

Discussion Paper

No. 128e

October 2012

Regional approaches to food security in Africa

The CAADP and other relevant
policies and programmes in IGAD

Dolly Afun-Ogidan and Frauke de Weijer

www.ecdpm.org/128e



Regional approaches to food security in Africa

Early lessons from the IGAD Regional CAADP
process

Dolly Afun-Ogidan and Frauke de Weijer



October 2012

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	iv
Acronyms.....	v
Executive Summary.....	vi
1. Introduction.....	1
2. The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme in IGAD.....	2
2.1. Progress made in implementing and supporting CAADP Regional Plans: Lessons & Challenges.....	2
2.2. CAADP regional plans and linkages with the overall framework for regional integration.....	19
3. Other regional initiatives relevant to food security and possible linkages with CAADP.....	22
4. Concluding remarks: towards a regional IGAD CAADP compact and investment plan.....	28
Annex 1 – Timeline of events and meetings.....	33
Bibliography.....	35

List of Boxes

Box 1 CAADP in brief.....	4
Box 2 Priority areas of parallel initiatives.....	19
Box 3 Added value of the CAADP framework.....	21

Acknowledgements

ECDPM gratefully acknowledges the financial contribution of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which has made this study possible.

The authors thank all interviewees for their valuable input. Appreciation also goes to their ECDPM colleague Shirley Geraerds for her support. The views expressed herein are those of the authors only and should not be attributed to any other person or institution.

For comments and information, please contact Dolly Afun-Ogidan (da@ecdpm.org) or Frauke de Weijer (fdw@ecdpm.org).

Acronyms

AUC	African Union Commission
AU-IBAR	African Union-Inter African Bureau for Animal Resources
ASAL	Arid and Semi-arid Lands
CTF	Child Trust Funds
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CPF	Common Programming Framework
CBNRM	Community Based Natural Resources Management
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CEWARN	Conflict Early Warning Mechanism
CPP	Country Programming Papers
EAC	East African Community
EAFF	East African Farmers Federation
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
ECOWAP	ECOWAS Agriculture Programme
ECDPM	European Centre for Development Policy Management
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
HoA	Horn of Africa
IDDRSI	IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
ICPALD	IGAD Centre for Pastoral Areas and Livestock Development
ICPAC	IGAD Climate Prediction and Applications Centre
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
LPI	Livestock Policy Initiative
MDTF	Multi-Donor Trust Fund
NAIP	National Agriculture Investment Plans
NPCA	NEPAD Planning and Coordination Agency
NSA	Non State Actors
REC	Regional Economic Communities
REFORM	Regional Food Security and Risk Management Programme
RPF	Regional Programming Framework
PANSPSO	Sanitary & Phyto-sanitary capacity building
SRAP	Sub-Regional Action Programme
SHARE	Supporting Horn of Africa Resilience
TICP	Tripartite and IGAD Corridor Programme
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa

Executive Summary

In 2003 the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) was established by the assembly of the African Union (AU) aiming to raise agricultural productivity by at least 6% per year and increasing public investment in agriculture to 10% of national budgets per year. After an initial phase focused primarily on interventions at the national level, there is growing awareness on the need to work more on the regional dimensions of the CAADP. In this context, the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) has undertaken policy-oriented analysis and stakeholder consultations on regional CAADP processes - and issues at stake - as well as on its linkages with the broader regional integration dynamics, in various African regions. This paper focuses on the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), with the objective to stimulate further discussions among involved stakeholders, to contribute to the consultative processes around the development and implementation of CAADP at regional level, as well as to contribute to lessons-sharing across Africa on regional approaches to food security.

IGAD Regional CAADP compact: parallel initiatives, one goal

Between 2010 and 2011, parts of the Horn of Africa experienced some of their worst droughts in history. This prompted Heads of State and Government from IGAD and the East African Community (EAC) to come together to endorse a more preventative, regional and holistic approach towards ending drought emergencies in the region. The Summit gave birth to the IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI) and a number of related initiatives aimed at operationalizing the drought resilience agenda in the region's Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASAL). This includes the Common Programming Frameworks (CPF) to guide national interventions, a Regional Programming Framework (RPF), an IGAD regional CAADP process and an IDDRSI Strategic Plan, all geared, in one way or the other, towards addressing regional aspects of the resilience effort. An IDDRSI Regional Platform is also being established to coordinate and mobilize resources around all the processes. These initiatives are currently being developed simultaneously and are all 'work-in-progress'. While perceptions around the initiatives are still evolving, most stakeholders appear to have differing views on the value of each initiative, neither are they clear about how these parallel initiatives can complement each other.

National-Regional nexus: operationalizing the principle of subsidiarity

There is a high degree of consensus among various stakeholders that regional action is very important for reducing the vulnerability of the ASAL areas to drought and food insecurity. In this sense, the consensus strongly leans toward adopting a long-term, resilience-focused regional approach. The regional IGAD compact is expected to build on and complement the national CAADP compacts, where they exist, and national agriculture strategies/ policies of other member states, which have not yet developed CAADP compacts. During the process of national consultations for the regional compact, it emerged that the national-regional nexus is not always well thought through by most countries. Being already involved in the other processes that focus more on country challenges, the sense of momentum around the regional CAADP does not appear to be fully shared by technical ministries at the country level. In addition, there is the challenge of working out ways to operationalize the principle of subsidiarity. Different stakeholders have different ideas on what regional CAADP means, which could make operationalizing issues of complementarity and subsidiarity between regional and national processes a likely challenge.

NSA perspectives and degree of engagement: regional representation non-existent

The IGAD region is predominantly an ASAL area, however, in most countries, sedentary farming takes precedence, and pastoralist organizations are not always able to provide sufficient input into general agricultural policy processes. At the regional level there is no entity that represents the pastoralists' perspectives. In general, the degree and nature of engagement of a range of non-state actors (NSAs) in the regional CAADP formulation process differs. Their perspectives on the specific policies and interventions to be prioritized for action through the regional CAADP compact differ, depending on the specific interests of the stakeholders and the development paradigm they subscribe to. Most of these actors are also not fully informed of how the regional CAADP links to and complements the other drought resilience initiatives. But many see the regional CAADP compact as an opportunity to mobilize pastoralist representation's involvement in and contribution to regional policy issues.

The role of IGAD Secretariat: right institution, strong mandate, weak capacity

Many stakeholders feel that IGAD can play an important role in redressing the current underinvestment in ASAL areas, both financially and policy-wise. There is broad agreement that IGAD is the right (and possibly only) REC that can adequately forge regional approaches to address ASAL specific issues. However, the current capacity level of the Secretariat is very low, which makes it difficult to adequately coordinate and facilitate these processes. This increases the risk that the REC level could become a proxy arena for a battle over paradigms and developmental visions linked to what approach should be adopted to better address drought, resilience and food security challenges in the Horn. Added to this, the speed at which the regional IGAD compact process- alongside the other regional drought resilience processes- are moving might mean that the IGAD Secretariat is overstretched and might not be able to provide the necessary guidance and direction, given its current capacity shortcomings. Yet a good starting point for the Secretariat is its very strong mandate by member states and other partners, to strengthen drought resilience in the Horn of Africa. From here, efforts are being made to strengthen the institutional foundations of the Secretariat, upon which the drought resilience initiatives can be built. Most stakeholders generally agreed that while capacity building will take time, IGAD could already start engaging with those areas where it has a real comparative advantage, and build up credibility and legitimacy steadily by starting with the low-hanging fruit, for example, fast-tracking regional trade in livestock, management of shared natural resources, etc.

The role of development partners: urgent need for coordination among donor initiatives

There is a real sense among donors and other key stakeholders in the IGAD region that there is a need for a new approach to the recurrent droughts in the Horn of Africa. This shared sense of urgency and acknowledgement of the changes required is an unprecedented opportunity that should be seized. However, the direct engagement of donors in the formulation of the IGAD regional CAADP compact has been relatively limited, although there is interest in the process. So far, no donor coordination mechanisms has shaped up around the regional CAADP, which seems to be mostly due to the high degree of confusion around the parallel processes, including the Regional Platform. Donor attention predominantly centers on the Regional Platform as the mechanism for coordination. Considering that the role of CAADP in the Regional Platform is still unclear, some development partners do not yet see CAADP as the main framework on which investment will be based. There is however a strong sense among donors that improved regional coordination is of utmost importance, to guide this process well. Donor coordination is necessary at a number of levels: sectoral programming (agriculture, natural resource management, conflict, disaster risk management, etc); country programming, and between regional and national

programming. A regional CAADP can potentially serve as a framework for coordination between these levels, as it does provide a useful template that is already established at continental level, in which expertise has been built up and building blocks have already been prepared (that mechanisms of mutual accountability are an integral part of).

The role of pan-African institutions and other RECs

Institutions responsible for CAADP implementation at the pan-African level, such as the African Union Commission (AUC) and the NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency (NPCA), are also important actors in the regional food security processes. The AUC has since the height of the HoA food crisis, been active in mobilizing support for the region, starting with a pledging conference in August 2011, to raise funds and donations from other African countries. The AUC is very clear about using CAADP as the flagship framework to ensure food security and build resilience of vulnerable populations to food crises. Although the AUC has noble plans for dealing with food crises across the continent, a number of stakeholders questioned the appropriateness of CAADP as the right tool to deal with ASAL-specific challenges, resilience and safety nets. Other RECs - COMESA and EAC - are also in the process of developing a regional CAADP compact. Given that some IGAD member states are part of either COMESA or EAC or both, dialogue with these RECs is necessary to get a minimum understanding of - and possibly agreement on - the added value each REC brings to the regional CAADP process. There is general agreement that each REC has different areas where they have comparative advantage.

CAADP regional plans and linkages with the overall framework for regional integration

The challenges of regional integration in IGAD are likely to be reflected in the development and implementation of the regional CAADP. Consensus on the need for a regional approach is obvious, but the perspectives on what a regional CAADP approach means for the IGAD region differs quite substantially among stakeholders. Having an agreement on what the key issues with regional dimensions are is therefore still quite different from having a consensus on what the regional CAADP compact would look like in practice. A number of concerns were raised about the use of CAADP as the overarching framework for coordinated regional action. One facet to the emerging complexities is that the focal areas of the IGAD regional CAADP appears to overlap with the priority areas of IDDRSI Strategic Plan. Another concern is the proposal that the IGAD CAADP could be an "ASAL-focused CAADP", rather than one that covers all agro-ecological issues. Most stakeholders do not think the CAADP framework is strong enough to address the specific challenges of ASAL areas. They argue that it is not possible to have a 'partial CAADP', as the core principles of the CAADP framework focus on agricultural productivity and growth and less on vulnerability and resilience. Therefore, using the existing agricultural policies and national CAADP compacts as building blocks for a regional approach will only serve to transfer a problem from the national to the regional level. The debate should be less on "which overarching framework" but more emphasis should be placed on "how" all initiatives could complement each other to achieve the overall goals of the IDDRS Initiative.

Other regional initiatives relevant to food security and possible linkages with CAADP

There is in general full support for an effectively multidimensional regional CAADP, anchored in on-going programmes implemented by IGAD. Indeed, many actors in IGAD believe that it is very important to ensure the 'horizontal' coherence between regional policies and investments in food security and in other sectors

of regional cooperation. While synergies should be identified and promoted between the regional CAADP compact and ongoing initiatives on drought resilience, trade, infrastructure and natural resources, it will be important not to lose sight of the cross-cutting general bottlenecks to regional integration. Taking the resilience approach, the “Ending Drought Emergencies in the Horn of Africa” Initiative has been able to gather much stronger momentum to address the region’s food security challenges. There are strong arguments in favour of promoting cross-border trade in food and agriculture, not just for the sake of food security, but as a way to stimulate closer economic integration and development in the region. Yet, IGAD member states have divergent trade interests. The IGAD regional CAADP compact has the potential to renew reflection on how IGAD can provide a platform in which these interests, especially those related to livestock trade, can be negotiated. The region is generally characterized by poor and underdeveloped infrastructure. Making agriculture more productive and food security more attainable in IGAD requires better roads, storage, irrigation and other infrastructural enhancements. Given the central role of food trade and regional agricultural markets for food security, the IGAD CAADP compact will have to take into account the strengths and weaknesses of corridors development. A possible synergy between CAADP and corridors could be the identification of ways for a regional CAADP compact to contribute to the development of ‘agriculture trade corridors’ and regional trade tools. Considering the Horn’s vulnerability to environmental and climate challenges, recurrent droughts and conflicts arising from use of shared natural resources, the importance of regional cooperation and integration around natural resources is also equally important. There is a natural link between the land, livestock, rivers and waterbeds, and food security. Most pastoralists organizations underscored the need for a holistic approach that integrates and addresses the needs and challenges of the people, the resource base and livestock in conjunction. Many view a regional CAADP as an opportunity to ensure the joint management of natural resources in the Horn. In general, framing certain initiatives in such areas within a comprehensive, multi-dimensional and multi-stakeholder policy process like CAADP could contribute to removing some of the obstacles that limit regional cooperation and integration.

Emerging messages on the way forward

The IGAD Regional Compact document is nearly ready and should be launched in November 2012. But before and even after this takes place, clarifying what each of the different initiatives are, joint agreement among regional stakeholders on how the different processes can complement each other, and if necessary to converge at some point, is important as soon as possible. The CAADP could be a useful framework if it is used at its most flexible. However, it is crucial that the process of involving NSAs is better managed, and more awareness is created around the importance of a regional approach. IGAD can play an important role in creating both the institutionalized space for non-state actors to engage at regional level. Synergies should be identified and promoted between the regional CAADP compact and on-going initiatives. These synergies could be explored more in detail during the regional compact finalization process and other multi-stakeholder dialogues, when actors will be able to discuss concretely about coherence, complementarity and coordination of specific CAADP actions within the regional compact with other existing policies and investments. In certain circumstances, even if synergies are clear, there may be challenges to their operationalisation, for instance political sensitivities, potential conflict between institutions involved in those programmes, or simply the preference by one or more IGAD member state to deal with that particular issue outside of the CAADP framework. Going forward, it could be useful for IGAD and its regional partners to clarify in a ‘roadmap’ those critical actions and investment areas which are needed for the implementation of the compact and investment plan.

1. Introduction

There is growing awareness on the need to work more on the regional dimensions of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP). This was also formally recognised at the 7th CAADP Partnership Platform meeting in Yaoundé, Cameroun (March 2011): of particular importance was the acknowledgement by all CAADP stakeholders that the development and implementation of regional CAADP compacts should be accelerated. This would require greater involvement of all CAADP partners at the regional level and effective harmonization of their interventions, including bringing countries together to share lessons, providing support to link regional and country processes, identifying and addressing cross-border issues.

The European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) works actively with African institutions on how to better integrate agriculture, trade and aid policies and processes. Improved coordination, coherence and complementarity between agriculture, trade, regional integration processes and development partners' support is key for Africa's development agenda. While CAADP implementation at national level has gained momentum in recent years, implementation at the regional level has been slow, and progress differs between regions. The rate and degree of progress emphasise the need for lesson sharing between Regional Economic Communities (RECs).

To contribute to the CAADP, ECDPM undertakes policy analysis on regional CAADP processes -and issues at stake- as well as on its linkages with the broader regional integration processes in Africa, including by facilitating deeper dialogue and lesson-sharing among and between the RECs and development partners working on CAADP in various African regions. In those regions¹ where the preparations for a regional CAADP compact are under way, ECDPM's work, in collaboration with RECs, development partners, and other key CAADP actors such as the NEPAD Planning and Coordination Agency (NPCA), include the analysis of:

1. progress made in implementing and supporting CAADP Regional Plans and other relevant regional programmes linked to CAADP Pillars (natural resources management, trade, infrastructure, etc.);
2. how regional integration is dealt with within the CAADP and the linkages between CAADP and other regional programmes (and whether these are effectively utilised to achieve CAADP objectives).

