

March 2012



منظمة الأغذية
والزراعة للأمم
المتحدة

联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food and
Agriculture
Organization
of the
United Nations

Organisation des
Nations Unies
pour
l'alimentation
et l'agriculture

Продовольственная и
сельскохозяйственная
организация
Объединенных
Наций

Organización
de las
Naciones Unidas
para la
Alimentación y la
Agricultura

FAO Regional Conference for Africa

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Brazzaville, Congo, 23-27 April 2012

**THE CAADP IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGE, 2012-2013 -
STRENGTHENING CAPACITY FOR LINKING COMPACTS AND
INVESTMENT PLANS TO POLICY AND BUDGET PROCESSES AND
INNOVATIVE FINANCING MECHANISMS**

Table of Contents

| | Pages |
|---|-------|
| Executive Summary | 2 |
| Suggested action by FAO..... | 2 |
| I. Introduction | 3 |
| II. CAADP Progress and Mainstreaming Sectors 2010-2011 | 3 |
| III. Moving the CAADP Agenda Forward in 2012-2013 | 5 |
| IV. Responding to the Challenge in the Horn of Africa..... | 7 |
| V. Appendix: FAO support to CAADP in Africa (Updated February 2012) | 9 |

This document is printed in limited numbers to minimize the environmental impact of FAO's processes and contribute to climate neutrality. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and to avoid asking for additional copies. Most FAO meeting documents are available on the Internet at www.fao.org

Executive Summary

Over the last decade, the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) has evolved into a continent-wide framework whose vision and guiding principles have galvanized the region's attention on the critical need for sustained investment to accelerate agricultural growth and progress toward poverty reduction and food and nutrition security in sub-Saharan Africa.

This document reviews the progress achieved in advancing the CAADP agenda in 2010-2011 and discusses the challenges of strengthening the capacity of member countries and RECs to move forward in implementing CAADP investment plans and programmes. It also examines current efforts to effectively link emergency responses to the current food security crises in the Horn of Africa and the Sahel to longer-term investment plans and programmes that contribute to reducing structural vulnerabilities and improving resilience.

Since 2009, 29 countries and one regional economic community (ECOWAS) have successfully completed their CAADP Compacts, 22 have completed national agricultural investment plans and six countries have received 270 million USD from the Global Agriculture Food Security and Programme (GAFSP). Numerous countries have also incorporated fisheries, forestry, livestock and nutrition programmes and investments into their national frameworks.

In order to continue serving as a point of reference and coordinated framework for agricultural and food system development in the region, this paper discusses potential measures that member countries, RECs and NPCA could consider in 2012-2013 as actions to energize the CAADP implementation process and create opportunities for translating investment plans and programmes into concrete actions on the ground. Successful efforts will depend partly on the capacity of national and regional actors to link their CAADP compacts and investment plans to policy and budget processes and innovative financing mechanisms.

The recent crisis in the Horn of Africa and the current situation of low rainfall and acute food insecurity in the Sahel underscore the importance of a twin track approach consisting of short-term measures to respond to the immediate needs of vulnerable populations linked to and coherent with the requisite, longer-term policy and investment to address the underlying structural factors needed to improve resilience and improve human welfare.

Suggested Action by Regional Conference

The Conference is invited to review and endorse the following:

- FAO's approach to support the implementation of CAADP.
- FAO's support to further develop processes that can translate CAADP Compacts and Investment Plans into tangible programmes that produce positive impacts on the livelihoods of producers, pastoralists and fishermen and women of Africa.

The Conference may also request FAO to:

- Continue support to member countries through the development of Compacts and National Investment Plans and build capacity for the implementation of CAADP.
- Support mainstreaming or incorporating livestock, forestry and fisheries better into the CAADP process
- Strengthen the capacity of member countries to linking Compacts and National Investment Plans to policy and budget processes and innovative financing mechanism.

