CAADP MDTF: Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) Child Trust Fund (P121913)

Key Dates

Key Project Dates

- Board Approval date: 09-Sep-2010
- Effectiveness Date: 22-Nov-2010
- Planned Mid Term Review Date: --
- Actual Mid-Term Review Date: --
- Original Closing Date: 31-Dec-2013
- Revised Closing Date: 31-Dec-2015

Project Development Objectives

Original project development objective: To improve strategic planning and implementation of agricultural investments at national and regional level.

Revised project development objective: Improved enabling environment for African agricultural programs and policies at national and regional level.

Has the Project Development Objective been changed since Board Approval of the Project Objective?
No

Components

Name

Overall Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Previous Rating</th>
<th>Current Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress towards achievement of PDO</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Implementation Progress (IP)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Status and Key Decisions

Past reporting on project progress up to the end of 2014 was done through Grant Reporting & Monitoring (GRMs). At the end of 2014, a decision was made to switch reporting to the Implementation Status Report system (ISR). This is the first implementation support mission related ISR to be completed following that decision.
Considering the challenges faced at the launch of the Child Trust Fund (CTF), including the lack of awareness, understanding and buy-in of the CAADP process in the region, progress towards achievement of the ECCAS CTF development objective is considered satisfactory. 2011 marked a good and encouraging start for the grant. This was followed by an overall implementation slowdown of the grant in 2012, then a significant increase in the implementation momentum and consolidation of results in 2013, 2014 and half of 2015. In December 2013 the grant was successfully restructured to include an extension of the grant for another two years and an additional US$ 2 million to continue to support and advance the CAADP process, as well as address new CAADP priorities and emerging challenges in the region. As part of the restructuring and in line with a larger initiative in CAADP to incorporate more outcome oriented objectives and results measures, the grant's Project Development Objective (PDO) and associated Results Framework were modified. The CTF’s original PDO statement “to improve strategic planning and implementation of agricultural investments at national and regional level” was revised to “improved enabling environment for African agricultural programs and policies at national and regional level”. Changes to the result frameworks include application of a common set of intermediate results areas and new results indicators to ensure a harmonized approach between the main Multi-donor Trust Fund (MDTF) and the ECCAS CTF. The new indicators were identified to better capture outcomes instead of outputs, and to better measure qualitative changes at institutional and policy levels. The total grant amount was increased to $5.9 million. The additional funds have been helping to solidify gains and scale up achievements attained on the ground in the past three years of CTF implementation. Specifically, the additional funds are financing the costs associated with completion of the CAADP process in the sub-region, scale-up of certain CAADP activities including strengthening the delivery of current CAADP commitment, and addressing new CAADP priorities and challenges (including the implementation of the CAADP Malabo Declaration). The latter includes expanding support for targeted technical assistance, policy dialogue and programming at the national and regional levels, resource mobilization for the implementation of the National Agriculture Investment Plans (NAIPs) and the Regional Agriculture Investment Plan (RAIP). The ECCAS CTF is scheduled to close on December 31, 2015. ECCAS has been fully briefed on the grant closing procedures. ECCAS is also aware that all grant activities must be fully completed by or before the grant closing date, and that any expenditures incurred after the closing date will be deemed ineligible under the grant, and must be paid for by the ECCAS Secretariat.