This paper outlines the results of such a 'mapping exercise' for the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD). **The IGAD regional CAADP process is still on-going, so the perspectives presented in this paper are based on interviews conducted while the process is evolving.** It is meant to stimulate further discussions among involved stakeholders and contribute to the consultative processes around the formulation of CAADP at regional level in the Horn of Africa. Indeed, the first key step is to make important information about regional strategies and plans available to everyone to contribute to multi-stakeholder ownership.

This paper, a contribution in this direction, is part of a series of publications, made possible by the financial support of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, presenting an independent assessment by ECDPM on the status of regional approaches to food security. It is the outcome of: extensive and regular consultations and interviews with stakeholders in the regions (including RECs Secretariats, the NPCA, government officials, donors, civil society, the private sector, and other experts from regional institutions); ECDPM's different types of informal contributions to the formal CAADP-related processes; as well as a deep investigation of the existing literature (which is already very extensive on regional integration and growing rapidly on CAADP).

¹ Discussion papers on CAADP progress in COMESA, SADC, EAC and ECOWAS, available at: www.ecdpm.org/dp128

Section 2 of this paper describes the status of preparations in IGAD for a regional CAADP compact, highlighting the role played so far by key involved stakeholders and the relationship between food security processes and the overall progress on regional integration. Section 3 analyses other regional initiatives relevant to food security and the possible synergies between CAADP and such policies and programmes. Taking into account these existing challenges and opportunities, Section 4 presents some ideas and recommendations on the way forward for regional food security plans, including in terms of what each actor could do to contribute positively to the implementation of a regional CAADP compact in IGAD.

2. The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme in IGAD

2.1. Progress made in implementing and supporting CAADP Regional Plans: Lessons & Challenges

IGAD Regional CAADP compact: parallel initiatives, one goal

Geographically, the Horn of Africa (HoA) is made up of Somalia, Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Djibouti. However, as members of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) Kenya, Uganda, Sudan and South Sudan are also considered part of the Horn. The region is particularly prone to harsh weather conditions and climate change hazards, making it one of the most vulnerable regions in Africa. Most of the region is classified as Arid and Semi-arid Lands (ASAL), and divided into lowland-highland areas, with different land use and livelihood patterns. In the highland areas, sedentary farming and crop production is more prevalent, while those in lowlands are predominantly engaged in and dependent on nomadic livestock livelihood.

Between 2010 and 2011, parts of the HoA experienced the worst drought in 60 years². Considering that the Horn is one of the most food insecure regions in the world, the exceptionally dry weather conditions led to a humanitarian and food crisis affecting at least 13 million people and worsening malnutrition rates in over 30%³ of the affected areas.

In September 2011, IGAD and EAC Heads of State and Government met in Nairobi to define a strategy for a mid- and long-term response to the current and possible future crises. The Nairobi Summit launched the IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI) as an effort towards ending drought emergencies in the HoA⁴. The Summit assigned the IGAD Secretariat the task of leading and coordinating the process of implementing this initiative. Since then, the momentum to address the long-standing drought and famine emergencies has increased dramatically. The IGAD Secretariat has convened a series of high-level consultative meetings (see Annex 1), bringing together its member states, the African Union Commission (AUC), development partners and Non-State Actors (NSAs), to build consensus on the way forward. Out of these meetings, a number of initiatives and approaches aimed at implementing the drought resilience agenda have emerged. One is the process to prepare an IDDRSI **Strategic Plan** to guide efforts to strengthen the region's resilience to droughts and other hazards. At the national level,

² European Commission. 2012. EC SHARE: Supporting Horn of Africa Resilience. Commission Staff Working Document 8744/12. 13 April 2012. Brussels: European Commission

³ OCHA. 2012. Ending drought emergencies: Urgent action on sustainable solutions. April 2012. Available at: <http://www.disasterriskreduction.net/east-central-africa/reglap>

⁴ IGAD. 2011. Communique on the summit on the Horn of Africa crisis: Ending drought emergencies: A Commitment to Sustainable Solutions. 8th-9th September 2011, Nairobi

countries will be engaged in developing **Common Programming Frameworks** (CPF) for drought resilience and sustainability. This will involve preparing **Country Programming Papers** (CPPs) that identifies the specific needs and root causes of vulnerability in ASAL areas of member states. Regional aspects of the CPPs will be pulled into a **Regional Programming Framework** (RPF). Another key outcome of the Nairobi Summit was an agreement to establish a **Regional Platform** to coordinate these different processes. At the same time, IGAD together with its continental, regional and development partners have also committed to prepare a **regional Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme** (CAADP) compact and investment plan for the IGAD region (see CAADP in brief, Box 1). In general, many stakeholders welcomed the IDDRS Initiative as a proactive approach which pays special attention to ASAL areas and prioritises long-term sustainable solutions to strengthen regional disaster resilience, rather than recurrent and ad-hoc emergency action. But the complexities associated with how these processes will be rolled out are at the fore of everyone's minds.

It is important to note that **these initiatives are being developed simultaneously and are all work-in-progress**; therefore perceptions around the initiatives are still evolving. Nevertheless, a number of early lessons can be drawn to inform the rest of the process and future implementation of these initiatives. The next few paragraphs will provide an overview of different stakeholders' perspectives on the on-going processes and how they have changed over time which highlights some of the emerging complexities.

The process to develop an **IGAD Regional CAADP Compact** was launched in January 2012, as a way to ensure that the IDDRSI links up to existing continental frameworks. This regional CAADP compact will be informed by national CAADP compacts and investment plans, where they exist- Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda and Djibouti - and existing national agriculture policies and strategies for other countries where CAADP has not yet been adopted. A team of regional experts (referred to as the Regional Team) were recruited to support the IGAD Secretariat and organize and facilitate consultations with national stakeholders on the value, content and priority issues for a regional CAADP compact, in all IGAD member states. During the inception workshop, it was agreed that the IGAD regional compact would focus on key thematic areas⁵:

- facilitating and legalizing mobility of livestock, people and goods across the borders in the ASAL border areas, and improving livestock trade (policies, routes, infrastructure) within (and beyond) the region;
- trans-boundary animal disease control;
- management of natural resources (including management of shared water resources);
- conflict prevention and resolution, especially those relating to natural resource management (NRM) between farmers and livestock owners (e.g. water harvesting, land raids, etc);
- disaster risk management (DRM), including early warning and response, tailored to pastoralist areas;
- knowledge exchange and policy harmonization around the abovementioned policy areas.

One of the initial expectations of the regional CAADP was that it would underpin the development of a coherent investment plan to strengthen the region's food and nutrition security, and to catalyze collective action by all partners towards ending drought emergencies in the Horn. Due to the unique characteristics of the HoA, another expectation of some stakeholders is that the regional CAADP will serve as an ASAL-specific CAADP, which will focus on those vulnerable populations whose livelihoods are dependent on the ASAL areas⁶. However, there are concerns about the extent to which a regional CAADP can help achieve this objective (discussed in detail in Section 2.2).

⁵ IGAD. 2012. Regional Comprehensive African Agriculture Programme (CAADP) Roadmap towards Building the IGAD Regional CAADP Compact: "Pre-Compact Roadmap". 26 January 2012. Djibouti: IGAD

⁶ IGAD. 2012. Regional Comprehensive African Agriculture Programme (CAADP) Roadmap towards Building the IGAD Regional CAADP Compact: "Pre-Compact Roadmap". 26 January 2012. Djibouti: IGAD

Box 1 CAADP in brief

The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) is the agricultural programme of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), which is a programme of the African Union. Established by the AU assembly in 2003, CAADP's goal is to eliminate hunger and reduce poverty through agriculture. To do this, African governments have agreed to increase public investment in agriculture by a minimum of 10 percent of their national budgets and raise agricultural productivity by at least 6 percent per annum. CAADP identifies four key pillars for food security improvement and agricultural investment: (1) Sustainable Land and Water Management; (2) Market Access; (3) Food Supply and Hunger; and (4) Agricultural Research.

The CAADP is centered around the definition of national and regional plans ('Compacts'), an agreement between all stakeholders (public, private as well as donors) serving as a framework for partnerships, alliances, and dialogue to design and implement the required policy interventions and investment programmes. The formulation of national and regional investment plans is one of the most important activities to implement CAADP after the definition and signature of the Compact. To date 30 countries in Africa have signed the national CAADP Compacts, and more than 24 have reviewed Investment Plans. (for more information: www.caadp.net)

CAADP therefore is not a (donors') programme, it is a common framework for stimulating and guiding national, regional and continental initiatives on enhanced agriculture productivity and food security which each region and country can develop and implement as preferred. CAADP is a very advanced attempt at fully implementing the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action on Aid Effectiveness. It is difficult to identify similar partnerships, even sector-wide approaches, that can claim to have the same: degree of African ownership- both among political and technical experts- at continental, regional national levels, (unlike many other AU/regional initiatives such as free trade arrangements); robust plans for mutual accountability (serious monitoring & evaluation is built into CAADP); outreach to other sectors (trade, capacity development, natural resources, infrastructure, research and technology, safety); level of ODA predictability (substantial commitments of funds and relatively advanced alignment by donors) and regular donor coordination (e.g. headquarters focal points work together via teleconference every other week to task-divide and harmonize their CAADP activities).

The clear linkages between trade and agriculture within CAADP are confirmed by the fact that around thirty percent of the investment needs included in national CAADP investment plans formulated so far relate to the development of market access and value chains. Weaknesses remain, with CAADP criticized by some stakeholders for lacking sufficient: private sector involvement; regional level implementation; and clarity on the continental-regional-national nexus.

Formulation and implementation of CAADP-related initiatives is driven by a broad range of actors. CAADP being a continental framework, the African Union, and particularly the NPCA, is tasked with its coordination. Designated Pillar Lead Institutions oversee and support work that falls under the four CAADP pillars. RECs facilitate the formulation and implementation of a regional compact and a regional agricultural investment plan, while supporting their member states with CAADP initiatives on the national level. At the national level, governments facilitate the formulation and implementation of a national compact and investment plan. Bilateral and multilateral donors provide financial and technical support to CAADP processes and investment.

One specific financial donor vehicle to support the CAADP processes (not investments), is the CAADP Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MTDF) hosted at the World Bank. The MDTF aims to strengthen institutional capacities of African drivers of CAADP, particularly on the continental and regional level, to effectively lead, implement, monitor and evaluate CAADP processes. Resources from the MDTF are allocated to CAADP institutions, such as the NPCA, Pillar Institutions and the RECs through 'Child Trust Funds'. Among the contributing donors are UK's DFID, the European Union, France, Ireland, the Netherlands and USAID.

The other process is the **Common Programming Framework (CPF)**. The IGAD Secretariat is playing a lead role in supporting member states to develop country coordination mechanisms for ending drought emergencies in the Horn of Africa, as a way for governments and development partners to align their efforts to build resilience. Based on the **view that the CAADP framework's focus on ASALs, livestock and pastoralist issues is not strong enough**, IGAD member states are developing country-led programming frameworks specifically targeted to address resilience-related aspects of drought-prone ASAL areas. These programming frameworks are presented in **Country Programming Papers (CPPs)**, which have been drafted by the IGAD member states. The CPPs highlight the needs and lay out a rationale and evidence for priority areas of investment in ASAL areas of IGAD countries. They are not investment plans with fully costed projects, rather they present prospective multi-sectoral responses and investments, as well as national coordination mechanisms to implement the prioritized drought resilience programmes⁷. The CPPs are expected to facilitate the coordination, alignment and mobilization of funds by member states and their development partners. Regional and cross-border priorities identified in the CPPs will be consolidated and integrated into a **Regional Programming Framework (RPF)** to guide interventions at the regional level.

An **IGAD Regional Platform for Disaster Resilience and Sustainability** has also been set up, to provide the collaborative framework for action. The Regional Platform is led by the IGAD Secretariat and will be the governance and institutional mechanism to coordinate, harmonize, support and raise funds for drought resilience activities in the region. Its purpose is three-fold: regional programming, knowledge management and capacity building⁸. It is expected to be a multi-stakeholder partnership that brings together and promotes dialogue between IGAD member countries, Non-State Actors (NSA) and development partners. The Regional Platform will work with a similar counterparts established at the country level, for example, the existing coordination structures for engagement between the national CAADP focal points and other stakeholders, the livestock policy hubs, etc.

In addition, the IGAD Secretariat has also initiated the process of developing a five year **Strategic Plan**, to guide implementation of the IDDRS Initiative. The draft Plan identifies the new working methods and defines the intervention areas⁹ through which the objective of drought resilience and sustainability will be achieved under the general leadership and coordination of the IGAD Secretariat. The draft Strategy proposes to identify and address underlying causes of social and environmental vulnerability by applying a holistic approach that strengthens the capabilities of ASAL communities to be resilient¹⁰.

From discussions with a diverse range of stakeholders, it is clear that most are generally aware of the attention being paid to the region and its food security challenges. But the specifics of what initiatives are being proposed or undertaken, how and whether these initiatives may converge, or will complement each other, at what level implementation will take place, who will be involved, ownership, etc is not always obvious or understood by many stakeholders. This is particularly true among non-state actors and those who work at the national ministries, but even many of those who are closely involved at the political and policy level, including some IGAD staff and development partners appear to have differing views on the

⁷ IGAD. 2012. IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI) Strategic Plan 2013- 2017. Draft version, August 2012

⁸ Global Alliance for Drought Resilience and Growth. 2012. Technical Assistance Sub-group to support the IGAD Regional Platform on Drought Resilience and Sustainability: Meeting Report. 10 August 2012, Addis Ababa.

⁹ 1. Coordination, institutional strengthening and partnerships; 2. Natural resources and environment management; 3. Livelihoods support and basic social services; 4. Market access, trade and financial services; 5. Research, knowledge management and technology transfer; 6. Conflict prevention, resolution and peace building; 7. Disaster risk management, preparedness and effective response

¹⁰ IGAD. 2012. IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI) Strategic Plan 2013- 2017. Draft version, August 2012

value of each initiative, neither are they clear about how these parallel initiatives can complement each other.

Some stakeholders are aware of, and welcome the Common Programming Framework (CPF). Others instead are more informed about the regional CAADP process. However, **most are not sufficiently aware of both processes**. Even within ministries there has been little exchange of information on progress and plans between staff working on either of these processes resulting in a high degree of confusion. A third puzzling element is how these- the CPPs, RPF, regional CAADP and even the national CAADPs- hang together within the IDDRS Initiative. Questions raised included: what is the role of each vis-à-vis the regional Strategic Plan? How will the Regional Platform ensure proper coordination of all processes?

From the initial interviews conducted, it appears that some stakeholders viewed the regional CAADP process as the strategy to implement the IDDRS Initiative, and thought that the national CPPs and RPF will be a way to operationalize the regional CAADP. According to this perspective, the regional CAADP is seen as the overarching strategic framework for achieving the goals of the IDDRS Initiative. Those who share this view also tend to support the idea of a special ASAL-oriented CAADP. Others suggest that the CPPs, RPF and regional CAADP are components of the IDDRSI Strategic Plan. According to this viewpoint, the CPPs are meant to focus solely on drought resilience and ASAL issues, while the regional CAADP will focus on agricultural productivity and growth aspects. However, some stakeholders think that the Common Programming Framework is the overarching strategy, while others were of the understanding that the regional CAADP would be implemented simultaneously with the CPPs. Finally some suggested that both processes will proceed as a dual track, but the regional compact will play the over-arching guiding framework from the regional point of view, while the CPPs will be the guiding frame to mobilize resources for priorities identified at country-level. In general, most stakeholders view each process as overlapping in terms of purpose and approach. Yet, the myriad of opinions are mostly speculative, as consultation and information sharing has not been sufficient in the past. However, efforts are currently being undertaken to help most stakeholders understand how these process complement each other.