I. Introduction

Since the first meeting of the Heads of State and Government Implementation Committee (HSGIC) of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), in Abuja, Nigeria in 2001, and continuing unremittingly over the last decade, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) has served as a strategic partner to the NEPAD Planning and Coordination Agency Secretariat (NPCA), the African Union Commission's (AUC) Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture (DREA), Regional Economic Communities (RECs) and member countries in offering assistance and expertise to the design and implementation of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP). During this period, CAADP has evolved into a continent-wide framework whose vision and guiding principles have galvanized the region's attention on the critical need for sustained investment to accelerate agricultural growth and progress toward poverty reduction and food and nutrition security in sub-Saharan Africa.

In 2012, CAADP remains pertinent and critically important to the continent's goals of feeding itself and, through increased intra-African trade and exports to the rest of world, a dynamic source of growth that can contribute to broad-based income and employment in sub-Saharan Africa. This document reviews the progress achieved in advancing the CAADP agenda in 2010-2011 and discusses the challenges of strengthening the capacity of member countries and RECs to link CAADP compacts and investment plans to policy and budget processes and innovative financing mechanisms. It also examines current efforts to effectively link emergency responses to the current food security crises in the Horn of Africa and the Sahel to longer-term investment plans and programmes that contribute to reducing structural vulnerabilities and improving resilience.

II. CAADP Progress and Mainstreaming Sectors 2010-2011

Following its endorsement by African Ministers for Agriculture in June 2002 at the FAO Regional Conference for Africa, and subsequent adoption by African Heads of State and Government at their Summit in Maputo, Mozambique in 2003, FAO has worked to support AUC and NPCA in developing and translating this shared African-led CAADP vision for sustained, broad-based agricultural growth in sub-Saharan Africa into concrete steps and actions at continental, regional and national levels.

To reach the agreed goal of average annual growth of 6 percent in agriculture, Heads of State agreed in 2003 to commit at least 10 percent of national budgets to agricultural development by 2008. An investment portfolio valued at USD 251 billion was subsequently developed for the 12 year period 2003-2015, with approximately half to be derived from domestic resources (public and private) and the remaining half generated from external grants and borrowing. The CAADP programme is designed around four key pillars: (i) extending the area under sustainable land management and reliable water control systems; (ii) improving rural infrastructure and trade-related capacities for improved market access; (iii) increasing food supply and reducing hunger; and (iv) agricultural research, technology dissemination and adoption.

Between 2003 and 2008, despite significant efforts to solidify commitment to the programme's vision and principles, CAADP results on the ground were less than expected. In 2009, however, the G8 donors' pledged at Aquila, Italy to allocate USD 22.2 billion in support of the global food and nutrition security, of which almost USD 1 billion has been allocated to the Global Agriculture Food Security and Programme (GAFSP), to jump-started the CAADP process. The hope of accessing a portion of these funds served as an incentive for member countries to accelerate the CAADP formulation process so that by the end of 2011, 29 countries and one REC (ECOWAS) had successfully completed their CAADP Compacts.

In this context, FAO provided technical support for different aspects of the CAADP process in numerous countries: preparation of background documents, contribution to peer review, and active participation in the roundtables that were organized to sign the Compacts in Benin, Central African Republic, Guinea, Kenya, Lesotho, Mauritania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, United Republic of Tanzania and Togo; finalization of Investment Plans in Cape Verde, Côte D'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana,

Guinea Bissau, Malawi, Niger, Nigeria, United Republic of Tanzania and Uganda; and participation in the related Business Meetings.

Sector Mainstreaming

The calls for and efforts to “mainstream” various sectors (e.g., fisheries, forestry, gender, employment, livestock and nutrition) into the CAADP process stemmed from the recognition that many CAADP Compacts and National Agricultural Investment Plans (NAIPs) have emphasized crop production and trade-related issues to the neglect of other sectors. These other sectors have either not been sufficiently elaborated in the CAADP Compacts or have been allocated relatively minimal funding in the NAIPs. In one country, for example, livestock programmes were not sufficiently developed and the budgetary allocation in the NAIP was significantly less (1 percent of the total value of the NAIP) than the livestock sector’s contribution to agricultural GDP (14 percent).

In most cases, these omissions or underweighting can be attributed to the hurried manner in which many investment plans and programmes were formulated in order to meet GAFSP submission deadlines. The limited number and capacity of sector experts who were actually involved in the formulation process also contributed to these imbalances and inconsistencies between content of the investment plans and programmes.

