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Executive Summary

The Platform for Agricultural Risk Management (PARM), a G8-G20 initiative hosted by International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), is a multi-donor partnership co-financed by the European Commission (EC), Agence Française de Développement (AFD), the Government of Italy (DGCS), and IFAD to support government and stakeholders on Agricultural Risk Management (ARM). PARM works in strategic partnership with the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD). Since its launch in December 2013, PARM has made progress and is in various stages in nine countries in sub-Saharan Africa.

Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation
As envisaged in the monitoring plan the mid-term evaluation was undertaken with a purpose to provide the PARM Secretariat, the Steering Committee (SC) and the development partners an assessment of the strengths and weakness of PARM processes – including the methodology and its application at overall coordination and at country levels. The main objective of the evaluation was to provide an independent external view of the overall PARM process, achievements in the selected countries (Ethiopia, Niger, and Uganda), and the performance of the overall coordination mechanisms (from launch until August 2016).

Programme Description
PARM, with a total budget of USD 7,775,000 (EUR 5,980,789), is managed by the PARM Secretariat, hosted by IFAD. The PARM is governed by a Steering Committee (SC) and an Advisory Committee (AC) and managed by the Secretariat (Figure 1). PARM works in a strategic partnership with The New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD). PARM’s over goal is to achieve a “Sustainable agricultural growth in beneficiary LDCs and LMICs improving resilience to climate and market shocks and in particular farmers” by meeting the demand for ARM from Government and smallholders, enhancing awareness and capacities on ARM and improving generation, access, and sharing of knowledge on ARM. PARM is currently implemented in nine countries in sub-Saharan Africa. PARM’s work is based on six key elements; it includes holistic approach, demand driven standardized methodology and process, embedded in national policies, broad stakeholder basis, and inter-linked to other ARM initiatives.

Approach and Methodology
The evaluation used a collaborative and participatory approach. The evaluation approach was process-oriented with a view to improving efficiency and effectiveness of PARM to have a better

---

1 In 2016, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany (BMZ) and KfW Development Bank joined the Steering Committee of PARM and provided USD 5 million to NEPAD to build capacity and to carry-out project emerging from PARM activities
2 The mid-term evaluation was conducted between July 2016 and January 2017, with country visits during September 2016
3 The PARM Secretariat team is composed of a Senior Programme Manager, a Technical Advisor, and a Knowledge Management Associate.
4 Background Paper on PARM – December 2013
impact. Key methods used during the evaluation included key informant interview, review of documents and semi-structured observations. Country missions to Ethiopia, Niger and Uganda were undertaken during September 5-23, 2016. As part of the evaluation diverse stakeholders (117), including SC/Advisory Committee (AC) members, PARM Secretariat, government officials, development partners, insurance companies, research institutions and non-profit organizations were interviewed. Furthermore, the evaluation also reviewed both relevant corporate documents and country documents of PARM, in addition to national documents and relevant literature.

**Key Findings and Conclusions**

**PARM is highly relevant at various levels – global, regional, country and at the farmer levels.** In addition to PARM being an outcome of G8/G20 discussions, it is co-financed by multiple development partners. Additionally, PARM is aligned with various global frameworks and agendas, including SDGs and its “zero hunger” goal. Among other regional strategies, PARM contributes to CAADP process. At the country level, it works with the Government and Ministry of Agriculture to integrate ARM into national policies and investment plans. **While PARM has been able to meet the demand for ARM support from the Government, successfully, it is too early to expect PARM to meet the demand for ARM support from smallholders** (at the time of mid-term evaluation).

**PARM has been effective in terms of its progress towards achievement of stated results.** At the time of this mid-term evaluation, PARM was carrying out activities simultaneously in nine countries in sub-Saharan Africa. PARM has been effective in facilitating the integration of ARM into the national strategies and investment plans. **ARM has been integrated into national sector investment plans in Uganda and Niger** (two out of nine countries). With country planning cycles aligned to CAADP process, **PARM will have to explore along with NEPAD as to how ARM can be integrated into other seven countries.**

**PARM has completed RAS in six out of nine countries.** While only one RAS (Uganda) has been published at the time of the mid-term evaluation; others are in various stages of being finalized. **Validation workshops have been completed in five countries** (Uganda, Ethiopia, Niger, Senegal, Cabo Verde and Cameroon). Risks have been prioritized in four countries (Ethiopia, Niger, Senegal, and Uganda); with Cabo Verde and Cameroon report being finalized, **PARM will achieve its target of six countries by 2016 (with risks prioritized).** PARM has undertaken two multi-country studies to development ARM tools – Warehouse Receipts System and ARM Information System; however, the only feasibility study that has been completed in the countries is in Uganda on risks of crop pest and diseases. Discussions are in progress on to conduct feasibility studies as the RAS reports are being finalized.