**Key achievements:** The CAADP process is moving in the region with varying degrees of advancement in the individual member countries. As of the end of the mission on June 16, 2015, all 10 ECCAS member countries and the region have signed and validated their individual CAADP compacts. Eight countries have also prepared, signed and validated their respective NAIPs. The remaining 2 countries, i.e. Equatorial Guinea and Angola, are expected to validate their NAIPs before the end of the mission year. The RAIP has also been validated. NPCA has conducted the external technical reviews of the NAIPs for 5 countries: Burundi, Cameroon, CAR, DRC and Sao-Tome. Three countries (Burundi, DRC and CAR) have held business meetings to attract development partners and private sector investment for their NAIPs. The outstanding key activities include conducting the remaining external technical reviews of the NAIPs and RAIP, and associated business meetings. For most of the ECCAS member countries, these will be conducted over the course of this year with some expected spill over into 2016, in particular the business meetings. Other achievements include strengthening of ECCAS’ institutional capacity both for its Agriculture & Rural Development (ARD) Service and in fiduciary management in the Department for Programs, Budget, Administration, and Human Resources (DPBARH); significant improvement of ECCAS’ internal procedures and manuals; significant improvement of ECCAS – ARD expertise, work environment and allocation of offices well equipped for modern working conditions. The CTF also helped to expand communication on CAADP in the region and ECCAS has developed a well functioning dedicated window on the ARD expertise, work environment and allocation of offices well equipped for modern working conditions. Member countries have also developed website information on their respective CAADP process. Consequently, the visibility of the ECCAS Agricultural Service at the regional level and within the member countries has increased very substantially. In terms of capacity building, fiduciary reporting software made available for the Agriculture Service under the CTF is now progressively getting used more institution wide. On a broader political regional basis, four critical decisions in further support of agriculture in the region were agreed upon by the region’s Council of Ministers of Agriculture in October 2014 and further confirmed by the 16th Conference of Central Africa Heads of States in May 2015. These include the adoption of: (i) a common agriculture policy; (ii) a regional policy on food security for Central Africa; (iii) a regional investment program on food security and nutrition; and (iv) capacity strengthening for agriculture and rural development at regional level. ECCAS is now focused on winding down and completing outstanding CTF activities in the remaining implementation timeframe.

**Procurement.** Procurement performance has been rated "moderately satisfactory" throughout implementation. Most of the major procurement activities were conducted during the earlier phase (1st and 2nd year) of grant implementation. For the former, it was the recruitment of the four experts which made up ECCAS’ core grant implementation team. For the latter, it was the contracting of three big technical assistance contracts with FAO, IFPRI and Hub-Rural,UNOPS to support ECCAS in launching and advancing the CAADP process in the region. There has been limited procurement activity for the reporting period. The main procurement issue is a delay in completing the recruitment process for an external auditor to conduct the 2014 and 2015 audits. The process is expected to be completed by the end of August 2015. The mission informed ECCAS that all ongoing contracts for goods, works and services will need to be completed by or before the closing date.

**Financial Management.** To date, 85% of the $5.9 million grant has been disbursed and ECCAS is on track to disburse the remaining funds per its 2015 annual work plan and budget by grant closing on December 31, 2015. Key issues for the reporting period include: (i) a delay in the submission of the 2014 audit, which was due on June 30, 2015, but which has yet to be conducted due to procurement complications; and (ii) continued payment under the grant of the salary of the former M&E Specialist who became an ECCAS civil servant as he was promoted to Agriculture Service Program Coordinator effective February 28, 2015. Per the Trust Fund Grant Agreement, the salaries of ECCAS civil servants are ineligible under the grant. ECCAS has agreed to reimburse the funds to the grant account for the period between February 28 to June, 2015. ECCAS has also been requested to formally end the grant funded M&E Specialist contract as of February 28. As a result, FM performance is rated "moderately satisfactory".

**Challenges.** One of the most persistent challenges has been the effective monitoring and evaluation of the CAADP process in Africa in general, in the ECCAS region, as well as at country level; this relates to effective and timely data collection for the CTF Results Frameworks (RFs), in particular. From grant effectiveness to December 31, 2013, the RF indicators were predominantly quantitative and focused on outputs. Following the grant restructuring in 2014, new indicators were added to the RF to better capture outcomes and qualitative changes at institutional and policy levels. With these
changes, monitoring and data collection became more challenging. At ECCAS, this situation was further affected by the retirement of the Agriculture Program Coordinator seven months ago and ECCAS’ subsequent decision to nominate the M&E specialist as the new Agriculture Program Coordinator; this left the M&E specialist position vacant. In light of this, the World Bank team is providing technical assistance to support the ECCAS team on the remaining M&E activities to ensure that, at a minimum, ECCAS is able to produce performance reports and fully populate its CTF Results Frameworks by December 31, 2015. Another short term challenge is for ECCAS to complete the recruitment procedure of a new External Auditor (for FY14 and FY15): this is expected to be completed by the end of August 2015.