Although there is a strong consensus on the need for IGAD to focus on food security and enhanced drought resilience in the ASAL areas, and a relatively strong consensus on the need for regional action, the opinions of some actors interviewed- ranging from pastoralist representation to some donors, and IGAD representatives- were **less equivocal on whether CAADP would be the right vehicle for IGAD to address specific ASAL issues**. To an extent, these reservations stem from: 1) the perception that the CAADP framework and its core principles are not adequately suited to address livestock and pastoralist challenges; and, 2) the lack of clarity among many stakeholders at both regional and national levels on the various initiatives that have been launched since the Nairobi Summit.

Understanding what each of these processes are, how they will be implemented and if possible, how they could be better integrated to avoid duplication of efforts, depend greatly on the joint clarification and agreement of the purpose of each process: including joint agreement on priority areas for regional cooperation versus national responsibility, definition of respective roles, and commitment to implement, during the national consultations and the entire regional CAADP process. It is crucial that this clarification is made to all stakeholders at all levels. To help reduce the lack of clarity around these processes, the IGAD Secretariat and its technical partners convened an internal meeting in May 2012 to explain the linkages between the CPF, RPF and Regional CAADP Compact.

In a note¹¹ shared during the meeting, the IGAD Secretariat (with support from FAO) explained that the **IGAD Regional CAADP compact will serve as the strategy** to address issues that could be better dealt with through regional action. It will also serve as a tool to promote resilience-oriented approaches to address the pastoralist, livestock, NRM, and DRM challenges at a regional level. The CPPs and RPF, will complement existing CAADP national agriculture investment plans (NAIP). The CPF is expected to bring balance to and provide a stronger focus on broader agriculture investment and increase investment in ASAL areas. In combination the **CPPs, RPF and NAIPs will serve as instruments for planning and coordination and resource mobilization**. As numerous donor initiatives and projects are currently being implemented or planned, it is expected that the development partners will be able to increase investment and financing to the priority areas identified in the CPFs, NAIPs and RPF. However, the note leaves open the question of how the CAADP regional investment plan will fit with these other investment tools: for example, will the CAADP regional investment plan be constituted from the sum of the CPPs and NAIPs of all countries, or will the RPF be one component of the regional investment plan?

Since then, the IGAD Secretariat seems to have (slightly) shifted its strategy with emphasis now being placed on **the five-year Strategic Plan as the tool to guide the implementation of the IDDRS Initiative**¹². According to the draft Strategy, the CPPs and RPF are considered fundamental elements of the Strategy and its action plan and programmes. The (August 2012) draft document refers to CAADP within the context of ensuring that the IDDRSI is “implemented in complementarity with national plans and other frameworks, such as CAADP”¹³. While views differ, most stakeholders in general consider that both the IGAD regional CAADP and the CPF (CPP/ RPF) process have a role to play in achieving the HoA’s resilience and food security objectives. The main challenge is how. Because this is still an evolving process, the specifics of how these parallel initiatives will jointly contribute to the IDDRS Initiative’s goals are yet to be fully clarified.

National-Regional nexus: operationalizing the principle of subsidiarity still a challenge

In terms of *substance* of the regional CAADP, i.e. policies and investments, it is crucial to design regional food security plans that are coherent and foster synergies between the regional and national levels, as well as across different regional initiatives. In this sense, the IGAD regional CAADP should enhance vertical coherence between the content of national CAADP compacts and the regional compact. It should also strengthen horizontal coherence and synergies between policies and investments in the food security sector and other sectors of regional cooperation in IGAD.

There is a high degree of consensus among various stakeholders with an interest in and knowledge about ASAL areas and pastoralists livelihoods that **regional action is very important** for reducing the vulnerability of the ASAL areas to drought and food insecurity. In this sense, the consensus strongly leans toward adopting a **long-term, resilience-focused regional approach**. Recognizing that strong political commitment and ownership was needed, the IGAD Heads of State came together to endorse the Ending Drought Emergencies in the Horn of Africa Initiative. The overall sense among both national government representatives and donors, is that **the mandate given to IGAD by the member states is strong**. IGAD is being seen as having relatively high political clout on ASAL related issues, particularly when compared to

¹¹ IGAD. 2012. IGAD Initiative for Ending Drought Emergencies in the Horn of Africa: Processes underway and their linkages. 30 May 2012

¹² IGAD. 2012. IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI) Strategic Plan 2013- 2017. Draft version, August 2012

¹³ Ibid.

other RECs such as the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA)¹⁴. This, coupled with the degree of financial support pledged to the region, provides a real opportunity to act and deliver on the region's food security objectives.

The **regional IGAD compact is expected to build on and complement the national CAADP compacts** of Kenya, Ethiopia, Uganda, and Djibouti **and national agriculture strategies/ policies** of the other member states, which have not yet developed CAADP compacts. During the process of national consultations for the regional compact, it emerged that the **national-regional nexus is not always well thought through** by most countries. The consultations were expected to bring together key stakeholders-national ministry representatives and non-state actors to identify and draw out priority issues with a regional dimension. However, the regional facilitating team¹⁵ noted a general lack of awareness of the added value of a regional approach to vulnerability in the ASAL areas of the HoA, especially at the national level and particularly by those without an in-depth understanding of issues facing the low land ASAL areas. In Kenya for example, although the regional dimension is recognized as important, concerns were raised regarding developing the regional CAADP compact before all IGAD member states have signed national compacts. Being already involved in the common programming framework, the lack of clarity, connection and complementarity between the two processes added to the confusion. Dialogue between the IGAD Secretariat, the African Union Commission (AUC) and the Kenyan government helped ease the process for national consultations and contribution to the regional CAADP compact.

Interviews¹⁶ with ministry staff in some IGAD member states also revealed that although the go-ahead for a regional compact has been initiated and approved at the IGAD Secretariat, and among international development partners and high-level political representatives of IGAD member states, this **sense of momentum was not fully shared by the technical ministries at the country level**. Some members of the regional facilitation team, expressed concern about a lack of ownership on the regional CAADP at the Ministries of Agriculture, even with the designated national CAADP focal points and technical departments. From interviews at some Ministries of Agriculture, there was a lack of sufficient exchange of information between the CAADP focal point and staff working on the Common Programme Framework (CPF).

This leads to a paradox: the mandate given to IGAD to facilitate regional processes and the political commitment by Heads of State does not seem to be mirrored in ownership by policy makers and bureaucrats at technical ministry level. Members of the regional team, and some national ministry (of agriculture) staff explained that this disconnect between relatively high commitment at the political level and low ownership at the technical level can partially be attributed to **communication problems within the member states' governments**. In one of the countries where interviews were conducted, for instance, the letter to the Ministry of Agriculture informing them about the regional CAADP process arrived very late. This increases the risk that although the national and regional teams have identified gaps in national policies, raised awareness on issues with important regional implications, and connected the regional Compact with other policy frameworks, (albeit during national consultations where national government ministry representatives were present), these technocratic processes may not automatically translate into the political commitment of member states and ownership of technical ministries to adapt their policies accordingly. A regional CAADP that is formulated through an overly technocratic process will run the risk of ending up as a document on the shelf that will not get implemented. Beyond government representatives signing the regional CADP compact, ownership at the national sectoral ministry level (e.g. agriculture,

¹⁴ COMESA has a draft policy framework on food security for pastoralists: the COMESA Policy Framework for Food Security in Pastoralist Areas. Consultative Draft, December 2009

¹⁵ FAO supported regional team facilitating national consultations and preparation of the regional IGAD CAADP compact.

¹⁶ Physical interviews were conducted in Djibouti, Kenya and Ethiopia. Phone interviews were made to ministries in Uganda and Sudan.

trade) is particularly key. Nevertheless, the **IGAD Secretariat has been making efforts to address the gap in communication and increase awareness in ministries** in member states. Through several meetings¹⁷, for example, the April 2012 Ministerial Meeting in Nairobi,¹⁸ the IGAD Secretariat internal meeting with technical partners on linking the different processes in May, the Global Alliance for Action for Drought Resilience and Growth meeting in Geneva, in June and the Regional Technical review meeting¹⁹, which brought together technical experts from national ministries to review progress on the CPPs and RPF- the Secretariat has tried to redress this challenge to a considerable extent. In order to build credibility and ownership for its processes at the national technical level, the IGAD Secretariat has also organized a team, which will visit member states to inform them better about the on-going processes²⁰.

Another issue raised by few informants, especially NGOs and donors who have worked in the region for a while- is **the extent and direction in which a political mandate will really translate into a delegation of authority – or even facilitating power – to IGAD**. At its current levels of knowledge, policy analysis and implementation capacity is much lower than those of the member states, some feel that it could be a challenge for the IGAD Secretariat to play that facilitating role. But this perception is gradually changing. The Secretariat has intensified its engagement with member states and other regional partners over the course of the year, as part of developing the IDDRSI Strategic Plan, Regional Platform and the Regional CAADP. It has also facilitated the review of existing coordinating mechanisms at the national level, as an effort to improve exchange and information sharing between countries and the Secretariat. In line with this, IGAD has asked national (agriculture, trade, etc.) ministries to appoint focal points who will be responsible for liaising with the regional coordination mechanism(s) and will work towards streamlining initiatives in different ministries which have an impact on the resilience agenda. In addition, considering that the Secretariat has been the preferred partner for development partners, the current processes has created an opportunity for development partners to improve coordination (although this is not yet at an optimal level). All this has contributed to increased **confidence from member states to let IGAD lead coordination around the regional initiatives**.

The principle of **subsidiarity** is a key principle in the CAADP framework. It promotes the idea that decision-making, programming and delineation of responsibilities and resources is carried out by the level which is best suited to achieve results²¹. Issues that are over and beyond what a certain level can undertake alone is passed to the next level, to ensure that 'synergies, complementarities, boundaries and mandates are task oriented'²². This means that **roles and responsibilities are not cast in stone, but may evolve over time, according to who is best placed to do the work**. Current thinking among different stakeholders in IGAD envisages that CAADP implementation could take place at three levels:

- National – national: country level implementation by member states
- National – regional: implementation by member states in strong coordination with each other, of elements of a regional effort/ initiative, or implementation of an initiative in that country but which has value for the region (e.g. a road linking two or more countries)
- Regional – regional: implementation by IGAD institutions directly. Specific activities that are mentioned as requiring regional – regional implementation are support for the strengthening of non-state actors' capacity to engage in these processes and a number of specific stand-alone regional institutional capabilities (such as Regional Market Information Systems).

¹⁷ See Annex 1: Timeline of events and meetings

¹⁸ More about the April meetings available at: <http://hornofafricadevelopment.org/>

¹⁹ IGAD IDDRSI CPP and RPF Regional Technical Review Meeting, 6-8 October, Nairobi, Kenya

²⁰ The IGAD Secretariat organized a meeting on 15th May, where a decision was taken to conduct missions to member states, starting from June, in order to clarify the mechanisms of the regional CAADP and CPF processes, and build country devices for the regional platform.

²¹ NPCA. 2010. *Guide for CAADP country implementation*. Midrand: NPCA

²² NPCA. 2010. *Guide for CAADP country implementation*.

A number of informants (some working at the IGAD Secretariat, and others who have worked on regional integration issues) pointed to the **challenge of working out ways to operationalize this principle of subsidiarity**. It will not be easy to draw the line between facilitation and implementation, as there are a lot of grey areas. The IGAD mandate in general is limited to assisting its member states in formulating regional projects, facilitating coordination and harmonization of policies, and mobilizing resources. For the drought resilience and regional CAADP initiatives, the Secretariat was mandated to coordinate efforts to end drought emergencies in the Horn and to ensure strong linkages between the Plan of Action and activities undertaken by national governments and partners in the region²³. This mostly coordination role could be an obstacle to ensuring that a regional CAADP is sufficiently implemented over time. Operationalizing issues of complementarity and subsidiarity between regional and national processes is likely to be a challenge. A number of concerns have been raised by different interviewees:

- The large differences in national policies and strategies, in particular with regard to pastoralist and livestock livelihood. Overall, there is a consensus that national agricultural policies are focused strongly on high-land agriculture and place much less emphasis on low-land agriculture and pastoralism in particular. While a number of countries have a relatively explicit policy to settle the migratory pastoralists, others like Kenya, are well aware of the essence of mobility to drought resilience and has formulated its strategies for northern Kenya on the basis of this principle. The difference in policies with respect to ASAL areas is therefore quite vast, and this can lead to difficulties when regional approaches require a degree of policy harmonization. In addition, the degree to which civil society consultation is an accepted component of policy making is very different, with Kenya at one end of the spectrum and Ethiopia on the other.
- Implementation of regional agreements remains a major challenge. A number of regional policy frameworks already exist and have been signed off by IGAD member states, such as the AU-Inter African Bureau for Animal Resources (IBAR) Pastoral Policy Framework and the IGAD regional animal health framework. However, these have not been translated into policies or legislation at the national level.
- National level implementation of regional approaches requires very strong coordination and joint implementation. Differences in timelines, budget cycles, procurement and other systems and processes can easily cause delays and impair coordinated action. In particular for time-sensitive interventions, such as emergency vaccination campaigns, national level implementation may not suffice. For these reasons, a high number of informants (regional team, IGAD-Livestock Policy Initiative experts, some national ministry staff and some donor staff) underscored the importance of having a strong regional body that could provide a real momentum towards coordinated regional implementation. However, concerns were raised that national governments may not accept such a strong role to be played by IGAD, in particular when it means delegating authority to IGAD.

IGAD's somewhat weak mandate on implementation roles may hamper the regional CAADP process down the line. Leaving implementation almost entirely to the member states may be challenging, as some aspects of operationalizing regional policies could require that implementation efforts are undertaken by the REC itself. It may also be the case that for certain actions a degree of coordination is necessary that can only be achieved through regional implementation. Also for reasons of cost-benefit analysis regional arrangements for implementation may be called for. However, these are all likely to come up against sovereignty issues, especially when the interests of member states are divergent.

²³ The Communiqué of the 19th Extra-ordinary session of IGAD Assembly of Heads of States, reaffirmed the decision of September 8-9, 2011 directing IGAD to take the lead in coordinating efforts of all other actors in ending drought emergencies in the Region. Addis Ababa, 25 November 2011.

NSA perspectives and degree of engagement: regional representation non-existent

The formulation of a regional food security plan should guarantee stakeholders' ownership and aim at gathering support for its implementation. The regional CAADP *process* therefore should: be inclusive and transparent; effectively take into account the different points of view of all relevant stakeholders; include the design of mutual accountability mechanisms allowing for the monitoring of stakeholders' implementation responsibilities and the evaluation of food security impacts further down the line. Arguably farmers and other private sector actors are the most important groups to be involved in the design and implementation of CAADP-related policies and investment, both as key contributors to food security and as beneficiaries of support programmes.

The IGAD region is predominantly an ASAL area, however, in countries like Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda, there is at least equal, if not more engagement in highland farming activities. In countries where pastoralism and livestock livelihoods are more prevalent, pastoralist organizations exist and contribute to national agricultural policies/ debates. However, in most countries, sedentary farming takes precedence, and pastoralist organizations are not always able to provide sufficient input into general agricultural policy processes²⁴. Among most non-state actors (NSA) interviewed, there is a general understanding that national agricultural strategies in most, if not all, **IGAD member-states have a strong bias towards high-potential commercial agriculture**, and particularly on crop agriculture. Livestock is an area that is underrepresented in national agriculture strategies, and mobile livestock keeping (pastoralism) even more so. Livestock policies that do exist tend to focus on commercial livestock keeping, such as dairy, rather than focus on where the bulk of the livestock is; e.g. in ASAL areas. According to many non-state actors, including those who have worked on the Livestock Policy Initiative (LPI)²⁵, and even national ministry staff, the awareness of importance of the livestock sector and livestock production systems in the ASAL areas is slowly increasing, but still very low. From interviews in the region, it was obvious that among stakeholders that have been deeply involved with policy development for ASAL areas and pastoralism, the awareness of a need for a regional response, such as a regional CAADP process dedicated to the ASAL region, is quite high. In comparison, similar awareness is considerably lower among stakeholders who are involved in general agricultural policy areas. Although some IGAD member states, like Uganda and Kenya, and even parts of Ethiopia have sizeable non-pastoral farming communities, this paper focuses on pastoralists as the main concern in terms of NSAs. This is based on the premise that while non-pastoralist livelihoods and organizations are relatively able to have their voice and concerns fed into the policy arena, this is not necessarily the case for pastoralist representation in the region.