**PARM has increased awareness and capacities of national stakeholders** (more than 600) on ARM through successive and successful events organized in various countries. Stakeholders reached included policy makers, technical staff of MOA, research institutions, development partners, insurance companies and farmers. This has contributed to moving the discussions from “production” to “productivity” and bringing a holistic perspective to ARM. Nevertheless, **it is too**

---

5 With exception of Liberia, Zambia and Mozambique
early to expect these individual capacities being transferred or institutionalized in their respective organizations. **PARM’s effort to integrate ARM into extension service is a positive step in meeting the demand for ARM tools and capacity development at the farmer level** (e.g. Uganda and Ethiopia).

At the country level, the **partnership MOA or its specialized agency has worked well, but other partnerships are still a work in progress** and are at various stages in different countries. Partnership with development partners and the private sector in the country is an important area for improvement for PARM. **PARM also needs to strive to be part of country “sector mechanisms” where all investors come together.**

**PARM has been involved CAADP events and other regional events in Africa** and has jointly organized events with FAO, IFAD, and FARM-D, in terms knowledge sharing. However, there is scope to be strategically involved in various regional events to share knowledge and raise the profile of PARM. As a facilitator and knowledge broker, PARM should ensure linkages with various initiatives and platforms that address components of ARM.

**PARM has an efficient and effective governance and management structure.** Despite the delay in setting up the PARM Secretariat, **PARM has gained momentum in the last year and a half.** PARM has spent only about 40 percent of its overall budget and is on track to spend all the rest of the budget within the time frame with activities being carried out in nine countries. **About 50 percent of the costs are pertaining to human resources including consultants and about 45 percent of the costs are pertaining to overall coordination** and the rest for country activities. **There is scope to manage the country process time more efficiently and effectively to sustain the interests of national stakeholders.**

**Sustainability of PARM is mixed.** The holistic perspective introduced by PARM and the individual capacities developed will continue. The knowledge products created by PARM will be referred to in the future. However, the integration of ARM into national policies and attracting investment to use the ARM tools is critical for long-term sustainability and impact. **Sustainability of PARM itself depends on development partner finance.** One option to ensure continuity of PARM is to integrate it into IFAD or other development banks.

In terms of business model, **PARM should remain a facilitator,** in general, providing public goods and being a **knowledge broker.** PARM could look at evolving into a “CGAP” of ARM. While continuing the policy process approach to integrate ARM into national policies and strategies, PARM should also endure to evolve and consolidate itself as an evidenced-based advocacy and knowledge management platform on ARM.

ARM is a critical and important aspect that has been neglected and not been looked at holistically, so far, even though government and development partners have been supporting farmers. The continuation of PARM Secretariat as a knowledge management platform and knowledge broker is crucial to continue the paradigm shift of thinking holistically about ARM. Hence it is important that PARM should not come to an end, after “**opening the eyes**” and starting the paradigm shift. The business operations model that PARM should evolve into in the next two years should take into consideration a combination of some or all of the aspects mentioned in the recommendations, in order to ensure continuity and have a larger impact.
The ultimate success and value addition of PARM will be based on how the studies and assessments, capacity development, and knowledge management activities have translated into uptake and/or integration of PARM/ARM tools and products into investments.