In the long term, especially due to ECCAS current funding issues from member States and in the absence of a funding mechanism such as the CTF or other reliable funding sources, ECCAS faces a number of key challenges. These include: (i) a long term vision and internal resource mobilization for staffing and capacity building to carry forward the region’s agriculture agenda, especially in the context of the Malabo Declaration and country engagement in advancing the CAADP; (ii) sustainability of investments made at ECCAS, including institutional capacity building, retention of the technical staff capacity which has been built-up, as well as other investments made during the course of implementation of the CTF; and (iii) further development and capacity strengthening to implement and monitor the various regional agriculture policies and anticipated agriculture investment projects. The Bank CTF management team has continuously made note of these challenges in its mission reports and through official correspondence which called for intervention and greater attention from the highest ECCAS institutional level. Discussions are currently underway between ECCAS and other potential donors to try and close a funding gap of about US$0.5 million / year for 2016 and 2017 to keep the momentum created by the CTF going.
Results

Project Development Objective Indicators

1. Effectiveness of national structures in agricultural policy making (disaggregated by countries and type of changes achieved).
   (Percentage, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>01-Jan-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16-Jun-2015</td>
<td>31-Dec-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
The level of effectiveness aims at evaluating the contribution of CAADP to changes that occurred in the agricultural sector. Each respondent to the Monkey Survey considers that CAADP has significantly contributed to achieving progress in the agricultural sector. CAADP gives a strong impetus to the agricultural sector in the eight ECCAS member States involved in the process. The level of effectiveness (taking into account levels 4 and 5 of participation, meaning important and very important) reaches 100% divided as follows:

1. Important: 33.33% (Congo-Brazzaville and CAR)
2. Very important: 66.67% (Chad, Angola, Cameroon and Equatorial Guinea)

Regarding the type of changes achieved, CAADP contributes to giving more importance to the agricultural sector. Under this framework, all the countries have launched CAADP processes that were not previously considered as priorities.

2. Inclusiveness of national structures in agricultural policy making (disaggregated by countries and type of changes achieved).
   (Percentage, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>73.68</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>01-Jan-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16-Jun-2015</td>
<td>31-Dec-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
The level of inclusiveness determines the level of participation of different stakeholders (government, farmers’ organizations, CSOs, private sector and others) in events and processes held by each country. All listed actors are strongly involved in decision-making in the agricultural sector. In terms of inclusiveness, the level of participation of the listed stakeholders (government, farmers’ organizations, CSOs, private sector and others) is as follows:

3. Very weak: 6.32%
4. Weak: 8.42%
5. Average: 11.58%
6. High: 20.00%
7. Very high: 53.68%
The global level of participation of the listed stakeholders is as follows (taking into account levels 4 and 5 of participation, meaning High and Very High):
8. Government: 100%
9. Farms’ organizations: 75%
10. CSOs: 65%
11. Private sector: 65%
12. Others: 60%
The level of inclusiveness disaggregated by country is as follows (taking into account levels 4 and 5 of participation, meaning High and Very High):
13. Gabon: 50.00%
14. Chad: 93.34%
15. Sao Tome e Principe: 88.89%
16. Congo-Brazzaville: 90.00%
17. CAR: 33.33%
18. Angola: 93.33%
19. Cameroon: 73.33%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of investment plans and programs demonstrating resource alignment with the Regional Compact/CAADP evidenced priority sectors. (Percentage, Custom)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
The global level of alignment of investment plans and programs with all four CAADP principles reaches 88.33% (taking into account levels 4 and 5 of alignment, Somewhat Aligned and Totally Aligned). The level of alignment of all the processes, plans and policies with all four CAADP principles is as follows:
20. 1.67% are only a little aligned
21. 10% are fairly aligned
22. 60% are somewhat aligned
23. 28.33% are totally aligned