At the regional level there is no entity that represents the pastoralists' perspectives; neither in the shape of a regional representative body or a regional interest group. There is also no IGAD specific regional farmers representation, rather the East African Farmers Federation (EAFF) represents the broader interests of farmers organizations of most IGAD member states. Even at the national level, pastoralist representation is weak. Organization of pastoralists and the expression of the voice of pastoralists' interests lags behind other agricultural producers quite significantly. In all countries, there is an enormous gap in capacity between cooperatives and associations representing the interests of high-potential crop producers and traders, livestock producers and traders, and pastoralists, in decreasing order of capacity. The lowest degree of organization and capacity is found among pastoralists, both at national and regional level. This leads to an imbalance of perspectives being represented in national and regional processes that

²⁴ This bias is often politically influenced. Some countries that have realized this stronger political push for sedentary farming and have made efforts to redress this bias (e.g. Kenya has done to some degree)

²⁵ The work done by the Livestock Policy Initiative has tried to address this imbalance, for instance through coming up with new, and more accurate ways to calculate the contribution livestock makes to the GDP. In the case of Ethiopia, this led to an upward adjustment of the contribution of livestock to GDP by 47%. When including all services provided by livestock, the total value is more than 350% of the original estimate. (IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative – Livestock Brief; Livestock's Contribution to Ethiopia's Economy: Much Higher than Previously Thought. IGAD LPI Brief 7)

needs to be addressed. It is strongly felt by many that work on pastoralist issues, that pastoralists' interests should not be merged with other farmers' interests. **Efforts should be made towards a stronger national or regional expression of pastoralists voices**, and this should be kept separate from efforts in organizing other farmers. On this basis a **regional CAADP compact could be a good tool to mobilize pastoralist representation's involvement in regional policy issues**.

There is high agreement among most key stakeholders, including non-state actors, that the focus areas of the IGAD regional compact, as identified by the regional team are indeed the right ones: facilitating mobility across borders, and improving livestock trade within (and beyond) the region; trans-boundary animal disease control, management of natural resources; conflict prevention and resolution; disaster risk management, and; knowledge exchange and policy harmonization around the above mentioned policy areas. However, perspectives on the more specific policies and interventions to be prioritized for action through the regional compact differ somewhat, depending on the specific interests of the stakeholders and the development paradigm they subscribe to.

National pastoralist associations and pastoralist advocacy organizations stress the importance of mobility as a key element of strategies for ASAL areas, with mobility having a strong regional dimension. In addition, they underscore the need for a holistic approach that deals with the people (pastoralists), the resource base (pasture and water) and livestock in conjunction. Facilitating (cross-border) mobility and empowering traditional institutions to play a key role in (cross-border) natural resource management is key.

National private-sector associations representing livestock producers and traders, such as the Kenya Livestock Marketing Council and the Agro-pastoral association of Djibouti, focus more on facilitating livestock trade across borders, facilitating access to markets and increasing agricultural productivity (for instance through breed improvement and enhanced livestock feeding).

The only regional farmers organization that exists for IGAD is the **East African Farmers Federation** (EAFF). At regional level, the EAFF is the most vocal and capable organization, representing farmers and traders. They are organized along commodity lines, and have members in ten countries²⁶ across East Africa, including in some IGAD member states (Kenya, Ethiopia, Eritrea, South Sudan, Uganda and Djibouti). Livestock is not their strongest pillar, although their membership does include a number of livestock producers and traders organizations. Yet, pastoralists are not strongly represented by them, as their emphasis lies on trade and marketing and not on pastoralist livelihoods. The EAFF takes a similar view to the above mentioned private sector associations, when it comes to livestock issues. The EAFF feels that COMESA has failed to recognize livestock's contribution to the economy and to food security, and view this as an important niche for IGAD. However, they feel that IGAD should look at these issues more broadly, and needs to invest solidly in research on the long-term sustainability of pastoralism, especially considering climate change, and perhaps explore alternative avenues (such as agro-pastoralism). As the perspective of the EAFF is broader than livestock producers and traders, and encompasses all farmers' interests, they identified a number of additional priority areas for regional action: regional infrastructure; improved management of relative surpluses and shortages in the region (Regional Food Balance Sheet); Regional Market Information Systems; harmonization of trade policies and agricultural subsidies; management of shared water resources.

The **degree and nature of engagement of these categories of non-state actors in the regional CAADP formulation process differs**. From interviews with national pastoralist organizations in IGAD

²⁶ EAFF members are present in: Tanzania, Rwanda, Burundi, Kenya, Ethiopia, Eritrea, South Sudan, Uganda, Democratic Republic of Congo, and Djibouti

countries visited, the level of awareness of NSAs about these processes- the regional CAADP and CPFs is very weak. On the whole, most non-state actors, with the exception of the EAFF, are not very well aware of the regional IGAD CAADP process. Even with the EAFF, there were initially some gaps in communication, as they were not formally invited to the launch workshop in Djibouti, despite having a long history of involvement in national and regional CAADP processes and holding observer status in the East African Community (EAC). On their own accord, the EAFF presented themselves to the IGAD Secretariat, requesting a seat at the table, and drafted a MoU for formal engagement in the IGAD regional CAADP process.

Other non-state actors are even less familiar with the process of formulating a regional CAADP.

Some are vaguely aware that these processes are happening, but uninformed of concrete steps in the process and how and whether they will be able to participate. Even those that have basic knowledge about the IGAD regional CAADP process are largely unaware of its potential future significance as the basis for regional investment in the Horn of Africa, within the context of the initiative to 'end drought emergencies' in the Horn.

However, despite these challenges, many stakeholders strongly believe that the IGAD regional CAADP process definitely provides the **opportunity to bring NSAs, including pastoralists' views, priorities and concerns to the fore**. In addition, these stakeholders felt that particularly in situations where there is a weak enabling environment for NSA engagement, IGAD could provide a real opportunity for enhanced participation. Despite this optimistic view, there have been a number of challenges, for example: some pastoralist organizations²⁷ did not feel that their participation in the national consultation meeting was very effective; they were merely asked to give their consensus to a prepared statement. They claimed that they were not involved in the elaboration of the document, and they were not given sufficient time to analyse the document, nor was there space and time during the national consultation to really discuss issues and wrestle them to the ground. In general, with the ever-shifting dates, the late or no circulation of country reports before the consultation meetings, non-state actors did not always have enough time to prepare themselves for the national consultation. This sentiment was echoed by the EAFF more broadly.

From discussions with the EAFF and some other pastoralist organizations, there was the perception that it might be tricky getting non-state actors to sign off whole-heartedly on a regional IGAD CAADP if their participation has been limited. The East African Farmers Federation and its associated members, who would be the most logical signatories on the side of the farmers' organizations, have expressed strong concerns about the governance of the process.

While there is room for stronger NSA involvement as the regional CAADP process rolls out, some credit should be given to the Secretariat and the Regional Team for doing their best to ensure broad-based participation. Despite the above mentioned short-comings, the national consultations organized in IGAD member states was a good opportunity to bring together farmers and pastoralists, among others to trash out the key priorities for a regional CAADP approach. The IGAD Secretariat has also intensified efforts in recent months to share information with and get ownership from NSAs for the broader resilience process. To this end, a consultative meeting with regional NSAs²⁸ was organized in October 2012. The two-day meeting brought together NGOs, private sector representatives, pastoralist and farmer organizations, and regional learning centres, to get a shared understanding of the IDDRS Initiative and the roles of different NSAs could have in contributing to the IDDRSI Strategic Plan. The meeting was an opportunity to explore how NSAs can work with the IGAD Secretariat to elaborate and implement the national and regional plans

²⁷ This was shared during interviews in Djibouti: the Agro-pastoralist association of Djibouti participated in the national consultations for the regional IGAD compact, but voiced the above-mentioned challenges.

²⁸ IGAD Non-State Actors Consultative meeting, October 4-5, 2012, Naivasha, Kenya

for building resilience, food security and sustainable development. Here as well, these actors stressed the importance of “timely and continuous engagement and involvement of all relevant NSAs in the process, before verification and approval of the final strategy documents and plans”²⁹. IGAD also has an **NGO and Civil Society Forum**³⁰ that could be used as a platform to promote livestock, pastoralist and others farmers’ representations’ engagement at the regional level, based on principles of broad-based participation. From all discussions with stakeholders, it was not clear if this Forum is operational. It would indeed be a **missed opportunity if this mechanism is not exploited for interaction and exchange of information and experience** between national NSAs and encourage the establishment of a regional livestock/ pastoralist representation.

The role of IGAD Secretariat: right institution, strong mandate, but weak capacity

Many stakeholders feel that IGAD can play an important role in redressing the current underinvestment in ASAL areas, both financially and policy-wise. There is broad **agreement that IGAD is the right (and possibly only) REC that can adequately forge regional approaches to address ASAL specific issues**. The unique characteristics of the Horn of Africa make the IGAD region the right geographical locus for regional approaches to get shaped. In addition, there is the perception that the IGAD has a clear mandate for development, ‘as reflected in its name, in which ‘development’ features prominently. Although in recent years, it has focused more on peace and security, its vision and mandate³¹ is still very well suited for this purpose.

A number of specific issues were raised by some donors, as well as national ministry staff, with regard to the IGAD Secretariat’s capacity. Overall, the leadership of IGAD received a lot of praise, and the Executive Secretary has acquired substantial goodwill and credibility, with member states governments, donors and technical experts. The different regional initiatives have moved at quite a fast pace, which on one hand is considered good, as the response to the region’s food crisis was swift. But many interviewees felt that the speed at which the regional IGAD compact process- alongside the other regional drought resilience processes- were moving might mean that the IGAD Secretariat is overstretched and might not be able to provide the necessary guidance and direction, given its current capacity shortcomings. They stressed that it is **essential that strong institutional foundations be created** upon which an initiative this ambitious can be built. In particular, there is a sense that the layer of strong people within the IGAD secretariat is too narrow and that capacity is spread too thin. Some feel that IGAD has gotten involved in too many initiatives, but doesn’t have the capacity to follow through. It is viewed as essential to build a stronger second tier of capacity within the Secretariat.

A number of stakeholders at country level (within ministries) feel that the Secretariat will need to build up a significantly strong technical capacity in order to position itself as an organization that can facilitate policy harmonization between member states with highly divergent policies. A relatively high number of informants (especially development partner staff who have worked in the region and with the IGAD Secretariat, but also some staff working at the national agriculture ministries and some members of the regional team working on the compact process) also said that IGAD would need the empowerment that comes with having resources. **IGAD would need to have access to some funds**, not merely for its own operations but also to serve as a source of funding for member states in order to be perceived as adding value. However, it was also felt by many of these stakeholders interviewed that it might be difficult convincing member states to accept that funding be channelled through the Secretariat/ regional level.

²⁹ IGAD. 2012. IDDRSI report on the proceedings of the IGAD Non-State Actors Consultative meeting, October 4-5, 2012, Naivasha, Kenya

³⁰ Initiated in the Khartoum Declaration at the 8th Summit of Heads of State and Government of IGAD

³¹ More information available at: http://www.igad.int/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=93&Itemid=124&limitstart=1

Based on discussion with various interviewees it appears that there are real risks associated with building up capacity rapidly in a weak institution that finds itself in a strong force field of players. A number of **high-powered donors are involved, that have their own dynamics and drivers and have strong ideas on policies, priorities and strategies**. A weak institution may not be able to pull these strong actors together, unless it has a very strong core capacity, that is seen as legitimate by the sub-regional organizations and member states' regional initiatives it aims to coordinate. From some of the interviewees' opinions on what approach should be adopted to better address drought, resilience and food security challenges in the Horn, it appeared that there could be a risk that **the REC will become a proxy arena for a battle over paradigms and developmental visions**. This risk is especially high if a capacity development strategy chosen is one that depends strongly on the support of (seconded) advisors from donor agencies within the Secretariat. To mitigate this risk, some suggestions point out that it is essential that IGAD recruits its own people, ideally from the region, and build up its core capacity rapidly and independently. This could mean seconding experts from national ministries in IGAD member states, to strengthen the Secretariat, rather than solely hiring foreign experts.

However, It was felt by some regional team members, other (LPI) experts and some at the AUC, who have worked closely with the Secretariat, that IGAD could make use of the experience and expertise held by the AUC, the NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency (NPCA) and COMESA. Using CAADP would provide IGAD with an institutional support mechanism that it could draw upon, and it would not have to reinvent the wheel. In addition, some of the experts referred to above mentioned that while IGAD has a number of satellite bodies that function relatively well and do have capacity (such as the Conflict Early Warning Mechanism, CEWARN), the knowledge and expertise acquired by these bodies has not become fully integrated into the IGAD Secretariat, which is seen as an opportunity lost. The same holds true for the IGAD-LPI, the Livestock Policy Initiative, where a wealth of knowledge on evidenced-based policy making has been collected. These informants felt that this is a tremendous asset that could strengthen IGAD considerably if it was brought on board in a smart manner.

Nevertheless, there have been strong attempts at building capacity and doing so in a streamlined way. ,The **mandate given to IGAD to strengthen drought resilience in the Horn of Africa is very strong**, both from the member states and from development partners. This creates such an opportunity that the overall sentiment is that the Secretariat's current low capacity should not be seen as an impediment to working with IGAD; rather it should be seen as a strong justification for concerted and coordinated effort into strengthening the Secretariat's capacity. Also, **recent efforts have been made to build capacity within the Secretariat**. IGAD has now signed MoUs with key development partners for capacity building initiatives. This was agreed at a meeting of technical assistance sub-group of the Global Alliance to support the IGAD Regional Platform in August 2012. Development partners committed technical support for the newly established regional platform, its organs, and especially the platform coordination unit within IGAD towards the development of a coherent approach of technical assistance. The Global Alliance, an informal alliance to support the Drought Resilience initiative has developed a matrix of what each partners is going to offer IGAD to strengthen the Secretariat's capacity.

All in all, it was generally agreed that while capacity building will take time, IGAD could already start engaging with those areas where it has a real comparative advantage, and build up credibility and legitimacy steadily by starting with the low-hanging fruit, for example, fast-tracking regional trade in livestock, management of shared natural resources, etc. Stakeholders recommended that the Secretariat should not succumb to a premature overload as it risks delegitimizing itself and the processes it aims to coordinate. One donor representative expressed his fear that IGAD-led donor coordination mechanisms may not be seen as sufficiently legitimate (to promote performance) and effective by the donors, at which

point its presence may hamper donor coordination rather than strengthen it, or may again lead to the establishment of parallel systems.

The role of development partners: urgent need for coordination among donor initiatives

There is a real sense among donors and other key stakeholders in the IGAD region that there is a need for a new approach to the recurrent droughts in the Horn of Africa. Some donors, such as USAID, have made this a key area of concern, and are well aware of the urgency with which both internal and external process management needs to turn a corner and adopt drastically new approaches, notably addressing underlying causes, developing resilience strengthening policies and better linking relief to development interventions. The current situation, in which emergency aid creates dependency and undermines medium- to long-term development approaches, needs to be reversed and synergies sought. A lot of progress has been made over recent years in developing innovative approaches³², but the ways of working of donors, implementation agencies, national governments and regional coordination bodies needs to be adapted accordingly for these approaches to be implemented effectively. A number of informants- in national ministries, and among donor representation, viewed this general and shared **sense of urgency and acknowledgement of the changes required as an unprecedented** opportunity that should be seized.

The **direct engagement of donors in the formulation of the CAADP Compact has been relatively limited**³³, although there is interest in the process. The regional team and technical experts recruited by FAO are conducting the necessary steps to formulate the regional CAADP and donors are waiting for the final product before engaging further. So far no donor coordination mechanisms have shaped up around the regional CAADP, which seems to be mostly due to the high degree of confusion around the other ongoing processes, and the possible role of the Regional Platform. As the role of CAADP in the Regional Platform is still unclear, some development partners interviewed do not yet see CAADP as the main framework on which investment will be based.