**Recommendations**

The recommendations are provided keeping in mind both short/mid-term and long-term aspects of PARM. It has also taken into consideration aspects that PARM should take into account – a) from the perspective of carrying out its country process efficiently and effectively; and, b) from the perspective of how the implementation (stage 5) will be carried out to ensure an impact. The recommendations are inter-connected in many ways and address areas to make PARM more effective.

a) **Leveraging country offices (of SC members) support/partnership during and after the country process.** Both the SC and PARM Secretariat should strive to achieve this through messaging at a corporate level and PARM staff meeting with country offices with country representatives and relevant programme managers. This is important from two aspects:

- One of the country offices (of SC members) could act as the “voice” for PARM in the country. This does not mean staff paid by PARM or additional responsibility for the country office. The person from the country office (IFAD or one of the SC members) can bring the topic of ARM/PARM in appropriate forums in the country. It provides credibility and sustained interest by keeping ARM/PARM on the agenda in the country. This way PARM/ARM will be discussed in donor forums and sector working group meetings among others, even when PARM staff are not on a mission.

- It also means that PARM/ARM will be on the agenda of country offices (of SC members) and thereby considered during their country planning cycles and hence the likely integration of ARM for investment.

- PARM should also consider involving one of the country offices of SC members’ to co-chair PARM events in the country, along with its national partners – MOA or the specialized agency

b) **PARM should plan to be present in the country “sector structures” in the country (e.g. donor working groups, sector working group).** This is crucial to gain visibility. This is an important aspect that needs to be addressed early in the country process and should continue throughout the country process. It also adds credibility which is required to get investment and integration of ARM into development partner programmes, the private sector, and other investors. Being present in the “sector structures” also gives the opportunity to present PARM’s work, exclusively for them and discuss their interests.

- This will lead to better connections and “visibility”/awareness with development partners and other investors who are key actors to invest and implement.
c) Creating “informal” coordination mechanism in the country along with PARM focal person within the ministry of agriculture or across ministries would help institutionalization and ownership right from the beginning. PARM should involve both the PARM and CAADP focal persons together during planning/discussions at MOA and ensure that there is a mechanism for them to have regular discussions on ARM. This also helps to move away from a single-person dependency. This should start early in the process and building capacity to coordinate is also crucial.

d) Ensure private sector involvement and facilitate investment. Leveraging the expertise and experience AC members, to start with to understand how to get private sector interested in PARM’s work at the country level. The private sector plays a big role in the agriculture sector, in the entire value chain - input companies, processors, aggregators, traders, packaging, warehousing, distribution to markets (internal and international), among others.

   o Partnering with the private sector could help in leveraging resources and expertise at the country level from an industry and commercial perspective. PARM should identify and appropriate private sector firms to partner with depending on the risks prioritized for a country.7

e) Partnering with local universities and national/regional institutions is important to leverage and bring ARM knowledge and capacity from policy level to farmer level at the grassroots. This will be in addition to work through extension services through the ministries of agriculture, as appropriate. Cementing the discussions already started (with Makarere University in Uganda, AGRHYMET in Niger and UGB in Senegal) into partnerships will help PARM’s work and effectiveness in the respective countries. Similarly, PARM should identify capacity building partners in other countries.

f) PARM should create and strengthen synergies and collaborations with other relevant knowledge platforms/initiatives and establish links. This will increase visibility and create awareness about PARM products and portfolio of services. It will also position PARM as a knowledge broker on ARM and will also leverage PARM’s effort to become a Global Platform.

   o Work with partners and other relevant organizations to have links to PARM website. The SC and AC partners can provide a page or blurb with a link to PARM website. It creates access to PARM library to wider audience;

   o PARM should connect with initiative and platforms, even if they address only components of ARM. They add value and bring synergies under PARM, as a knowledge broker and platform on ARM.

   o In addition to highlighting PARM’s effort and ARM uptake in G20 discussions, facilitate global level discussions and/or bilateral consultations on ARM to ensure that it is

---

6 Without necessitating financial requirements and naming it a Steering Committee
7 For example if pest and diseases is risk then likely partners could pesticide and herbicide manufacturers (national or international companies operating in a country)
getting integrated into agricultural sector programmes of bilateral and multilateral development partners and global foundations.

g) In countries where PARM has not been able to integrate ARM into NAIP (due to entering a country after the plan has been finalized), **PARM should have a concrete steps defined for course of action to ensure that ARM is integrated into subsequent plan** and/or how it can fit into national annual budget in the current plan, even if it is addressing only components of ARM. NEPAD/CAADP’s support and advocacy is very vital in this regard.

h) PARM should **improve its country process** which can improve perceptions on time lag between activities, in addition to improving overall efficiency, and reduced time frame in a country.