Level of alignment of investment plans and programs with CAADP principles:
24. Transparency and Accountability: 80%
25. Local Ownership and Responsibility: 86.66%
26. Partnerships and Collective Responsibility: 93.33%
Inclusiveness: 93.33%
4. Percentage of stakeholders satisfied with the quality and utility of CAADP related sector planning, programming and accountability mechanisms and structures. (Percentage, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>68.71</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>01-Jan-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16-Jun-2015</td>
<td>31-Dec-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
The global satisfaction level of partners regarding the technical assistance received reaches 68.71% (taking into account levels 4 and 5 of satisfaction, meaning satisfied and very satisfied).
The global satisfaction level of partners regarding technical assistance received is disaggregated as follows:
27. 3.91% of respondents are strongly unsatisfied
28. 10.06% of respondents are not satisfied
29. 17.32% of respondents are neutral
30. 53.63% of respondents are satisfied
31. 15.08% of respondents are very satisfied
The satisfaction level of the different partners regarding technical assistance is as follows (taking into account levels 4 and 5 of satisfaction, meaning satisfied and very satisfied):
32. Government: 79.41%
33. Farmers’ organizations: 75.76%
34. CSOs: 72.73%
35. Development partners: 75.76%
36. Private sector: 48.48%
Others: 58.82%

5. Number of African agricultural policy positions advocated at regional (Ministerial) level. (Number, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>01-Jan-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16-Jun-2015</td>
<td>31-Dec-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
Data for this indicator will be collected by the African Union Commission (AUC) and is not yet available.

Overall Comments
Data for this indicator will be collected by the African Union and is not yet available.

Intermediate Results Indicators
1.1 ECCAS CAADP operational Team fully resourced. (Yes/No, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>01-Jan-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16-Jun-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
The ECCAS CAADP team is fully resourced, despite the fact that the M&E specialist became Project Coordinator when the Head of ARD Service retired in January 2015. It has been discussed with the Bank team and understood that the project would not recruit a new M&E specialist for the remaining few months before closure; instead, the Bank agreed to provide specific Technical Assistance in the field of M&E.

1.2 ECCAS Regional Agricultural Investment Plan (RAIP) completed and approved. (Yes/No, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>01-Jan-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16-Jun-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
The CAADP Compact was signed in July 2013.

ECCAS signed the Regional CAADP Compact (PRIASAN) in September 2015. However, the External Technical Review has not yet taken place and the Business Meeting has not been organized because of financial issues encountered by NPCA.

1.3 Number of countries in the current year where CAADP principles are embraced in processes, plans and policies. (Number, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>01-Jan-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>31-Dec-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
The number is based on a matrix of activities which include the CAADP Compact, Technical Reviews, Investment Plans, Joint Sector Reviews, Mutual Accountability Framework, and Partnership Platform (PP) participation.

Chad, Angola, Cameroon, Equatorial Guinea, Congo Brazzaville and the Central African Republic (CAR) have adopted processes, plans and policies aligned with CAADP principles. The level of alignment is as follows:

37. 10% are fairly aligned
38. 60% are somewhat aligned
39. 28.33% are totally aligned
The overall level of alignment of all the processes, plans and policies according to each CAADP principle is as follows (taking into account levels 4 and 5 of alignment, meaning Somewhat Aligned and Totally Aligned):
40. 80.00% for the Transparency and Accountability principle
41. 86.66% for the Local Ownership and Responsibility principle
42. 93.33% for the Partnerships and Collective Responsibility principle
43. 93.33% for the Inclusiveness principle

All the processes, plans and policies are in large part aligned with the Inclusiveness principle (93.33%), when taking into account all levels of alignment. This percentage of alignment is the same as for the Partnerships and Collective Responsibility principle. However, 6.67% of all processes, plans and policies are “only a little aligned” with the Partnerships and Collective Responsibility principle, while the same percentage (6.67%) of all processes, plans and policies are “fairly aligned” with the Inclusiveness principle.