There is however a strong sense among donors that **improved regional coordination is of utmost importance**, to guide this process well. Donor coordination is necessary at a number of levels: sectoral programming (agriculture, natural resource management, conflict, disaster risk management, etc); country programming, and between regional and national programming. A **regional CAADP can potentially serve as a framework for coordination between these levels**, as it does provide a useful template that is already established at continental level, in which expertise has been built up and building blocks have already been prepared (mechanisms of mutual accountability are an integral part of). It is for this reason that a number of donors view CAADP as the right framework to provide and strengthen overall coherence and coordination. However, for other donors, this overarching role for CAADP is less evident. In any case, most stress strongly the need for donor coordination led by IGAD, be it through the CAADP or through any other vehicle.

As mentioned above, some donors have been particularly active in supporting the HoA resilience processes. As described earlier an IGAD partners' consultative meeting held in November 2011 ended with a commitment to form a regional IGAD Platform to coordinate the drought resilience initiatives. In April 2012, another development partners meeting was held in Nairobi to follow up on progress made on the September commitment and fast-track implementation of the regional platform. This meeting also ended with an agreement among development partners to establish a Global Alliance for Action for Drought

³² Most notably through the LEGS initiative: Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards. More information available at: <http://www.livestock-emergency.net/>

³³ With the exception of FAO, which provides and coordinates technical support for the different processes.

Resilience and Growth³⁴. The Global Alliance was created to allow development partners to better coordinate, harmonize and align programme investments and policy to ongoing initiatives in the Horn (and the Sahel). The Alliance is meant to provide a mechanism that allows for coherence among funding and investment activities, strengthens coordination of humanitarian and development assistance, build new partnerships with civil society and the private sector and connects global donors with regional and country level coordinating bodies³⁵.

Since September 2011, it is estimated that the development community has committed about US\$ 4 billion toward the HoA Initiatives³⁶. The Global Alliance is currently based around those development partners that came on board at the first Nairobi Summit. This includes: USAID, the EU, DFID, Denmark, Sweden, and several multilateral organizations- FAO, World Bank, the African Development Bank. Other non-traditional development partners have also indicated interest in the Alliance, Turkey, Qatar and Saudi Arabia, among others. According to USAID, the current priority is to consolidate this group and clearly identify those who are keen on participating in and contributing to the Alliance and drought resilience efforts. Responsibility for organizing the coordination activities of the Alliance will be assigned to development partners on a revolving basis. The US is currently serving as the Secretariat for the Alliance, for the first year³⁷.

IGAD has also endorsed³⁸ the "Supporting Horn of Africa Resilience" (SHARE) initiative, which has received a €250 million contribution from the European Union (EU) in May 2012³⁹. The first phase (2012-2013), funded by the EU, foresees measures in the drought-affected areas of Somalia, Ethiopia, Kenya, and Djibouti. It is designed to improve the resilience of communities and give better access to safe water and nutrition⁴⁰.

Many national and regional representatives interviewed mentioned that **the existence of different decision-making processes, budgeting processes, time cycles and implementation modalities of the development partners, is expected to be a major challenge** to implement a coordinated approach to food security in the region. Many donors have already designed their multi-annual programs and investment commitments are made, before a common regional strategy framework and investment plan is finalized. In addition, it is unlikely that all resources will be channeled through a multi-donor trust fund, and budget support will not be acceptable to all donors, and clearly not for all IGAD countries. There is the risk that coordination is therefore likely to be limited to information and knowledge sharing, with at best some degree of division of labour. Of course this problem is not unique to the Horn of Africa, and the current drive of donors to rally themselves behind an IGAD-forged strategy is quite strong. Yet, the practical implementation for the regional CAADP will be a challenge, in particular in the short- and medium run.

The role of pan-African institutions and other RECs

Institutions responsible for CAADP implementation at the pan-African level, such as the AUC and NPCA, are also important actors in the regional food security processes. The AU has since the height of the HoA food crisis, been active in mobilizing support for the region, starting with a pledging conference in August

³⁴ More information available at: <http://transition.usaid.gov/press/releases/2012/pr120404.html>

³⁵ USAID. 2012. USAID Feed the Future Stakeholder Meeting: New Country and Region-Led Efforts and Partnerships for Enhancing Resilience and Building Growth in the Horn of Africa. Q & A Transcript. May 10, 2012

³⁶ See: <http://transition.usaid.gov/press/releases/2012/pr120404.html>

³⁷ USAID. 2012. USAID Feed the Future Stakeholder Meeting: New Country and Region-Led Efforts and Partnerships for Enhancing Resilience and Building Growth in the Horn of Africa. Q & A Transcript. May 10, 2012

³⁸ IGAD. 2012. Communiqué for the Joint IGAD Ministerial and High Level Development Partners on Drought Resilience in the Horn of Africa. Nairobi, Kenya, 4th April 2012.

³⁹ European Commission. 2012. Kenya: New EU support to strengthen food security among vulnerable mothers and children. Press Release 2 May 2012. Available at: <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/443>

⁴⁰ More information available at: http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/georgieva/hot_topics/horn_africa_one_year_on_en.htm

2011⁴¹, to raise funds and donations from other African countries. In addition, the AUC has developed a longer-term strategy to address food and nutrition crises not just in the Horn, but also across the continent. The AUC is very clear about using CAADP as the flagship framework to ensure food security and build resilience of vulnerable populations to food crises. They propose to work with affected communities through CAADP Pillar 3 to build social protection and productive safety net programmes, water conservation and community infrastructure, cash and food transfers and school feeding programs, etc. Predictable contingency funds and innovative insurance schemes will also be established at national and regional levels to strengthen institutions' preparedness and response capacity to related crises.⁴²

Although the AUC has noble plans for dealing with food crises across the continent, a number of **stakeholders questioned the appropriateness of CAADP as the right tool to deal with ASAL specific challenges, resilience and safety nets**. In addition, safety nets and social protection (Pillar 3) were not identified as priority areas of the IGAD regional compact.

Other RECs - COMESA and EAC - are also in the process of developing a regional CAADP compact. The COMESA process has been on for almost two years and EAC since August 2011. Given that some IGAD member states are part of either COMESA or EAC or both, many stakeholders stressed that **dialogue with these RECs is necessary to get a minimum understanding of - and possibly agreement on - the added value each REC brings to the regional CAADP process**. Although, IGAD has made an effort to learn from the regional CAADP process in West Africa. Members of the regional facilitating team visited the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) region to draw lessons from the ECOWAS regional agriculture programme, ECOWAP/ CAADP process.

There is general agreement that each REC has different areas where they have comparative advantage and it makes sense to focus on. COMESA was portrayed as primarily being about regional trade and infrastructure, EAC about deepening political, economic and even monetary integration. IGAD's comparative advantage was described mostly in terms of development of marginalized areas, particularly dry-land management and pastoralism in the context of disaster risk management and food security. These issues are of the highest importance for the Horn of Africa, and would get diluted in a REC as large as COMESA, and even in a smaller REC as the EAC where these issues do not feature as highly on the agenda.

In general, most informants (especially regional team members, national CAADP focal points and other LPI experts) were not aware of any processes currently in place through which possible overlapping CAADPs could be addressed, as they were not fully aware of the details of all ongoing REC CAADP processes (EAC, COMESA, IGAD). These interviewees also did not express particularly strong views on how the different regional CAADPs would hang together. One national CAADP focal point did express however that an IGAD regional CAADP might eventually need to be included in a tripartite agreement⁴³, because of the overlapping memberships.

⁴¹ African Union Commission. 2011. Pledging Conference for the Horn of Africa. 25 August 2011. Available at: <http://www.au.int/pages/savinglives/events/pledging-conference-horn-africa-2011>

⁴² AUC. 2011. African Union's Perspective on a Long-Term Strategy to Addressing Food and Nutrition Crises in Africa. African Union Pledging Conference for Countries of Horn of Africa affected by drought and Famine, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia 25 August 2011.

⁴³ The COMESA-EAC-SADC Tripartite was created in 2006 to assist in the process of harmonising programmes and policies within and between the three RECs and to advance the establishment of a COMESA-EAC-SADC Free Trade Area (FTA), trade corridors, infrastructure development and industrial development.

2.2. CAADP regional plans and linkages with the overall framework for regional integration

Although bound by historical and geographical inter-dependence, the IGAD region has struggled with moving ahead on economic and regional integration. There is great potential to exploit synergies between cross-border exchanges and shared regional challenges. From the direction taken by the IGAD Secretariat and the regional team working on the IGAD regional compact, it is clear that the linkages between regional food security plans are being made with other regional sectoral areas. However, here it is important to emphasise that, the IGAD region **still faces serious challenges when it comes to regional integration**, which are likely to be reflected also in the implementation of regional CAADP. In addition, even where there is some degree of consensus on the need for a regional approach, the **perspectives on what a regional CAADP approach means for the IGAD region differs quite substantially among stakeholders**.

Concerns about CAADP as the overarching strategy framework for drought resilience

A number of concerns were raised about the use of CAADP as the overarching framework for coordinated regional action. One facet to the emerging complexities around a regional CAADP is the IDDRSI Initiative and its Strategic Plan. Putting the priority areas of the draft IDDRSI Strategic Plan and the IGAD regional CAADP compact⁴⁴ side by side, it becomes clear that these initiatives overlap in terms of intervention and approach:

Box 2: Priority areas of parallel initiatives

IDDRSI priority areas	IGAD regional CAADP
Coordination, institutional strengthening and partnerships	Trans-boundary animal disease control;
Natural resources and environment management	Management of natural resources
Livelihoods support and basic social services	-
Market access, trade and financial services	Mobility of livestock, people and goods, and cross-border livestock and goods trade
Research, knowledge management and technology transfer	Knowledge exchange and policy harmonization
Conflict prevention, resolution and peace building;	Conflict prevention and resolution, linked to NRM between farmers and pastoralists
Disaster risk management, preparedness and effective response	Disaster risk management (DRM), tailored to pastoralist areas

Both initiatives appear to address similar challenges, except for the regional CAADP compact, which does not prioritize livelihood and social services as a focal area. Some stakeholders were concerned about how the IGAD regional CAADP, which is based on the four pillars of the CAADP framework and covers all agro-ecological areas, will address issues specific to ASAL areas. They suggested that the IDDRSI Strategy, which focuses only on ASAL areas, might be a more appropriate intervention.

The flip side would be, considering that IGAD is a REC well placed to address the challenges of ASAL areas, the regional CAADP could be an “ASAL-focused CAADP”, rather than one that covers all agro-ecological issues. However, the very idea of this “ASAL CAADP” is a source of concern to some stakeholders. One of the biggest drawbacks is that many consider that the CAADP framework is not strong enough to address the specific challenges of ASAL areas. According to a number of informants (including some in the IGAD Secretariat itself) **it is not possible to have a ‘partial CAADP’, i.e. a regional CAADP**

⁴⁴ Preliminary priority areas of the regional CAADP were identified in the Regional Comprehensive African Agriculture Programme (CAADP) Roadmap towards Building the IGAD Regional CAADP Compact: “Pre-Compact Roadmap”. 26 January 2012, Djibouti

framework that focuses predominantly on ASAL issues. These stakeholders argue that the core principles of the CAADP framework focus on agricultural productivity and growth and less on vulnerability and resilience. **Livestock development and livelihoods, which is important for ASAL areas, is a thematic area that is widely believed to be under-emphasized in the CAADP framework.** Some even argue that efforts to address this short-coming, for example the AU-IBAR Companion Document for the livestock component of CAADP⁴⁵, still fall short by focusing mostly on livestock productivity and markets, while paying less attention to the social challenges facing those who depend on livestock for their livelihoods and does not promote a more social-oriented livelihoods approach⁴⁶. Other documents prepared by continental institutions, also acknowledge this weakness, for example, an AU-IBAR framework for mainstreaming livestock in the CAADP pillars, goes further to recognize that poverty reduction of pastoralists and livestock owners is not sufficiently incorporated in national agricultural and livestock policies and recommends ways how elements at the heart of livestock livelihoods can be integrated into existing CAADP pillars⁴⁷. A high number of stakeholders (ranging from LPI experts and pastoralist organizations, to some donor staff who are familiar with CAADP and IGAD Secretariat representatives) indicated that using the CAADP framework as the basis for a regional approach to drought resilience in IGAD (i.e. an “ASAL CAADP”) would have sub-optimal outcomes, with pastoralist livelihoods still being marginalized.

Another concern is the **low (or non-existent) prioritization of livestock livelihoods and pastoralists in CAADP at the national level.** The relative undervaluation of livestock in national CAADP compacts is not only a feature of the CAADP framework itself, it also reflects existing biases in national policy making, of which national CAADPs are a manifestation. Many stakeholders, particularly pastoralist representation and advocacy at the national level and LPI experts, expressed their concern that national agricultural policies and investment plans continue to favour ‘commercial, crop-based agriculture over livestock development, and in particular extensive livestock development. **High-land agriculture receives much more policy attention and investment than ASAL areas.** Research and even tertiary education are also heavily skewed in that direction, contributing to the knowledge gap on pastoralism, extensive livestock keeping and the ASAL areas in general. This concern is corroborated by a IGAD-LPI study⁴⁸ that presents the shortcomings of these compacts very clearly by concluding there has been “a complete failure to recognize the broader livelihood services derived from livestock, ignoring that the majority of livestock keepers in Africa are “marginal livestock keepers” who are unable to participate in national and regional markets”; little evidence that livestock representatives were consulted for participation in the design of the CAADP Compacts; if livestock views were represented, then these predominantly focused on male-oriented activities, without a balanced representation of women livestock keepers; compacts were developed based on existing policy documents, basically duplicating the same challenges which are present in those documents”. Therefore, these interviewees stressed emphatically that **using the existing agricultural policies and national CAADP compacts as building blocks for a regional approach will only serve to transfer a problem from the national to the regional level.**

Other RECs- COMESA and EAC- of which some IGAD member states are also members of, are currently in the process of developing regional CAADP compacts. This adds to the complexity associated with an IGAD regional CAADP and raises the question on how possibly ‘overlapping’ regional CAADPs will be addressed. If there can be no partial CAADP, can there be overlapping CAADPs? **IGAD is suggesting focusing on particular areas, based on where it’s comparative niche lies- ASAL areas and its**

⁴⁵ CAADP. 2006. *Companion Document: Integrating livestock, forestry and fisheries subsectors into the CAADP*. Midrand: NEPAD

⁴⁶ Nouala et al. 2012. *Including Livestock in the CAADP compacts: A framework for analysis for country CAADP teams*. IGAD LPI Working Paper No. 03 -12. Nairobi: IGAD-LPI

⁴⁷ AU-IBAR. 2010. *Framework for Mainstreaming Livestock in the CAADP Pillars*. Nairobi: AU-IBAR

⁴⁸ Nouala et al. 2012. *The Livestock Sector in the CAADP Compacts: Evidence from IGAD countries*. IGAD LPI Working Paper No. 04-12. Nairobi: IGAD-LPI

related challenges. However, if a COMESA or EAC regional compact covers everything (i.e. both agriculture and livestock), it is hard to see how complementarity can be obtained. These questions are too large for IGAD alone to answer. It is therefore important for the IGAD Secretariat and Regional Team, with support of the AUC/NPCA, to engage and discuss with the CAADP counterparts at COMESA and EAC to clarify the priorities, focus and future direction of each of these simultaneous regional CAADP processes.