There is ample evidence to make the case for mainstreaming or incorporating livestock, forestry and fisheries into the CAADP process given their important contributions to agricultural development. These sectors, together, account for approximately one third of Africa’s agricultural Gross Domestic Product (GDP), the bulk generated by the livestock sector. The three sectors’ contribution to sustainable agriculture is significant both economically and environmentally. Well over 50 percent of Africa’s arable land is cultivated under a variety of mixed farming systems including mixed crop/livestock, agro-pastoral and pastoral, forest-based and coastal artisanal fishing.

Against this backdrop, FAO collaborated with the NEPAD Secretariat in 2006 to prepare a Companion Document (CAADP/CD) with investment plans for these sectors totalling an additional USD 103 billion. This document incorporated livestock infrastructure investment in every CAADP pillar, with particular attention to the third pillar centered on ‘Improving Infrastructure and Trade-related Capacities for Market Access’. The forestry component was modified to include four critical priority areas: i) improvement of the policy, legislative and planning framework; ii) strengthening the institutional structures to implement policies and legislation; iii) increased investment, especially to implement sustainable forest management and to enhance the availability of goods and services; and iv) complementary investment for industrial development and supporting infrastructure. Finally, fishery sector mainstreaming focused on the integration of fisheries and aquaculture into the wider CAADP framework, emphasizing the benefits to African stakeholders of increased productivity, trade and improved environmental management.

Based on the work in the Companion Document, fifteen countries subsequently incorporated these sectors in their national investment plans (e.g. Benin, Cape Verde, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, United Republic of Tanzania and Togo). Comparable FAO support is currently being provided to Côte d’Ivoire, Guinea Bissau, Guinea Conakry, Lesotho, Mauritania, Mozambique, Swaziland and Zambia.

On the nutrition side, interest in incorporating a nutrition dimension in the CAADP multiplied following the increased attention on livelihoods and malnutrition during the 2008 food and financial crisis. This situation spurred the African Union to reaffirm its commitment to food and nutrition security in the context of CAADP-Pillar 3. A nutrition review of CAADP investment plans found that nutrition objectives and activities were inconsistently incorporated and allocated resources in the majority of countries. Although some countries included nutrition in their overall CAADP framework to promote dietary diversity, nutrition education and food safety, in most cases, the programmes remain insufficiently developed. The review further identified several areas of improvement to augment the nutritional impact of interventions: strengthening inter-sectoral collaboration; fortifying food; improving nutrition assessments and targeting of vulnerable households, women of reproductive

age and children under five; and enhancing information management and more systematic monitoring and evaluation.

Building on the guidelines developed by NPCA and development partners to mainstream nutrition in NAIPs, FAO and NPCA initiated collaboration in 2011 with nutrition experts in member countries, RECs and other development partners to develop and integrate nutrition action plans in NAIPs, the first held in Dakar in November 2011.

Finally, FAO actively participated in a review of Investment Plans to determine how countries can more effectively address the evolving challenges of climate change. In the future, FAO will contribute to mainstreaming sustainable agriculture approaches (Climate Smart Agriculture) within investment plans and their implementation programme. Additional funding to adopt Climate Smart Agriculture is anticipated in the context of Rio-20.

In addition to the support provided to the mainstreaming process, NPCA, FAO and other partners collaborated in the development of a Capacity Building framework for CAADP actors at country and regional levels.

GAFSP Financing

By the end of 2011, six member countries in sub-Saharan Africa (out of a total of 12 recipients worldwide) received GAFSP funding (totalling \$223.5 million) to implement priority programmes of their CAADP National Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plans, with FAO providing technical assistance to the GAFSP formulation process in four of those countries (Ethiopia, Rwanda, Sierra Leone and Togo). In 2012, eligible member countries have an opportunity to submit applications to the third GAFSP Public Sector Window Call for Proposals, which will select a limited number of country proposals to award approximately USD 180 million.

