishing a new technical Committee? Do we continue working with the Regional M&amp;E Working</b>	To avoid re-inventing the wheel, it is recommended to work with the Regional M&E working group with	Refer to the Regional M&E working group ToR

<b>Group? Do we consider other existing technical experts?</b>	focus on the modality of that group	
<b>Draft Terms of Reference (ECOWAS 2018 RJSR) SECTION D – SPECIFIC ISSUES TO BE COVERED</b>		
<b>Clarity sought by group on the feasibility of tracking indicators from 3-5 years</b>	Confirmed	Not relevant
<b>Agreed that data analysis should go for 3-5 years to ensure nothing is missed even when resources are not available to carry out yearly JSR</b>	Confirmed	Not relevant
<b>JSR should happen yearly as originally designed</b>	Confirmed	Not relevant
<b>New areas to be covered</b>	This heading should change to read “Areas for consideration for commissioning of studies”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None of these issues presented are new as they are reflected in Malabo but to capture them in terms of emphasis</li> <li>• There is the need to caption it differently.</li> </ul>
	The list of issues will remain as they are for further discussions and confirmation when the JSR process kicks off properly	It could be the responsibility of one of the would be sub-committees to better understand and define them
<b>Draft Terms of Reference (ECOWAS 2018 RJSR) SECTION E (TARGETED PARTICIPANTS) – THERE WERE NO ISSUES HIGHLIGHTED</b>		
<b>Draft Terms of Reference (ECOWAS 2018 RJSR) SECTION F - DELIVERABLES</b>		
<b>Policy review to be added to the process</b>	Agreed	This needs to be added to avoid conflict between the Agriculture policy and other policy reviews such as Trade, Commerce, Customs etc.
<b>Draft Terms of Reference (ECOWAS 2018 RJSR) SECTION H/ToR for Steering Committee</b>		
<b>What is the composition of the Steering Committee? Is it all of the ACAF or just a cross section of that?</b>		
<b>To have a Steering Committee of 8 Members</b>	Confirmed with slight amendment (Instead of 8, it is proposed to have 9 members - Hub Rural; +UEMOA & ECOWAS Parliament	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the ECOWAP Institutional Mechanism &amp; other sources, the ACAF is 53 Members with room to coopt.</li> <li>• The Standard JSR guidelines requires the establishment of a Steering Committee (see back of RJSR Assessment report).</li> <li>• Steering Committee must be inclusive group small enough to work with.</li> <li>• Procedurally, the ACAF meets only once a year and so that will not be</li> </ul>

		enough for deliberations, might be too late to address issues during the process; timely interventions.
<b>Secretariat to be based at ECOWAS Commission and Hub rural</b>	Secretariat to be based in ECOWAS	ECOWAS plays the coordination role
<b>Resource Mobilization</b>		
<b>Several mechanisms for resource mobilization</b>	Agreed with emphasis that ECOWAS institutionalizes the annual JSR into their budget	To ensure consistency and results

**Table 2.0 - ECOWAP RJSR 2018 – Stakeholders and their expected contributions**

<b>Stakeholders</b>	<b>Expectations</b>
ECOWAS Commission	Funding, Coordination, Data collection and Analysis
ECOWAS Parliament	Advocacy and Documents Review based on their oversight role
Members State	Data collection, Analysis and Advocacy
Technical and Financial Partners	Funding, Data collection and Analysis
Agricultural Professional Organization	Data collection, Analysis and Advocacy
Civil Society Organization	Data collection, Analysis and Advocacy
Technical Cooperation Organization	Capacity Strengthening, Data collection and analysis
Private Sector	Funding, Data collection and Analysis

**Presentation of draft JSR Road map**

The participants noted:

- A standard regional JSR roadmap should be developed for the process to serve as a reference point for subsequent JSRs.
- The dates proposed in the roadmap should be flexible enough to accommodate external factors but also make sure that the findings and recommendations should be made early enough to be integrated in the planning and budgeting process of the year following the year of the JSR.
- The organizing team should expand on the tasks to include the responsible persons as well as the expected deliverables.

**Table 3.0 – General tasks and periods of implementation presented in plenary**

No	Item	Tentative date	Deliverable	Responsible institution
1	Resource mobilization	February to June 2018	Funds available	DARD/ECOWAS
2	JSR inception meeting	March 2018	Workshop report	JSR secretariat (DARD/ECOWAS)
3	Validation of technical topics by steering committee	March 2018	Topics validated	JSR secretariat (DARD/ECOWAS)
4	Constitute technical review team	March 2018	Team constituted	JSR secretariat (DARD/ECOWAS)
5	Undertake the review	April to August 2018	JSR report finalized	Technical review team
6	Carry out the JSR Validation Workshop	September 2018	Workshop report	JSR secretariat (DARD/ECOWAS)
7	Draw up implementation and follow-up plan for JSR recommendations	October 2018	Recommendations brief available	JSR secretariat (DARD/ECOWAS)
8	Follow up on the implementation of the recommendations	November 2018 to August 2019	Recommendations implemented	JSR secretariat (DARD/ECOWAS)

### **Establishment of the RJSR Committees**

The result of the discussions in the group informed the final proposed JSR sub-committee composition presented in plenary. Participants agreed to the composition of the sub-committees with the recommendation to include specific institutions as well as profiles of the representatives per institution or stakeholder group. The participants highlighted the importance of including as much detail in the road map and sub-committee composition to ensure stakeholders involved are aware of their expectations.

By the end of the workshop, the following sub-committees were established:

- Steering committee
- Technical Review Committee
- Resource Mobilization Committee

### **Composition of the RJSR Steering Committee**

One member representing the following institutions/groups:

1. Chairman of the authority of ECOWAS
2. Clerk of Agriculture Committee - ECOWAS Parliament
3. ECOWAS Member States
4. UEMOA
5. Lead of ECOWAP Donor Group
6. Socio-professional Organizations
7. Civil Society
8. Private Sector
9. ECOWAP Gender Group
10. ECOWAP Youth Group

### ***Composition of RJSR Technical Review Committee***

M&E officers of the following organizations/groups:

1. DARD - ECOWAS Commission
2. Member States (One or two of these will participate as required)
  - a. NAIP Focal Point
  - b. NAIP M&E Officer
  - c. Agriculture Statistics Directorate
  - d. National Bureau of Statistics
3. Non State Actors (One representative of each sub-group)
  - a. Civil Society
  - b. Socio-professional organizations
  - c. Private Sector
4. ECOWAP Gender Group
5. Technical Cooperation Institutions (AfricaRice, CILSS, CORAF, ECOAGRIS, FAO, Hub Rural, IFDC, IFPRI, IITA, MSU, PASANAO, ReSAKSS, RESIMAO)

### ***Composition of RJSR Resource Mobilization Committee***

1. Commissioner / Director ARD ECOWAS
2. Commissioner / Director Agric. UEMOA
3. Lead of ECOWAP donor
4. Director / Federation of Chambers of Commerce of West African industries
5. Non State Actors (One representative of each sub-group)
  - a. Civil Society
  - b. Socio-professional organizations
  - c. Private Sector

### **Inauguration of the RJSR Steering Committee & Launching of the RJSR 2018**

The participants approved the progress of work on the draft terms of reference and proposed subcommittee members. The representative of the host country, Cote d'Ivoire moved for the 2018 regional JSR to be officially launched.