In recent months, given the IGAD Secretariat's capacity constraints, more attention has been paid to developing the IDDRSI Strategic Plan and the Regional Platform. These were specific deliverables that directly came out of the Nairobi Summit in September 2011. So while the IGAD Secretariat is making efforts to simultaneously work on all initiatives, getting the Strategic Plan finalized and Platform established appears to have taken precedence over the regional CAADP, at least for now. Most stakeholders say that IGAD is well placed to play a crucial role on placing the vulnerability of ASAL populations back on the agenda, and is currently doing this with on-going initiatives. However, the question remains how to best use a framework like CAADP to contribute to broader resilience objectives; how can IGAD leverage a regional CAADP compact and investment plan to fast-track implementation of existing (livestock related) policy frameworks. Many argue that the debate should be less on "which overarching framework" but more emphasis should be placed on "how" could the parallel initiatives complement each other to achieve the overall goals of the IDDRSI Initiative. **CAADP could be a useful framework if it is used at its most flexible.** The box below provides some insight into the added value of the CAADP framework.

Box 3: Added value of the CAADP framework

The CAADP framework is an existing continental framework that has legitimacy, is African-owned, has clear principles on which it is based (inclusiveness, subsidiarity and complementarity, partnership, mutual accountability, peer review mechanisms) and is comprehensive. It serves as a rallying point for and has established institutions, expertise, and partnerships to support the CAADP formulation and implementation processes. CAADP is considered by many as the official road map to ensure that the continent achieves the AU's vision on agriculture by 2015.

CAADP provides a useful framework for enhanced policy harmonization, by linking national agriculture processes to regional ones to continental ones. National CAADPs serve as building blocks for regional CAADPs, and regional CAADPs are expected to complement national policies and address areas where a cross-border approach is necessary. This contributes to vertical coherence and facilitates integration and complementarity at different levels.

As the C in CAADP stands for comprehensive, it allows for issues that go beyond agriculture, but are inherently linked to be included, e.g. trade in agriculture products, infrastructure development, natural resource management, etc. While other equally relevant dimensions, such as provision of basic social services, social protection, and disaster risk management are not sufficiently integrated in the framework; current reflections are being made on how to better address these areas with CAADPs that are fit to the specific context of a country or region. This broad-based nature of the CAADP can also help strengthen horizontal coherence between different sectoral areas (such as agricultural productivity, natural resource management, and conflict for instance). CAADP is relatively flexible as a framework, as the wide variety of national CAADP Compacts attests to. As living evolving documents, the CAADP compact and its multi-annual investment plans are flexible enough to adapt to changing development priorities and continuous sequence of planning, consultation, agreement and adoption, financing, monitoring and review. An example can be taken from the COMESA CAADP, which proposes to develop the regional compact as a living document, which can be adjusted to fit the implications of the national compacts for overall regional work.

The crux of CAADP is ownership. Because the CAADP framework promotes a multi-stakeholder participatory approach, if done right, the CAADP process for formulating national and regional food security plans has the potential to guarantee stakeholders' ownership and gather support for future implementation. A regional CAADP process should be inclusive and transparent, effectively taking into account the different points of view of all relevant stakeholders, including the design of mutual accountability mechanisms that allow for the monitoring of stakeholders' implementation responsibilities and the evaluation of food security impacts.

3. Other regional initiatives relevant to food security and possible linkages with CAADP

To effectively implement its mandate, IGAD has established several institutions and specialized centres of excellence, such as the IGAD Climate Prediction and Applications Centre (ICPAC) and Conflict Early Warning Mechanism (CEWARN), and some regional policies and programmes, which are very important to achieve food security objectives, e.g. the AU Pastoral Policy Framework and the IGAD Regional Animal Health Framework in the context of Trade. The Secretariat is also in the process of establishing the IGAD Centre for Pastoral Areas and Livestock Development (ICPALD). In many cases these initiatives precede the CAADP. In order to assess the progress and future prospects of regional food security plans, it is important to analyse the status of such policies and programmes. Understanding their strengths and weaknesses, what major bottlenecks they encounter, is crucial to:

1. Avoid duplications and identify opportunities and challenges for the creation of synergies with CAADP;
2. Understand whether the implementation of CAADP at regional level can build on the progress in other sectors and possibly contribute to removing current obstacles to those existing regional initiatives;
3. Implement a regional CAADP investment plan, which could benefit from existing investments (if any), which IGAD is taking forward in other regional integration areas, in a way that is coherent, complementary and coordinated.

This section can only provide some examples and **preliminary ideas about possible synergies between CAADP and other relevant regional initiatives**. Many other programmes, policies and investments could be looked at to derive lessons for regional food security cooperation. Synergies could be explored more in detail during the regional compact finalization process and other multi-stakeholder dialogues, when actors will be able to discuss concretely about coherence, complementarity and coordination of specific CAADP actions within the regional compact with other existing policies and investments. In certain circumstances, even if synergies were clear, there may be challenges to their operationalisation, for instance political sensitivities, potential conflict between institutions involved in those programmes, or simply the preference by one or more IGAD member state to deal with that particular issue outside of the CAADP framework.

Agriculture and food security: strengthening resilience central to achieving food security goals

The reference document for IGAD's investments in regional rural and agriculture development is the 2005-2008 IGAD Food Security Strategy. The strategy prioritizes ensuring sufficient production, food access, nutrition, improved regional food trade and providing safety nets for the region. The strategy still guides regional policy direction for agriculture and was to be updated in 2010, to bring it in line with the IGAD Minimum Integration Plan (MIP)⁴⁹, but is currently being finalized and would be launched towards the end of 2012. The strategy gives specific attention to livestock development for food security. This is based on the fact that although the Horn is home to a number of varied livelihoods, the most common source of income, employment and daily livelihood is pastoralism. Crop-based, sedentary farming is the second-largest livelihood in the region⁵⁰. Due to the increasing frequency of droughts and climate-related changes, in addition to poverty, conflict, degrading eco-systems, achieving food security in the Horn has been a challenge. Over the years, the region has largely been a recipient of aid and recurrent humanitarian assistance to alleviate the adverse effects of droughts and food crisis. Development partners are also

⁴⁹ IGAD. 2009. IGAD Annual Report. Djibouti: IGAD

⁵⁰ Headey, D., A. Taffesse and L. You. 2012. Enhancing Resilience in the Horn of Africa: An Exploration into Alternative Investment Options. IFPRI Discussion Paper 01176. April 2012.

supporting projects initiated by IGAD, which aim at enhancing sustainable food security, especially among pastoralists. For example: the pro-poor Livestock Policy Initiative (EU/ FAO), social protection for food security through the Regional Food Security and Risk Management Programme (REFORM/ EU), cross-border food trade (REFORM/ COMESA), sanitary & phyto-sanitary capacity building (PANSPSO-AU/IBAR), among others.

From the continental level, the African Union (AU) released a Pastoral Policy Framework in 2010 to promote coordinated action and synergy in addressing the challenges faced by pastoralist communities⁵¹. As well, following the launch of CAADP at the continental level in 2003, and the recognition that the framework did not give enough attention to livestock and pastoralist issues, the AU-Inter African Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR), in 2006, designed the CAADP Companion Document for livestock component of CAADP, and in 2010, an AU-IBAR Framework for Mainstreaming Livestock in the CAADP Pillars. Together, these documents provide the pan-African perspective and direction for policy makers at both national and regional levels on how to deal with livestock and plan and implement development interventions in the livestock sector. These guiding documents could be exploited to inform IGAD's regional CAADP formulation and implementation.

With regard to agricultural policies, and policies on livestock and pastoralism in particular, the differences between countries are quite vast, as noted earlier. Even though all IGAD Member States signed up on the AU Pastoral Policy Framework, staff working on agriculture policies at the national ministries admitted that **national policies diverge quite strongly from this policy framework in many countries**. Although livestock development and pastoralism has remained undervalued in almost all member states, policies and investments in dryland areas take shape quite differently in these countries. Kenya, for instance, has established a special ministry for the ASAL areas (the Ministry of Northern Kenya) and a specific ASAL policy framework was established as an annex to the overall development vision. This policy framework is viewed as being pro-pastoral and puts mobility central. The Ethiopian government, by contrast, takes an approach to ASAL areas in which intensification of livestock keeping, voluntary settlement and irrigation schemes are pivotal. A number of stakeholders interviewed foresee problems in forging a common approach to dryland areas with differences this large. A study⁵² is currently underway in which disaster risk management policies and institutions in Kenya and Uganda are being assessed. It could be interesting to have a closer look at these comparisons, to make a better judgment on the potential and obstacles to forging regional approaches around these policy areas.

Since the most recent droughts and food crisis, thinking in the region is moving away from recurrent emergency approach to a more sustainable way to build resilience to food security shocks in the region. There **appears to be different definitions of what it means to build resilience**, but the generally accepted understanding is that vulnerable communities are prepared to cope with shocks and adapt their livelihoods. In addition to working directly with communities, building resilience would require developing good policies, plans and programmes, and strengthening institutions to adequately implement the programmes. The resilience approach is multi-dimensional and brings together different skills to strengthen the ability of vulnerable populations to adapt by creating safety nets; improving basic social (e.g. schools, markets, health facilities) and physical infrastructure (roads, ports, etc) and increasing people's access to these public goods; strengthening institutions and cooperation between different levels of institutions (local-national-regional); supporting livelihood diversification; resolving conflicts, and;

⁵¹ OCHA. Introducing a pastoral policy framework for Africa: Securing and protecting the lives, livelihoods and rights of pastoralists and their communities

⁵² Reconcile is conducting this study

enhancing natural resource management.⁵³ Action research would be needed here to come up with community based solutions.

Taking the resilience approach, the “Ending Drought Emergencies in the Horn of Africa” Initiative, spearheaded by IGAD has been able to gather much stronger momentum to address the region’s food security challenges. A number of large donors are willing to support and invest considerable resources in these more sustainable and multi-dimensional approaches to achieve IGAD’s objective. The IGAD regional CAADP has the opportunity to capitalize on this momentum.

However, even where there is some degree of consensus on the need for a regional approach, the **perspectives on what such a regional approach could entail**, particularly for pastoralists and livestock development, **differs quite substantially among stakeholders**. There is a distinction between a livelihood-centered perspective and a growth – centered perspective for development in ASAL areas. The first perspective puts resilience of pastoralist livelihood strategies central, attempts to consider all livelihoods services provided by livestock in its policies and puts mobility central. This is the angle taken by the African Union (AU) Pastoralist Policy Framework, and most of the policy work conducted under the IGAD-Livelihood Policy Initiative (LPI). The second perspective focuses more on increasing livestock productivity, trade and marketing, and increasing the contribution of livestock to GDP and foreign currency. These two paradigms have drastically different starting points, and prioritize interventions and formulate policies in very different ways, even though the general thematic areas of priority are the same. Having an agreement on what the key issues with regional dimensions are is therefore still quite different from having a consensus on what the regional CAADP compact would look like in practice.

Trade: cross-border trade could be exploited better

IGAD’s regional integration agenda prioritizes trade integration in order to create a Free Trade Area by 2012. According to the 2003 IGAD Strategy, COMESA is the REC in charge of broader regional trade issues, while IGAD will foster trade among its member states in grains and livestock. All IGAD members except Somalia are members of COMESA but only four of them, Djibouti, Kenya, Sudan and Uganda, have acceded to the COMESA Free Trade Area. The division of labour around the trade areas is not entirely clear. Trade in food products and livestock seems to be in COMESA’s domain, but these trade domains are vital for food security in the IGAD region⁵⁴.

Formal intra-regional trade is very low in the IGAD region. Years of conflict and mistrust between countries, has led to weak trading relations and very little progress on regional trade liberalization. However, according to the IGAD Secretariat, the value of export within the region has been on the increase since 2000, though most of the growth is attributed to Kenya’s trade with Uganda⁵⁵. Informal trade, on the other hand, prevails. Small-scale traders informally exchange basic foodstuff, livestock, medicines, clothing and fuel across the borders. This serves as a major source of income and employment for people of the region. Beside small-scale trade in agricultural products, there is a huge industry of cross-border trade and export of livestock to markets, both within and beyond the Horn. In general, the countries in the Horn are net importers of cereals but net exporters of livestock products; livestock represent nearly 60% of the region’s

⁵³ USAID. 2012. Building Resilience to Food Security Shocks in the Horn of Africa. Discussion Note, March 2012. Washington DC: USAID

⁵⁴ Leonard, D. 2008. The Role of IGAD in Shaping Livestock Policy in the Horn of Africa: Understanding the International System, International Actors and Implications for Reform. IGAD LPI Working Paper No. 12-08. Nairobi: IGAD-LPI

⁵⁵ Healy, S. 2011. Hostage to Conflict: Prospects for Building Regional Economic Cooperation in the Horn of Africa. A Chatham House Report. London: Chatham House

agricultural GDP⁵⁶. There are **strong arguments in favour of promoting cross-border trade in food and agriculture**, not just for the sake of food security, but as a way to stimulate closer economic integration and development in the region.

Yet, as a result of poor infrastructure, insecurity, heavy informal and formal taxation and restricted cross-border movement, the regional food and livestock markets are still quite inefficient. Another challenge is that **IGAD member states have divergent trade interests**. For instance Ethiopia will benefit from formalizing livestock trade across its borders, as a means to increase government revenue. It is estimated that 60% of the livestock exported from Somalia crossed the borders from Ethiopia, in large degree through smuggling. This widespread informal trade across the borders deprives the government of potential income. Its main purpose in addressing livestock trade issues will be to formalize and control livestock movements across the borders. Ethiopia is therefore, theoretically, likely to oppose free trade, and it has also already exempted itself from the COMESA free trade agreement. In contrast, Somalia and Djibouti on the other hand would benefit from free trade of livestock across the border, as these serve as the main ports of export. Security concerns may also cause countries to prefer to limit mobility of pastoralists and rather control their movements to a larger degree, especially in those areas where pastoralist areas are equated with separatist movements or recruitment zones for terrorist organizations⁵⁷.

Interests also strongly differ between the member states: for livestock trade, it is between free trade versus controlled trade, in other cases, it's a battle between investment in highland versus lowland, i.e. sedentary farmers versus pastoralists. Also from a security perspective, interests may differ as a number of countries are not at a particularly friendly footing with each other. This may hamper attempts at forging a common approach. However, national level implementation can circumvent these problems to some degree, and **IGAD can provide a platform in which these interests can be negotiated**.

According to some, COMESA is in a better position- capacity wise⁵⁸ to deal with trade in the Horn. But given that livestock trade is a major feature of IGAD's trade pattern rather than COMESA's, and taxation, security concerns, and other barriers to trade are often politically orchestrated, others argue that IGAD would be the more suitable REC. The political backing of member states, and perceived role of a particular REC to address specific thematic issues goes a long way to ensure that regional policies are domesticated at country level. Furthermore, IGAD's trade priorities, especially livestock trade, might not be promoted sufficiently in COMESA. The issue of multiple and overlapping memberships of the several RECs makes it difficult to clarify the economic relationships between countries, address cross-border trade barriers or implement regional trade agreements and policies. RECs often derive authority and legitimacy over agricultural issues from common decisions or statements by the Councils of Agricultural/ Livestock Ministers and Heads of State but, because of overlapping memberships, it is difficult to decide the mandate of which REC is most pertinent or should supersede the others⁵⁹. It could be expected that the trade dimensions of the IGAD regional compact will focus on livestock trade, which after all is key for the region. However, clarifying other trade arrangements between IGAD and COMESA would be equally important.

⁵⁶ European Commission. 2012. *EC SHARE: Supporting Horn of Africa Resilience*. Commission Staff Working Document 8744/12. 13 April 2012. Brussels: European Commission

⁵⁷ IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative – Livestock Brief; Livestock's Contribution to Ethiopia's Economy: Much Higher than Previously Thought. IGAD LPI Brief 7

⁵⁸ Leonard, D. 2008. *The Role of IGAD in Shaping Livestock Policy in the Horn of Africa: Understanding the International System, International Actors and Implications for Reform*. IGAD LPI Working Paper No. 12-08. Nairobi: IGAD-LPI

⁵⁹ Munyua, S. 2010. *An institutional review of IGAD and IGAD Satellite Programs for the Establishment of an IGAD Livestock Unit*. Consultancy report. Nairobi: LPI-IGAD

Infrastructure and corridors

Economic and trade corridors have strong potential to contribute to CAADP objectives in terms of regional markets development and food security, through: support to regional agri-food chains and increasing the value of regional agriculture products; facilitation of private sector involvement in agri-food investment; and operational linkages between production and distributions aspect of agriculture development.