The level of alignment of all the processes, plans and policies with the Inclusiveness principle is as follows:
44. 6.67% are fairly aligned
45. 60% are somewhat aligned
46. 33.33% are totally aligned.

1.4 Numbers of RAIP/NIAP technical reviews in which cross-cutting issues have been positively addressed. (Number, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>01-Jan-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16-Jun-2015</td>
<td>31-Dec-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
Cross-cutting issues include, *inter alia*, gender, climate change, environment and poverty.

6 Technical Reviews of NIAPs have been undertaken, as follows:

4 Internal Technical Reviews
47. Cameroon (January 10-15, 2014)
48. Sao Tome e Principe (August 13, 2014)
49. Chad (January 20, 2014)
50. Congo-Brazzaville (December 10, 2014)

2 External Technical Reviews
51. Cameroon (August 20-27, 2014)
52. Sao Tome e Principe (August 25 to September 2, 2014)
### 2.1 Permanent Committees for Knowledge Management and Evaluation are operational in all ECCAS Member States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Number, Custom)</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>01-Jan-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16-Jun-2015</td>
<td>31-Dec-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

No member States have operational Permanent Committees for Knowledge Management and Evaluation (National SAKSS). This scheme requires technical and financial resources that are currently not available in ECCAS member States.

### 2.2 Permanent Regional Committee for Knowledge Management and Evaluation is operationalized (Yes/No, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Yes/No, Custom)</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>01-Jan-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16-Jun-2015</td>
<td>31-Dec-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

ECCAS has no operational Permanent Committees for Knowledge Management and Evaluation (ReSAKSS). This scheme requires technical and financial resources that are currently not available at ECCAS. A decision was made with the Bank to abandon the establishment of a SAKSS/ReSAKSS system in the region and at country level, taking into account that (i) this would require more time and money (not consistent with CTF timeframe) and that (ii) focus should instead be geared at operationalizing a simplified M&E mechanism.

### 2.3 Levels, quality and satisfaction of/with responsiveness of ECCAS to stakeholders (Percentage, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Percentage, Custom)</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>28.58</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>01-Jan-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16-Jun-2015</td>
<td>31-Dec-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

Equatorial Guinea has not responded to this question in the Survey monkey.

According to the data extracted from the Survey Monkey:

53. 42.86% of respondents are not satisfied with ECCAS responsiveness to stakeholders (Chad, CAR and Cameroon)
54. 28.57% of respondents are neutral (moderately satisfied) with ECCAS responsiveness to stakeholders (Gabon and Congo-Brazzaville)
55. 14.29% of respondents are satisfied with ECCAS responsiveness to stakeholders (Sao Tome e Principe)
56. 14.29% of respondents are very satisfied with ECCAS responsiveness to stakeholders (Angola)

The overall level of satisfaction with ECCAS responsiveness to stakeholders reaches 28.58% (taking into account levels 4 and 5 of
satisfaction, meaning Satisfied and Very Satisfied).

### 3.1 Number of mutually agreed technical assistance initiatives and other capacity strengthening initiatives to support country and regional level activities. (Number, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>01-Jan-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16-Jun-2015</td>
<td>31-Dec-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
TA initiatives include ECCAS collaboration with IFPRI, FAO, Hub rural, European Center for Development Policy Management (ECDPM), World Bank, AUC, NPCA and other technical partners.