III. Moving the CAADP Agenda Forward in 2012-2013

The CAADP continental-led vision and guiding principles have galvanized attention on the importance of sustained levels of investment for sustainable agricultural productivity growth and improved food security in sub-Saharan Africa. In order to continue serving as a point of reference and coordinated framework for agricultural and food system development in the region, increased emphasis must be given to strengthening national and regional capacity for linking compacts and investment plans to policy and budget processes and innovative financing mechanisms. This section briefly discusses potential measures that member countries, RECs and NPCA could consider in 2012-2013 as actions to energize the CAADP implementation process and create opportunities for translating investment plans and programmes into concrete actions on the ground.

The Importance of Public investment

Having effectively formulated Compacts, Investment plans and programmes, the largest challenge facing most countries in CAADP implementation consists of mobilizing funds to finance the priority interventions. Although CAADP was designed and has evolved as a dynamic partnership of diverse stakeholders at continental, regional and national levels, effective implementation hinges first and foremost on the commitment and leadership of member country governments to determine priority public investments in which the government can allocate a share of national budgetary resources.

Government investment in CAADP programmes represents a critical step in the implementation process, serving as a concrete manifestation of a government's commitment to the process. Given today's tight fiscal environment, this call to invest public funds in CAADP priority programmes will inevitably require in-depth budgetary analysis to identify the best use of scarce fiscal resources, as well as concerted efforts to advocate and negotiate for reallocation of government funds. The establishment of effective, broad-based stakeholder alliances and capacity building to strengthen communication, advocacy and negotiation skills could assist CAADP Country Teams to garner political support and mobilize resources for financing CAADP programmes.

Although this call for targeted public investment may challenge the prevalent perception of CAADP as simply an opportunity to access development partner financing, member countries cannot underestimate the importance of government expenditure on critical public goods to catalyze future investment of producers, private sector actors and diverse external partners. For example, government investment to strengthen legal systems for contract enforcement, to develop platforms for multi-actor dialogue or to assure the reliable supply of electricity represent just a few of the many areas where public expenditure and institutional strengthening could help to catalyze private sector investment or address specific binding constraints.

In the policy or regulatory arena, the mobilization of private investment may also hinge on complementary government actions in many areas, including the development and enforcement of clear guidelines for public intervention in food markets, land tenure rules for foreign investment, guiding principles for public-private partnerships, or measures to assure consistent application of trade agreements. Similarly at regional level, public good investment, policy formulation or enforcement is needed to complement actions taken at national level. For example, the establishment and enforcement of uniform food safety norms and standards may make sense at the regional level. In many situations, both at national and regional levels, policies and regulations already exist; it is their systematic application and enforcement that need to be strengthened.

Strategic Sectoral Partnerships

In the same way that the reallocation of government budgets to CAADP-aligned priority areas and the systematic implementation of key policies and regulations will require intensive engagement, lobbying and negotiating skills of diverse stakeholder coalitions and a variety of state and non-state actors, CAADP Country Teams may need to use similar approaches to more systematically link the CAADP framework to existing sector policy frameworks and programmes, innovative public-private partnerships or other emerging initiatives. Building these innovative linkages or strategic partnerships with other policy, programmes and initiatives may provide opportunities to build on and benefit from existing processes, stakeholder alliances or existing political capital that could help drive the CAADP implementation process. Reciprocally, these other programmes and initiatives could benefit from the comprehensive framework and broad political support of the CAADP.

Each country's approach to creating strategic sector linkages and partnerships for enhanced CAADP implementation will need to be carefully crafted after taking into consideration the existing socio-political and institutional context in each country, identifying potential entry points to initiate action and opportunities for mutually beneficial alliances. This type of approach will ostensibly move from one comprising a series of sequential technical steps (such as used to develop investment plans) to a more fluid, innovative one that joins the technical aspects to the policy, budgetary and political processes needed for effective implementation.

Ensuring political support for effective implementation may require that CAADP is explicitly linked and supportive of the priorities and objectives of the ruling parties' agriculture and food policy framework. Similar action may be needed to ensure the support and collaboration of numerous line Ministries whether by greater alignment of CAADP plans and programmes to the prevailing sector policies and programmes that form the sectoral point of reference for the government or sustained collaboration with diverse actors at sub-national level who are involved in programme implementation. Since many government programmes are often closely associated with major global or regional initiatives (e.g., Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN), National Programmes for Food Security (NPFS), Special Programme for Aquaculture Development in Africa (SPADA), Save and Grow, etc.), a strategic partnership approach would strive to connect CAADP implementation to the products, services and funding available through them.