The IGAD mandate prioritizes promoting regional infrastructure development, with the view of contributing to food security regimes and policies. However, the region is generally characterized by **poor and underdeveloped infrastructure**: physical and non-physical barriers to cross-border transport and communication, which are important for regional integration, still exist. Since its re-establishment, IGAD in collaboration with development partners, has made effort to improve the state of regional infrastructure. In 2008, the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) undertook a study- IGAD Strategy: transport/ infrastructure, industry and ICT to review progress made in the implementation of transport infrastructure and facilitation programmes and made recommendations for improving regional infrastructure. The recommendations emphasized the importance of harmonizing policies, and improving infrastructure in order to strengthen the competitiveness of IGAD member states' industries⁶⁰.

IGAD has also teamed up with the EAC, COMESA and SADC under the Tripartite⁶¹, to develop key transport corridors: the Northern and Central Corridors in East Africa, the Lamu and Djibouti Corridors in the Horn of Africa, and regional energy transmission interconnectors. The Tripartite and IGAD Corridor Programme (TICP) is based on the directives of the Heads of States during the North-South Corridor Conference held in Lusaka, Zambia in April 2009. These projects will be implemented between 2011 and 2016, as part of the implementation of the grand Tripartite Free Trade Area that was launched by the Second Tripartite Summit in Johannesburg, South Africa in June 2011. Considering the increasing demand from domestic, industrial and commercial activities in the region- e.g. connecting South Sudan to ports, oil exploration in Uganda, etc- the Tripartite and IGAD corridor development collaboration will help reduce the high costs of transport, trade and energy in the ESA region. In September 2011, a high-level Tripartite and IGAD conference⁶² took place to identify the major bottlenecks to trade and infrastructure development in the respective RECs, as well as outline the key requirements, sequence and opportunities for development partners and private sector support in order to implement the projects and programmes.

The conference has been tagged a success, in terms of the first steps needed to get not just the region's infrastructure development back on track, but also IGAD's wider regional integration agenda. The TICP targets both infrastructure and trade facilitation investment and provides a frame to mobilize public-private sector-development partners' support for the corridors. Private sector representatives are already investing US\$8.4 billion in terms of committed and pipeline projects, with the potential for \$2.5 billion in identified private sector investment projects, and agreed to further prioritise actions aimed at supporting the corridors programme⁶³. To complement these commitments, IGAD member states, in collaboration with the IGAD and other RECs' Secretariats will also prioritize relevant reforms by 2013- regional procurement legislation, capital markets development, providing public sector funding, implementing and harmonising supporting

⁶⁰ UNECA. 2009. Report on progress in the implementation of the MYPs with RECs and IGOs. 13th meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee of Experts (ICE) Mahe, Seychelles, 27-29 April 2009

⁶¹ EAC-COMESA-SADC Tripartite arrangement for corridor development: the Tripartite developed an innovative Aid for Trade Pilot Programme on the North South Corridor to address infrastructure and facilitation issues together and the corridor as a single network and successfully launched it at the Lusaka High Level Conference in 2009. The successful pilot programme has enabled the Regional Economic Communities, their Member States and the International Community to implement an economic corridor-based programme aimed at reducing the costs of cross-border trade in the Eastern and Southern Africa (ESA) region. (Tripartite & IGAD Infrastructure Investment Conference 28th - 29th September 2011, Nairobi, Kenya Outcomes, Conclusions & Way Forward)

⁶² More information available at: <http://www.tiic2011.org/>

⁶³ Tripartite & IGAD Infrastructure Investment Conference 28th - 29th September 2011, Nairobi, Kenya Outcomes, Conclusions & Way Forward

policies and regulations, and address general bottlenecks around infrastructure and trade facilitation - to facilitate effective public-private partnerships⁶⁴.

Through the TICP, IGAD will also collaborate with the Eastern and the Southern Africa Power Pool to put in place necessary market and regulatory systems to enable efficient energy to flow in the region under new market dynamics⁶⁵.

Making agriculture more productive and food security more attainable in IGAD requires better roads, storage, irrigation and other infrastructural enhancements. This collaborative approach recognizes the importance of IGAD's transport networks for the development of agriculture and food security in the region. Given the central role of food trade and regional agricultural markets for food security, the IGAD CAADP compact will have to take into account the strengths and weaknesses of corridors development. **A possible synergy between CAADP and corridors could be the identification of ways for a regional CAADP compact to contribute** to the development of 'agriculture trade corridors' and regional trade tools (regional market information systems, business facilitation initiatives, match-making exercises between buyers/sellers). In addition, the IGAD regional compact could promote the harmonisation various trade facilitation measures, which are particularly relevant for livestock and agricultural products, e.g. eliminating standards and non-tariff barriers, synchronizing customs and immigration procedures, transit and transport policies and procedures, etc.

Natural resources: space for greater harmonization of national policies, and coherence with regional compact

Considering the Horn's vulnerability to environmental and climate challenges, recurrent droughts and conflicts arising from use of shared natural resources, the importance of regional cooperation and integration around natural resources cannot be over emphasized. To better address the challenges of sustainable management of natural resources and environmental protection in the region, the IGAD Secretariat developed an IGAD Environment and Natural Resources Strategy in 2009. Due to recurrent droughts in the region, IGAD has also given priority to the development and implementation of Early Warning and Food Information Systems both at national and regional levels.

There is a natural link between the land, livestock, rivers and waterbeds, and food security. In this sense, the NRM Strategy could have the potential to contribute to the food security plans of the region, if relevant institutions are strengthened and investments better channelled to improve the sustainability of natural resource management use at different levels.

In the IGAD region, the land utilization pattern is split between use for agricultural activities (farming), livestock rearing, mineral exploration. There is frequent migration of people and livestock in search of pasture and water resources, among others. A significant proportion of the people in the region are pastoralists – the greatest number being in Sudan. In Ethiopia, about 10-12% of the total population is pastoralist, about 20% in Djibouti, 33% in Eritrea and 70% in Somalia⁶⁶. The IGAD region has the potential to utilize its agricultural land resources to feed its people and plans to operationalize the Business Plan of the IGAD Sub-Regional Action Programme (SRAP) and the IGAD Food Security Strategy to achieve this. Another approaches that IGAD is promoting is Community Based Natural Resources Management

⁶⁴ Tripartite & IGAD Infrastructure Investment Conference 28th - 29th September 2011, Nairobi, Kenya Outcomes, Conclusions & Way Forward

⁶⁵ Tripartite & IGAD Infrastructure Investment Conference 28th - 29th September 2011, Nairobi, Kenya Outcomes, Conclusions & Way Forward

⁶⁶ IGAD. 2007. IGAD Environment and Natural Resources Strategy. Djibouti: IGAD

(CBNRM) for the joint management of environmental resources. It is a strategy for creating a climate of cooperation and promoting and maintaining peace, allowing for investment in various sectors, implementation of environmental programmes and the development of science and technology⁶⁷.

But the continuous land degradation and desertification, climate variability, land tenure issues, armed conflict, among other factors pose a threat to fully utilizing land and other natural resources. Another challenge is that there is no inventory of the resources of the ASALs of the IGAD region. There is also little understanding of the environmental consequences and conflicts associated with pastoralism.⁶⁸

The pastoralists organizations interviewed underscored the need for a holistic approach that integrates and addresses the needs and challenges the people (pastoralists), the resource base (pasture and water) and livestock in conjunction. Facilitating (cross-border) mobility and empowering traditional institutions to play a key role in (cross-border) natural resource management is key. Many view IGAD's comparative advantage as being mostly in terms of development of marginal areas, in particular in relation to pastoralism, dry-land management in the context of disaster risk management and food security.

NRM is obviously a **crucial part of the development of a regional food security approach**. IGAD has already taken a good first step, by recognizing regional natural resource management/ disaster risk management as a priority focal area for the IGAD regional compact. But practically, this would require greater harmonization of IGAD member states' policies, as well as improved coherence between the national policies and the IGAD regional compact. Therefore, despite CAADP currently receiving high-level political attention, particular attention should be paid to managing the sensitivities around the **joint management of natural resources in the Horn**. On the other hand, it may also be the case that framing certain initiatives in such areas within a comprehensive, multi-dimensional and multi-stakeholder policy process like CAADP could also contribute to removing some of the obstacles that were limiting regional cooperation around water-land-energy sectors.

4. Concluding remarks: towards a regional IGAD CAADP compact and investment plan

Previous sections analysed the status of preparations for the IGAD regional CAADP compact, highlighting the role played so far by key involved stakeholders, the relationship between food security processes and the overall progress on regional integration, as well as the possible synergies between CAADP and other regional policies and programmes. Taking into account these existing challenges and opportunities, the final part of this paper presents some ideas and recommendations on the way forward for regional food security plans, including in terms of what each actor could do to contribute positively for the implementation of the regional CAADP investment plan. Given the complexities and sensitivities involved, such concluding remarks can only be considered preliminary, and will have to be tested against the results of upcoming policy dialogues and formal decisions by the relevant IGAD institutions. Nonetheless, the clarifications and suggestions provided here can hopefully shed some light on the way forward and be useful in the process, as they emerge from a series of stakeholders consultations and reflect the current plans around the regional compact formulation.

⁶⁷ IGAD. 2007. IGAD Environment and Natural Resources Strategy. Djibouti: IGAD

⁶⁸ IGAD. 2007. IGAD Environment and Natural Resources Strategy. Djibouti: IGAD

Emerging messages on the way forward

The **IGAD Regional Compact document** is nearly ready and should be launched by November 2012. During the course of this mapping exercise, it became clear that many stakeholders, across the board-national ministries, NSA representatives, development partners and even some officials at the IGAD Secretariat were not fully clear on how various on-going drought resilience initiatives are linked and will be implemented over time. Although considerable effort has been made by the technical partners and the IGAD Secretariat to clear up the confusion around the regional CAADP compact process, the CPPs and RPF, these efforts could be spread wider, especially for NSAs and national ministries. Although the two processes, CPP/RPF and regional CAADP, may be viewed as two sides of the same coin, current confusion erodes the efficacy of the IDDRS Initiative and the regional CAADP in particular.

In addition to clarifying *what* each of these initiatives are, it is equally important for key regional stakeholders to **jointly agree on how the different processes can complement each other** as soon as possible, and if deemed necessary to converge pointing the future. The IGAD Secretariat, along with its partners could draft a road map to describe the steps that will be taken for such coherence and complementarity. The complementarity could be around ensuring (vertical) coherence between existing national compacts/ agricultural policies and the IGAD regional CAADP compact; dovetailing the regional CAADP compact, CPPs and RPF with the IGAD framework on Animal Health and Trade, the AU Pastoral Policy Framework and other regional (including inter-REC) policy frameworks to ensure that synergies are explored and (horizontal) coherence is made.

To help streamline and simplify these processes (Regional and Country CAADP compacts and investment plans, CPPs and RPF), it will be important to recognize positive complexities and avoid challenging complications. In this respect, it would be necessary to:

1. Define more clearly the **purpose of each process**, the way they are linked, and their contribution to the broader outcome areas of the IDDRS Initiative;
2. **Coordinate and combine the processes** whenever it makes sense (e.g. dialogues on CAADP and CPFs in countries where it is possible) as a way to avoid duplication and reduce transaction costs;
3. **Utilize the same resource base** (consultants, institutions, fora, stakeholders, etc.) in order to build on the existing while providing for learning;
4. Gradually **mainstream these processes** within the nascent Regional Platform as the institutional mechanism that would coordinate and sustain dialogue;
5. **Avoid creating new processes**, unless they are absolutely necessary.

The **CAADP could be a useful framework if it is used at its most flexible**. Implementing the regional CAADP compact in parallel to the CPPs, that have a more specific focus on ASAL areas would bring stronger focus to address food security challenges of the wider Horn region. However, over time, country CAADPs could be adapted to better address livestock issues and the regional CAADP compact/ investment plan could also be developed using the tool⁶⁹ proposed by the IGAD-LPI.

With regard to the **national-regional nexus**, there is consensus in IGAD about the importance of regional action in agriculture. But the **value of the IGAD Regional Compact lies in the clear delineation of responsibilities**: national-national, national-regional, and regional-regional responsibilities. This needs to

⁶⁹ Recent studies under the IGAD-LPI have come up with a tool to integrate livestock elements into CAADP processes that are yet to take place and those which are already in existence, to capture the voices of marginalized livestock owners, especially women, and to ensure that livelihood services provided by livestock owners are adequately captured in CAADP compacts. This tool could also be used for the regional compact process. More details can be found in: Nouala et al. 2012. Including Livestock in the CAADP compacts: A framework for analysis for country CAADP teams. IGAD LPI Working Paper No. 03 -12. Nairobi: IGAD-LPI

be done in all processes (i.e. the regional compact/ CPPs/ RPF), and cannot be done only within the regional CAADP. Understanding, and **consolidating ownership and commitment on what aspects constitute responsibilities** of the member states, the IGAD Secretariat, and non-state actors vis-à-vis regional CAADP implementation is important, otherwise there is the risk that the regional CAADP would have minimal impact.

In addition, more progress is needed in the region in **articulating clearly those strategic regional investments that individual countries, acting alone, cannot afford**. Agricultural growth at country-level would benefit from regional spillovers and economies of scale in technology, human and policy development, trade and investment. Strategic thinking about those sub-sectors and concrete measures where the regional CAADP compact needs to complement action at national level can be fostered by both more regular multi-stakeholder policy dialogue throughout the region as well as analysis of the gaps the national compacts present in terms of possible joint action among neighbours. This would enhance the ownership of regional food security plans and the 'vertical coherence' between the regional and national CAADP compacts. The IGAD Secretariat, with the support of its development partners, could facilitate such dialogue and analysis as part of the process to develop the IGAD regional CAADP investment plan.

The views of most **non-state-actors engagement** reveal that sufficient time was not provided to NSAs to prepare for the national consultations on the regional CAADP compact. For the regional investment plan and future implementation, it is **crucial that the process of involving NSAs is better managed**, through engaging non-state actors in earlier phases of the process, by creating more awareness of the importance of a regional approach, and through enhancing the capacity of non-state actors to engage. IGAD can play an important role in **creating both the institutionalized space** for non-state actors to engage at regional level, and in **building their capacity to do so**. Special attention must be given to pastoralist associations, in order to bridge the capacity gap with farmers' organisations. In addition, this can address the prevailing knowledge gap on pastoralist issues among policy makers. Existing knowledge, especially the wealth of knowledge built up through the LPI, could be brought closer to policy makers. The IGAD Civil Society Forum could provide an entry point to organize and launch pastoralist and other non-state actors' (if lacking) representation at the regional level.

As IGAD prepares to sign the regional compact with its regional partners, it is particularly important to **identify the right stakeholders who shall participate in the regional compact preparation and signature**. The right mix of civil society representatives genuinely reflecting existing grassroots views should be involved in endorsing the regional compact, as this will have implications around present buy-in and allow for the appropriate stakeholders to be continuously involved beyond the regional compact formulation stage.

In view of the rather weak representation (and capacities) of pastoralist organizations at regional level and more particularly of the ones that are more livelihood-based, investment in pastoralist organizations' capacity development needs to be included as a key priority to be addressed within the IGAD Regional CAADP. The CAADP NSA participation guidelines recommend financing non-state actor participation through a regional or continental basket fund, if one exists, otherwise, it recommends that the REC develop such a fund. **Strengthening pastoralist organizations' capacity** could be identified as a key priority within the IGAD Regional CAADP.