ECCAS has 10 mutually agreed technical assistance initiatives and other capacity strengthening initiatives with:
- 57. FAO
- 58. IFPRI
- 59. Hub Rural
- 60. CORAF
- 61. Centre Phytosanitaire Interafricain
- 62. World Bank
- 63. AUC
- 64. NPCA
- 65. GIZ
- 66. ECDPM

### 3.2 Levels of demand for CAADP information and/or technologies. (Percentage, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>01-Jan-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16-Jun-2015</td>
<td>31-Dec-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
Only four countries (Chad, Angola, Cameroon and Equatorial Guinea; i.e. half of the surveyed countries) have replied to this Survey Monkey question. In this regard, we can assume that these four countries have requested and received CAADP information and/or
3.3 Levels of satisfaction with, and utilization of CAADP information and technologies. (Percentage, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>01-Jan-2014</td>
<td>16-Jun-2015</td>
<td>31-Dec-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
All ECCAS member States (8 countries) that are part of the CAADP process have responded to this question.

Data collected by the Survey Monkey shows that:

67. 12.5% are not satisfied (CAR)
68. 62.5% are moderately satisfied/average with and utilization of CAADP information and technologies (Gabon, Chad, Sao Tome e Principe, Congo-Brazzaville and Cameroon)
69. 25% respondents are satisfied with and utilization of CAADP information and technologies (Angola and Equatorial Guinea)

The overall level of satisfaction with CAADP information and technologies reaches 25% (taking into account levels 4 and 5 of satisfaction, meaning Satisfied and Very Satisfied).

4.1 Levels of partner satisfaction with partnerships. (Percentage, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>01-Jan-2014</td>
<td>16-Jun-2015</td>
<td>31-Dec-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
Equatorial Guinea has not responded to the Survey Monkey question related to this indicator.

The level of satisfaction with AUC, NPCA and ECCAS reaches a collective average of 19.05% (taking into account levels 4 and 5 of satisfaction, meaning satisfied and very satisfied).

AUC:

70. 28.57% of respondents are strongly unsatisfied (Chad and Sao Tome e Principe)
71. 42.86% of respondents are not satisfied (Gabon, Congo-Brazzaville and CAR)
72. 14.29% of respondents are neutral (Angola)
73. 14.29% of respondents are satisfied (Cameroon)
NPCA:
74. 57.14% of respondents are not satisfied (Gabon, Chad, Sao Tome e Principe and CAR)
75. 28.57% of respondents are neutral (Congo-Brazzaville and Angola)
76. 14.29% of respondents are satisfied (Cameroon)
ECCAS:
77. 42.86% of respondents are not satisfied (Chad, CAR and Cameroon)
78. 28.57% of respondents are neutral (Gabon and Congo-Brazzaville)
79. 14.29% of respondents are satisfied (Sao Tome e Principe)
80. 14.29% of respondents are very satisfied (Angola)
Regarding the quality of the external technical reviews:
81. 100% of respondents are satisfied based on 2 countries only (Cameroon and Sao Tome e Principe)

## 4.2 Number of partnerships for effective technical support and joint assistance developed (as measured by number of formal MOUs, TORs, contracts, conventions or frameworks) (Number, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments
Partnerships are defined as engagement/collaboration among countries, RECs, specialized thematic/pillar related institutions, civil society, private sector, donors, or other development agencies to support CAADP related activities.

6 partnerships were established with:
82.  FAO
83.  IFPRI
84.  Hub Rural
85.  PROPAC
86.  CORAF
87.  Centre Phytosanitaire interafricain
Interafricain

Overall Comments

## Data on Financial Performance

### Disbursements (by loan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Loan/Credit/TF</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Currency</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Cancelled</th>
<th>Disbursed</th>
<th>Undisbursed</th>
<th>Disbursed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9/14/2015 Public Disclosure Copy
Key Dates (by loan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Loan/Credit/TF</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>Signing Date</th>
<th>Effectiveness Date</th>
<th>Orig. Closing Date</th>
<th>Rev. Closing Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Cumulative Disbursements

Restructuring History

There has been no restructuring to date.

Related Project(s)

There are no related projects.