Similarly at the regional level, member countries may want to explore opportunities for operationalizing their investment plans through new initiatives or investment funds such as ECOWAS' Regional Fund for Agriculture and Food (ECOWADF), a financing instrument to be established in 2012 at the newly created Regional Agency for Food and Agriculture (RAFA) in 2012.

Likewise at the global level, member countries may see value in linking CAADP to emerging global initiatives like climate smart agriculture and price volatility, issues through which opportunities may exist for forming implementation alliances or accessing knowledge, funding and global political support for programme implementation. The increasing numbers of public-private partnership initiatives or diverse forms of south-south cooperation are other logical choices for CAADP implementation partnership and potential access to innovative financing instruments.

To be successful in carrying out this facilitation, networking and advocacy role, CAADP Country Teams and stakeholders will undoubtedly need to improve their knowledge of complex policy, budgetary and political processes and to strengthen their capacities in alliance-building, negotiation and other skills needed to successfully manoeuvre through the complex technical and socio-political issues involved in effective implementation. Greater collaboration may also serve to unite under common purpose; scarce human resources that are often spread too thin between similar but competing initiatives.

As there does not exist any textbook solutions as to how to effectively move to effective implementation, country experiences will need to be documented and shared across countries in order to distil lessons of creative and effective actions taken by CAADP Country teams. This peer learning process can already begin to identify and share best practices and showcase good examples of the last decade of experiences in formulating CAADP-related investment plans and programmes.

In conclusion, moving forward in CAADP implementation will depend largely on the ability of member countries, Regional Economic Communities (RECs), NPCA and development partners to develop technically-sound and politically-feasible processes that can translate CAADP Compacts and Investment Plans into tangible programmes that produce positive impacts on the livelihoods of producers, pastoralists and fishermen and women of Africa.

IV. Responding to the Challenge in the Horn of Africa

The recent experiences in the Horn of Africa provide insight into how the CAADP vision and process can be linked in an innovative fashion to other humanitarian and development processes and contribute to improved results. This section looks briefly at a few of the emerging lessons distilled from the recent work in the Horn of Africa.

Up to one year preceding the onset of the present crisis in the Horn of Africa, national, FAO and development partner early warning systems provided detailed information and analyses on the deteriorating food security situation in the region. Unfortunately, the lack of adequate and prompt response to these early warnings contributed to the recent crisis. In retrospect, it is apparent that independently-produced, technical information may need to be effectively combined with more incisive analysis of the socio-political and gender dimensions of a given situation in order to avoid the tendency to simply attribute the complex and interrelated set of determinants of a crisis to agro-climatic or other technical factors.

The large number and differential capabilities of humanitarian actors who responded to the crisis challenged government- and partner-supported coordination mechanisms to formulate and implement technically rigorous and contextually appropriate interventions that respected established standards and best practices across time, space and actors.

The crisis in the Horn of Africa also contributed to the growing recognition of the need for greater integration between short-term humanitarian response and longer-term development assistance. It has renewed the call for more consistent application of a twin track approach consisting of a coherent package of short-term interventions to address vulnerabilities, combined with longer-term investment and actions that address the underlying structural constraints to improved welfare and more resilient livelihoods and agri-food systems.

This crisis has also drawn attention to the negative impact of gross underinvestment in agriculture and food sectors over the last decades, particularly in dryland agriculture and diverse types of pastoral systems. Finally, it underscores the need for institutional evolution and coherent policy frameworks

that shape the enabling investment environment and assure the systematic application of the different dimensions of the risk management cycle.

In addition to addressing the temporal dimensions of the food security challenges in the region, member countries, RECs and development partners recognized the importance of linking actions and investment at national and regional levels to existing frameworks and plans. In this context, Country CAADP Compacts and NAIPs in Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda will serve as the basis for planning longer-term responses and investment in the region. It also led member countries and development partners to request the Inter-Governmental Agency for Development (IGAD) to prepare a Regional CAADP Compact and Investment Plan. Toward this goal, IGAD hosted an inception workshop in Djibouti in January 2012 and is collaborating with FAO, relevant CGIAR centres and other development partners to prepare these documents.