   - With a time gap of 12 months between launch and RAS validation workshop, where feasible, PARM should organize a capacity development or ARM awarenesses creation **workshop/seminar in the first twelve months**; this will help PARM having an activity (in addition to missions undertaken) to stay connected with national stakeholders and sustain their interests.

   - Furthermore, PARM should continue to ensure **conducting feasibility studies simultaneously** or with a staggered start, instead of completing one before starting another.\(^8\) This will help national stakeholders to stay involved continuously with regular outputs.

i) In the long-term, **PARM can be mainstreamed or “integrated” into IFAD** (since it was the organization of choice to host PARM) or another multilateral institution such as FAO.\(^9\) This would mean that there is a ready uptake of PARM products into programming and its investment in the countries, at the same time provide continuity as ARM proponent. There have been examples of integration of “hosted facilities” being integrated into IFAD, and still continuing.\(^10\)

---

\(^{8}\) It is likely that even studies start at the same time, they may be completed at different times (depending on scope of the study)

\(^{9}\) In the event of no further funding from resource partners

\(^{10}\) For example the Weather Risk Management Facility (WRMF) in IFAD.
1 Introduction

The Platform for Agricultural Risk Management (PARM), an outcome of the G8 and G20 discussions on food security and agricultural growth,¹¹ is a four-year multi-donor partnership¹² between development partners to make agricultural risk management (ARM) an integral part of policy plan.

The higher propensity of covariate risks thirteen in agriculture is a major reason that informal risk management arrangements break down and risk transfer products become expensive or unaffordable to many farmers in rural areas in developing and least developed countries. The most common risks in agriculture could be natural disasters, weather-related, biological and environmental, market-related, logistical and infrastructural, management and operations, public policy and institutional and/or political.¹⁴

1.1 Background

The current government policies and interventions by development partners either implicitly or explicitly address various agricultural risks, if not wholly, at least some components of it. These efforts, however, differ to a large extent among countries and tend to focus on one risk where the respective government and/or the development partner have a specific expertise.¹⁵ There is a lack of comprehensive approach to risk management, wherein agricultural risks are assessed, prioritized and addressed in a structured and well-coordinated manner.

In the past decade, several institutions including the World Bank, the European Union (EU), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, (FAO), the World Food Programme (WFP), and International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) have placed significant emphasis on Agricultural Risk Management (ARM). A number of development partners have also set-up initiatives/structures dedicated to particular components of ARM.

The meeting of the G20 Ministers for Agriculture in Paris on June 2011 identified improvement and development of risk management tools for governments, and farmers as a major priority area of support building capacity to mitigate and manage associated with food price volatility, especially in Africa. At the same time, African Union’s (AUs) New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) which has shown a strong focus on agricultural development through its

¹¹ June 2011 - G20 meeting of Agriculture Ministers in Paris’ November 2011 - G20 leaders Cannes Declaration; May 2012 – G8 Factsheet on Action on Food Security; and June 2012 - G20 Los Cabos Declaration
¹² Co-financed by European Commission (EC), Agence Francaise de Developpment (AFD), the Government of Italy (DGCS), and International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
¹³ Covariate risks are those risks that affect many farmers simultaneously (e.g. floods, droughts, market prices, etc.)
¹⁵ Background paper on PARM – December 2013
Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) took initiative and encouraged African countries to integrate risk assessment and management strategies into their agricultural development programmes covering agriculture, livestock and fisheries, and CAADP investment plans.\textsuperscript{16} Hence there was a need for a holistic risk management approach which focusses on the interactions among various types of risks, complementarities between on-farm based strategies and commercial risk management services and the impact of various government policies on risk management.

In this context, the subsequent G8 and G20 discussions\textsuperscript{17} led to the creation of PARM in 2013. NEPAD) is an integral part of this initiative. PARM processes are aligned with the intervention strategy and approach of NEPAD – integration into the CAADP process and investment plans.\textsuperscript{18}

1.2 Purpose and Objective of the Mid-term Evaluation

This mid-term evaluation was carried out as it was part of the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan, approved by the fifth PARM Steering Committee in July 2015.\textsuperscript{19}

The overall purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to provide the PARM Secretariat, the Steering Committee, and the development partners an assessment of the strengths and weakness of PARM processes – including the methodology and its application at overall coordination and at country levels. The findings of this evaluation are expected to contribute to improved efficiency of PARM and facilitate acceleration of the PARM process.

