



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations

AFRICAN COMMISSION ON AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS

Twenty-Seventh Session

15 – 18 November 2021, Virtual Host – Dakar, Senegal

AGENDA ITEM 3

REVIEW THE WORK ON ALIGNMENT WITH THE MALABO FRAMEWORK IN THE CONTEXT OF THE 3RD BIENNIAL REVIEW

Dorian Kalamvrezos Navarro

Statistician

Overview

- Update Members on FAO's engagement in the 3rd Biennial Review of the Malabo commitments, aiming to better align related SDG indicators and Malabo indicators, as first presented in AFCAS paper 19-E-44 in 2019
- Improved coordination with the AUC and a more systematic engagement by FAO in the proceedings of the 3rd Biennial Review has helped to align certain indicator methodologies and reduce discrepancies in country data
- Nevertheless, there is still important scope for further alignment and a more meaningful collaboration with the AUC, given that institutional constraints and data sharing concerns hampered FAO's ability to access country data and thus promote a better alignment of relevant indicators.
- A full assessment of the alignment is not yet possible given that the 3rd Biennial Review is still ongoing and country scores have not yet been published.

Background

- AFCAS paper 19-E-44 had presented an analysis of the current state of alignment between the different indicator frameworks in the context of the 2nd Biennial Review,
- It also provided a number of concrete recommendations for addressing remaining discrepancies and improving alignment
- The 3rd Biennial Review started in the fall of 2020, and FAO engaged proactively in numerous Technical Working Groups (TWGs) with the aim of addressing the various issues of alignment

FAO priorities for engagement in the 3rd BR

| Task Force TWG | FAO engagement priority |
|--|---|
| Malabo Theme 2: Investment Finance in Agriculture | Achieve a better alignment of SDG indicator 2.a.1 and Malabo indicator 2.1i – Government agriculture expenditure and eliminate discrepancies between data reported for countries |
| Malabo Theme 3: Ending Hunger | Eliminate discrepancies between data reported for SDG indicators 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 and the corresponding Malabo indicators 3.5iv and 3.5vii. |
| Malabo Theme 5: Intra-African Trade in Agriculture Commodities and services | Replace the defunct Malabo indicator 5.2ii: Domestic Food Price Volatility Index with SDG indicator 2.c.1: Indicator of food price anomalies (IFPA), and ensure consistency in data reported |

Priority 1: alignment of Government Expenditure in Agriculture data

- Malabo indicator 2.1i, “*Government Agriculture Expenditure*” is methodologically equivalent to the numerator of SDG indicator 2.a.1, i.e. “*Agriculture share of Government Expenditure*”
- But there are systematic discrepancies in values reported by the same countries for these two indicators under both frameworks
- FAO engaged systematically in the relevant TWG and prepared an analytical note for the AUC exploring the factors behind these discrepancies and proposing steps to address them
- In particular, FAO proposed to review the new country data on Malabo indicator 2.1i, but this was not accepted by the AUC based on data confidentiality concerns
- Without access to the data, FAO cannot currently assess the degree of alignment until the data are officially released

Priority 2: alignment of food security data

- the Malabo indicator framework includes two indicators (3.5iv *Prevalence of Undernourished*, 3.5vii *Reduction in the prevalence of adult individuals found to be food insecure*) that are ostensibly fully equivalent to SDG indicators 2.1.1 and 2.1.2
- But there are systematic discrepancies in values reported by the same countries for these two indicators under both frameworks
- FAO engaged systematically in the relevant TWG and also delivered two trainings for national and regional experts, highlighting a number of online resources for existing data
- However, FAO was not granted access to country data and therefore cannot currently assess the degree of alignment until the data are officially released

Priority 3: harmonize food price volatility indicators

- The Malabo framework included an indicator of food price volatility called “5.2ii Domestic Food Price Volatility Index”, that was previously curated by FAO but which had already been discontinued and replaced by SDG indicator 2.c.1, the “Indicator of Food Price Anomalies”.
- FAO proactively engaged in the relevant TWG and prepared a detailed note proposing the replacement of Malabo indicator 5.2.ii with SDG indicator 2.c.1. **The proposal was accepted by the AUC and the relevant TWG.**
- FAO also shared with the AUC the latest (2020) country data as soon as they became available in April 2021.
- However, without access to country data it is therefore not currently possible to assess the degree of alignment until the data are officially released

Other areas of alignment

- FAO also supported countries report on Malabo indicator 6.1i on the *Percentage of farm, pastoral, and fisher households that have improved their resilience capacity to climate and weather related shocks*, even though this indicator does not have a directly corresponding SDG indicator.
- In particular, FAO provided trainings at regional and country levels, supporting countries apply the Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis (RIMA) analytical approach to measuring household resilience capacity, and in this way be able to derive Malabo indicator 6.1i.

Key recommendations

- AFCAS members are invited to reflect on how FAO can better support the next BR process and ensure that national CAADP focal points **report data that is consistent** with what the National Statistical Office or other national reporting entity reports to FAO under the SDG reporting framework.
- For instance, there could be a **single, designated group of focal points** at country level that includes both CAADP and NSO SDG focal points to:
 - ✓ ensure coherent reporting on both reporting frameworks
 - ✓ prioritize the implementation (or “domestication”) of SDG indicators
 - ✓ optimize capacity development efforts on these indicators.
- AFCAS member are invited to make a stronger call on **FAO to be able to access data submitted by countries under the Biennial Review process**, and therefore be in a position to identify and address potential discrepancies promptly, before data is officially published.
- For instance, this could be done through tripartite working groups consisting of AUC, FAO and respective country experts, which will conduct a joint data validation exercise once country data are collected for the next Biennial Review

Thank you
for your attention

Doriamkalamvrezos.navarro@fao.org