Through active dialogue with the diverse number of public, private and civil society actors engaged in the process, and peer learning from the ECOWAS experience, it is hoped that the preparation of these CAADP documents will assist governments and development partners to channel their financial resources to well-funded investment programmes that systematically address the humanitarian and development challenges in arid and semi-arid lands and pastoral communities.

Sahel and West Africa

In a similar fashion, the 2012 food insecurity situation in the Sahel underscores the importance of a twin track approach consisting of short-term measures to respond to the immediate needs of vulnerable populations and the longer-term policy and investment needed to address the underlying structural factors that increase vulnerabilities and reduce resilience. Due to poor rainfall in 2011, projected cereal deficits in Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, Mauritania, Niger and Senegal may continue to place upward pressure on food prices as well as place thousands of people at risk of food insecurity. A projected fodder shortage in Chad, Mauritania and the Niger may lead to early or modified transhumance patterns in Burkina Faso and Mali, potentially increasing social stress in certain areas.

Beyond immediate measures to respond to the needs of at-risk populations, FAO is committed to support member countries, ECOWAS, CILSS and other actors responsible for the effective implementation of the National Agricultural Investment Plans (NAIPs) and the ECOWAS' Regional Agriculture Investment Plan (RAIP). The Regional Agriculture Investment Plan (RAIP), established in 2010 and inspired by the ECOWAS Agricultural Policy (ECOWAP), is centred on three pillars, one of which is focused on the "reduction of vulnerability to food crises and promotion of stable and sustainable access to food". This coherent policy and investment planning framework provides a natural platform to which member states, ECOWAS, CILSS and development partners can look in responding to the priority investment needs in the region.

ECOWAS and FAO are already in the final stages of establishing the aforementioned Regional Agency for Food and Agriculture (RAFA) and the Regional Fund for Agriculture and Food (ECOWADF) in 2012, two new instruments intended to mobilize and channel investments to the agricultural and food sectors.

In the spirit of the twin-track approach, and in addition to responding to short-term food security needs in the region in 2012, FAO will collaborate with ECOWAS, CILSS and diverse partners in 2012 to study the pertinence and feasibility of establishing a system of regional emergency humanitarian food reserves.

V. Appendix: FAO support to CAADP in Africa (Updated February 2012)

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Regions where FAO CAADP support is ongoing (* = significant support) | Regional CAADP Compact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECOWAS • IGAD Horn of Africa* | Regional CAADP Investment Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECOWAS • IGAD Horn of Africa* |
| Countries where FAO CAADP support has been completed (* = significant support) | CAADP Country Compact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burundi • Central African Republic* • Cape Verde* • Cote D'Ivoire • Djibouti* • Guinea Bissau* • Gambia* • Kenya • Lesotho* • Mauritania* • Malawi • Nigeria • Rwanda • Sierra Leone* • United Rep. of Tanzania* • Zambia* | CAADP Investment Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benin • Burundi • Cape Verde* • Cote D'Ivoire* • Ethiopia* • Gambia* • Ghana* • Guinea Conakry* • Kenya • Malawi* • Niger • Nigeria • Rwanda* • Sierra Leone* • United Rep. of Tanzania* • Togo* • Uganda |
| Countries where FAO CAADP support work is ongoing (* = significant support ongoing or anticipated) | CAADP Compact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congo* • Chad • Egypt • Lesotho* • Namibia • South Africa* | CAADP Investment Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central African Republic* • Côte d'Ivoire* • Democratic Republic of the Congo * • Guinea Bissau* • Lesotho* • Mauritania* • Mozambique* • Swaziland* • Zambia* |
| Countries receiving FAO GAFSP support (* = significant support) | Approved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sierra Leone (US\$50m) • Togo (US\$39m) • Ethiopia (US\$51.5m) | Ongoing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Gambia* • Mauritania* • United Rep. of Tanzania |
| Countries where FAO CAADP support has been requested (* = Compact; ** = Investment Plan) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Angola* • Comoros * • Madagascar * • Seychelles * • São Tomé and Príncipe | |