Overall, for pastoralists perspectives to be strongly and broadly represented at regional level, and to close the capacity gap between pastoralists and other farmers organizations, serious effort and investment will be required in the short, medium and long term. An IGAD-led regional approach to drought resilience and food security, based on the principles of inclusiveness and participation, and a specific focus on

pastoralism could in theory be a good opportunity to increase the engagement of pastoralists in policy processes. In the **short-term**, it could be useful for the IGAD Secretariat to engage with one national platform / advocacy organization per country, or a select number of organizations in countries where national platforms do not exist. These organizations need to be well connected to the realities on the ground while also able to analyze policy. In the **medium-term** these national platforms can perhaps be supported to form a regional livestock platform, and a capacity development plan can be developed, including the forging of stronger linkages between such platforms and policy makers and academics. In order to ensure sufficient inclusion of pastoralists perspectives IGAD could do three things. Firstly, it should provide the formal institutionalized space for pastoralists to engage in the regional CAADP and drought resilience policy processes, as independent stakeholders. Secondly, the Secretariat could provide resources and technical support for sustained capacity development of pastoralist organizations. Third, the Secretariat could facilitate the establishment of a regional pastoralist organization.

There is broad agreement that **IGAD is the right (and possibly only) REC that can adequately forge regional approaches to address ASAL specific issues**. The unique characteristics of the Horn of Africa make the IGAD region the right geographical locus for regional approaches to get shaped. Overall, the leadership of IGAD received a lot of praise, and the Executive Secretary has acquired substantial goodwill and credibility, with member states governments, donors and technical experts. However, many stakeholders stressed that it is essential that the IGAD Secretariat's technical capacity be strengthened, before it can effectively facilitate policy harmonization between its member states' divergent policies. The regional CAADP could provide IGAD with an institutional support mechanism that it could draw upon, without having to reinvent the wheel. And while capacity building will take time, **IGAD could already start engaging with those areas where it has a real comparative advantage**, and build up credibility and legitimacy steadily by starting with the low-hanging fruits (such as fast-tracking regional trade in livestock, management of shared natural resources, etc). IGAD could also play a role in promoting the actual adoption and implementation of policy frameworks that have already been formulated and signed off on (notably the AU pastoralist framework and the IGAD animal health framework).

In terms of the role of pan-African institutions and DPs in regional CAADP preparations in IGAD, many stakeholders believe the regional IGAD compact provides a good opportunity for better regional coordination around CAADP processes. The Regional Platform is already welcome as a mechanism for coordination around the broader drought resilience initiatives, but a **regional donor working group and coordination mechanism could be established** to focus specifically on the regional CAADP implementation. Coordination between different African agencies could also be improved. Given that the EAC and COMESA are developing regional compacts, it would be useful to start a process of clarification with these RECs, on how the issue of overlapping regional CAADPs will be dealt with, based on the same principles of subsidiarity. The AUC and NPCA could play a leading role in this process in **facilitating discussion and lesson learning between RECs**. In general, pan-African institutions and development partners should ensure that CAADP objectives and modalities are mainstreamed into ongoing regional programmes (also in other sectors relevant to food security) and making them more coherent and coordinated is the priority for implementing regional dimensions of CAADP, rather than just the finalisation of the regional compact document itself. In this respect, more regular dialogue between IGAD, NPCA and development partners around implementation of regional CAADP plans should be promoted.

Another emerging message from the IGAD stakeholders is that while key cross-sectoral areas (trade, NRM, DRM, etc) have been identified as focal points for the regional compact, it will be **important not to lose sight of the cross-cutting general bottlenecks to regional integration**. Getting full gains from the regional compact would mean that some of the complexities and challenges stemming from overlapping membership of RECs and lack of full enforceability of regional decisions at the national level, would have to

be addressed. In addition, action (i.e. implementation) could be better achieved if an ‘enlightening campaign’ is carried out in each IGAD member state, beyond ministries, to raise awareness about the benefits of regional approaches in every proposed regional cooperation area relevant to food security and drought resilience, and about the results achieved so far.

There is in general full support for an effectively multidimensional regional CAADP, anchored in ongoing programmes implemented by IGAD. Indeed, many actors in IGAD believe that it is very important to ensure the ‘horizontal’ coherence between regional policies and investments in food security and in other sectors of regional cooperation. **Synergies should be identified and promoted between the regional CAADP compact and ongoing initiatives** on drought resilience, trade, infrastructure and natural resources. This paper shows that some linkages will naturally emerge, such as with the CPPs, the elimination of agricultural tariff and non- tariff barriers, (agriculture) trade and infrastructure corridors, and existing regional agricultural programmes and institutions. Other synergies will need to be carefully analyzed, in order to prepare a regional investment plan that allows for coherent, complementary and coordinated investments in areas that promote regional integration in IGAD.

Going forward, it could be useful for the IGAD Secretariat and its regional partners to **clarify in a ‘roadmap’ those critical actions and investment areas which are needed** for the implementation of the compact and investment plan. Key regional stakeholders and development/ private sector partners could then come together to identify the kind of support they are interested in offering and what areas offer opportunities for public-private collaboration.

Annex 1 – Timeline of events and meetings

Important meetings that took place	Main decisions
8-9 September 2011 IGAD Ending Drought Emergencies in the HoA Nairobi Summit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launch regional projects to address the underlying causes of vulnerability in drought-prone areas, in particular emphasis on pastoralists and agro-pastoralists to promote disaster risk reduction, ecosystem rehabilitation and sustainable livelihood practices. • Support the Dry land Initiative that has been launched by six Horn of Africa countries; • Create and support a Multi-donor Trust Fund for drought and other disasters to be anchored in the IGAD Secretariat; • Develop the Horn of Africa Regional Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Strategy Framework.
15-16 November 2011 IGAD-Partners Consultative Meeting, Djibouti	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed to establish an IGAD Platform, whose terms of reference, structure and membership will be developed by IGAD, and to have this platform in place by mid December 2011. • Agreed that IGAD will provide overall coordination and dissemination of information through the IGAD Platform; • FAO to support the development of an IGAD Regional CAADP
25 November 2011 IGAD Summit of Heads of State and Government, Addis Ababa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment to fully support the proposed IGAD Regional Platform; • Directed the IGAD Secretariat to take the lead in coordinating efforts of all other actors in ending drought emergencies in the Region
January 2012 IGAD-Partners Consultative meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The third meeting for the implementation of the Horn of Africa Initiative; • IGAD Secretariat shared a proposal for the establishment of regional platform, which was approved by the partners; • Appointed an interim Steering Committee comprising eleven members from the partners for the finalization of the Regional Platform.
3 April 2012 Joint Technical Experts meeting of IGAD and Development Partners (DPs), Nairobi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed progress made since the September Nairobi Summit 2011; • Member states presented country reports using the Common Programming Framework (CPF); • The Secretariat presented the Regional Programming Framework (RPF), developed by IGAD with the support of the TC.
4 April 2012 Joint IGAD Ministerial and High Level Development Partners on Drought Resilience in the Horn of Africa, Nairobi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directed the Secretariat to convene a meeting of Member States to increase the buy-in, agree on an action plan will fast track the operationalization of the Platform; • Commit Member States to the establishment of a fund in support of the Platform activities, and call upon on development partners to support the establishment of the fund. • Encourage development partners to support national governments to incorporate drought resilience into national programme and enhance existing coordination mechanisms; • Advance the ongoing efforts, led by IGAD, to create a common program framework that can be used by governments, Development Partners and other stakeholders to coordinate their humanitarian and development resilience-oriented efforts around the common agenda; • Agree to the establishment of a Regional Development Partners' Group for Drought Resilience and Growth, in collaboration with IPF and IGAD, to allow Development Partners to better coordinate, harmonize and align programme investments and policy reforms in support of the IGAD platform in the Horn of Africa; • Agree to the establishment of a Global Alliance for Action for Drought Resilience and Growth to allow Development Partners to better coordinate, harmonize and align programme investments and policy
30 May 2012 IGAD, Technical Partners meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarified what the CPF, RPF and regional CAADP compact is. • Agreed to send an IGAD led team to countries to explain the linkages between the processes underway.
13- 14 June 2012 Global Alliance for Action for Drought Resilience and Growth, Geneva	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity development: strengthen IGAD's capacity, including identifying the different kinds of capacity offered by various development partners • Donor coordination: draft and circulate a joint communication to country donor groups, explaining CPFs and requesting active engagement by both humanitarian and development actors; select donor representation for the regional platform • Accountability: Map monitoring and evaluation systems
4-5 October 2012 Non-State Actors-IGAD meeting Naivasha, Kenya	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of the Platform and the IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI) strategic plan to NSAs
6-8 October 2012 Regional technical review meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To receive the Country Programming Papers (CPP) from member states (supported by the Technical Consortium (TC-FAO and ILRI) and identify and prioritize investment areas for the Regional Programming Framework (RPF).

Naivasha, Kenya	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Populate the RPF
IGAD Regional CAADP compact Validation meeting October 2012 (TBC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Upcoming
IGAD Regional CAADP Compact launch November 2012 (TBC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Upcoming

Bibliography

- AUC. 2011. *African Union's Perspective on a Long-Term Strategy to Addressing Food and Nutrition Crises in Africa. African Union Pledging Conference for Countries of Horn of Africa affected by drought and Famine*. Addis Ababa, 25 August 2011.
- COMESA. 2009. *Policy Framework for Food Security in Pastoralist Areas*. Consultative Draft, December 2009. Lusaka: COMESA Secretariat
- European Commission. 2012. *EC SHARE: Supporting Horn of Africa Resilience*. Commission Staff Working Document 8744/12. 13 April 2012. Brussels: European Commission
- European Commission. 2012. *Kenya: New EU support to strengthen food security among vulnerable mothers and children*. Press Release 2 May 2012. Available at: <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/443>
- Global Alliance for Drought Resilience and Growth. 2012. *Technical Assistance Sub-group to support the IGAD Regional Platform on Drought Resilience and Sustainability: Meeting Report*. 10 August 2012, Addis Ababa.
- Headey, D., A. Taffesse and L. You. 2012. *Enhancing Resilience in the Horn of Africa: An Exploration into Alternative Investment Options*. IFPRI Discussion Paper 01176. April 2012.
- Healy, S. 2011. *Hostage to Conflict: Prospects for Building Regional Economic Cooperation in the Horn of Africa*. A Chatham House Report. London: Chatham House
- IGAD. 2007. *IGAD Environment and Natural Resources Strategy*. Djibouti: IGAD Secretariat
- IGAD. 2009. *IGAD Annual Report*. Djibouti: IGAD Secretariat
- IGAD. 2011. *Communiqué on the summit on the Horn of Africa crisis: Ending drought emergencies: A Commitment to Sustainable Solutions*. 8th-9th September 2011, Nairobi
- IGAD. 2011. *Communiqué of the 19th Extra-ordinary session of IGAD Assembly of Heads of States*. Addis Ababa, 25 November 2011.
- IGAD. 2012. *Regional Comprehensive African Agriculture Programme (CAADP) Roadmap towards Building the IGAD Regional CAADP Compact: "Pre-Compact Roadmap"*. 26 January 2012. Djibouti: IGAD Secretariat
- IGAD. 2012. *Communiqué for the Joint IGAD Ministerial and High Level Development Partners on Drought Resilience in the Horn of Africa*. Nairobi, Kenya, 4th April 2012.

- IGAD. 2012. *IGAD Initiative for Ending Drought Emergencies in the Horn of Africa: Processes underway and their linkages*. 30 May 2012
- IGAD. 2012. *IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI) Strategic Plan 2013-2017*. Draft version, August 2012
- IGAD. 2012. *IGAD Regional Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Platform*. Draft version, August 2012
- IGAD-Livestock Policy Initiative. 2011. *Livestock Brief: Livestock's Contribution to Ethiopia's Economy: Much Higher than Previously Thought*. IGAD-LPI Brief 7. Addis Ababa: ILRI Ethiopia Campus
- Leonard, D. 2008. *The Role of IGAD in Shaping Livestock Policy in the Horn of Africa: Understanding the International System, International Actors and Implications for Reform*. IGAD LPI Working Paper No. 12-08. Nairobi: IGAD-LPI
- Munyua, S. 2010. *An institutional review of IGAD and IGAD Satellite Programs for the Establishment of an IGAD Livestock Unit*. Consultancy report. Nairobi: LPI-IGAD
- Nouala et al. 2012. *The Livestock Sector in the CAADP Compacts: Evidence from IGAD countries*. IGAD LPI Working Paper No. 04-12. Nairobi: IGAD-LPI
- NPCA. 2010. *Guide for CAADP country implementation*. Midrand: NPCA
- OCHA. *Introducing a pastoral policy framework for Africa: Securing and protecting the lives, livelihoods and rights of pastoralists and their communities*.
- OCHA. 2012. *Ending drought emergencies: Urgent action on sustainable solutions*. April 2012. Available at: <http://www.disasterriskreduction.net/east-central-africa/reglap>
- Tripartite & IGAD Infrastructure Investment Conference 28th - 29th September 2011, Nairobi, Kenya
Outcomes, Conclusions & Way Forward
- UNECA. 2009. *Report on progress in the implementation of the MYPs with RECs and IGOs*. 13th meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee of Experts (ICE) Mahe, Seychelles, 27-29 April 2009
- USAID. 2012. *Building Resilience to Food Security Shocks in the Horn of Africa*. Discussion Note, March 2012. Washington DC: USAID
- USAID. 2012. *USAID Feed the Future Stakeholder Meeting: New Country and Region-Led Efforts and Partnerships for Enhancing Resilience and Building Growth in the Horn of Africa*. Q & A Transcript. May 10, 2012. Washington DC: USAID

About ECDPM

ECDPM was established in 1986 as an independent foundation to improve European cooperation with the group of African, Caribbean and Pacific countries (ACP). Its main goal today is to broker effective partnerships between the European Union and the developing world, especially Africa. ECDPM promotes inclusive forms of development and cooperates with public and private sector organisations to better manage international relations. It also supports the reform of policies and institutions in both Europe and the developing world. One of ECDPM's key strengths is its extensive network of relations in developing countries, including emerging economies. Among its partners are multilateral institutions, international centres of excellence and a broad range of state and non-state organisations.

Thematic priorities

ECDPM organises its work around four themes:

- Reconciling values and interests in the external action of the EU and other international players
- Promoting economic governance and trade for inclusive and sustainable growth
- Supporting societal dynamics of change related to democracy and governance in developing countries, particularly Africa
- Addressing food security as a global public good through information and support to regional integration, markets and agriculture

Approach

ECDPM is a “think and do tank”. It links policies and practice using a mix of roles and methods. ECDPM organises and facilitates policy dialogues, provides tailor-made analysis and advice, participates in South-North networks and does policy-oriented research with partners from the South.

ECDPM also assists with the implementation of policies and has a strong track record in evaluating policy impact. ECDPM's activities are largely designed to support institutions in the developing world to define their own agendas. ECDPM brings a frank and independent perspective to its activities, entering partnerships with an open mind and a clear focus on results.

For more information please visit www.ecdpm.org

ECDPM Discussion Papers

ECDPM Discussion Papers present initial findings of work-in-progress at the Centre to facilitate meaningful and substantive exchange on key policy questions. The aim is to stimulate broader reflection and informed debate on EU external action, with a focus on relations with countries in the South.

This publication benefits from the generous support of ECDPM's core and institutional funders: The Netherlands, Belgium, Finland, Ireland, Luxemburg, Portugal, Sweden and Switzerland.

ISSN 1571-7577

European Centre for Development
Policy Management

ecdpm

HEAD OFFICE SIÈGE

Onze Lieve Vrouweplein 21
6211 HE Maastricht
The Netherlands *Pays Bas*
Tel +31 (0)43 350 29 00
Fax +31 (0)43 350 29 02

BRUSSELS OFFICE BUREAU DE BRUXELLES

Rue Archimède 5
1000 Brussels *Bruxelles*
Belgium *Belgique*
Tel +32 (0)2 237 43 10
Fax +32 (0)2 237 43 19

info@ecdpm.org
www.ecdpm.org
KvK 41077447



Printed on FSC certified paper.