The main objective of the evaluation is to provide an independent external view of the overall PARM process, achievements in the three selected countries, and the performance of the coordination mechanisms since the launch until August 2016. This mid-term evaluation aims to:

a) Assess the performance of the overall PARM programme coordination; and,

b) Assess the country level activities, and provide suggestions for improvement.

As the part of the mid-term evaluation, in addition to the assessing the progress and country process in three countries (Ethiopia, Niger, and Uganda), the evaluation also reviewed PARM’s overall coordination mechanism and structure with a specific focus on organization of the Secretariat (including country staff and network); the partnership and complementarities with existing (potentially new) strategic and implementing partners; and the knowledge management strategy and capacity development strategy at the global, regional and country levels. Furthermore, the evaluation also examined institutional arrangements and the governance structure of PARM, in the context of PARM being a G20, initiative.

\textsuperscript{16} The need to integrate a risk management strategy in national investment plans was acknowledged by the Government representatives participating in a NEPAD workshop in Johannesburg on May 16-18, 2012.

\textsuperscript{17} November 2011 - G20 leaders Cannes Declaration; May 2012 – G8 Factsheet on Action on Food Security; and June 2012 - G20 Los Cabos Declaration

\textsuperscript{18} Background Paper on PARM, December 2013, p7

\textsuperscript{19} The mid-term evaluation was conducted between July 2016 and January 2017, with country visits during September 2016
As part of the mid-term evaluation, separate reports were prepared for each of the three countries, in addition to an overall coordination report. This report is the consolidated evaluation report of the mid-term evaluation of PARM.

2 Programme Description

The Platform on Agricultural Risk Management (PARM), an outcome of G8 and G20 discussions, was launched in December 2013 to support the development of a holistic approach to risk management in agriculture. PARM is a new partnership between development partners and developing countries to ensure risk management as an integral part of policy planning and implementation in the agricultural sector. PARM, a four-year multi-donor initiative, is co-financed by the European Commission (EC), Agence Française de Développement (AFD), the Government of Italy (DGCS), and IFAD, established with a budget of USD 7,775,000 (EUR 5,980,789) – refer Table 1.

PARM is managed by the PARM Secretariat, hosted by IFAD. The PARM is governed by a Steering Committee (SC) and an Advisory Committee (AC) and managed by the Secretariat (Figure 1). PARM works in a strategic partnership with The New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD).

The PARM Secretariat team is composed of a Senior Programme Manager, a Technical Advisor, and a Knowledge Management Associate.

The Steering Committee (SC) consists of contributing members EC, AFD, DGCS and IFAD and the strategic partner NEPAD. In 2016, BMZ/KfW joined the Steering Committee.20

The Advisory Committee (AC) currently consists of knowledge partners (AGRHYMET, Agrinatura); private sector partners (Cargill, Munich-Re); Regional Economic Community (REC)21 partners (COMESA, ECOWAS); and Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD).

---

20 In 2016, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany (BMZ) and KfW Development Bank joined the Steering Committee of PARM and provided USD 5 million to NEPAD to build capacity and to carry-out project emerging from PARM activities.

21 There are eight Regional Economic Communities in Africa - Arab Maghreb Union (UMA); Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA); Community of Sahel-Saharan States (CEN-SAD); East African Community (EAC); Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS); Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS); and Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD).
ECOWAS); cooperation partners (FAO, WFP, World Bank); and, farmer organizations (EAGC and ROPPA). The report presents discussions on the PARM governance subsequently in the report.

PARM’s over goal is to achieve a “Sustainable agricultural growth in beneficiary LDCs and LMICs improving resilience to climate and market shocks and in particular farmers”. The theory of change of how this goal will be achieved is presented in Figure 2. The detailed logical framework is presented in Annex D.

**Figure 2: PARM - Theory of Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Sustainable agricultural growth in beneficiary LDCs and LMICs, improving resilience to climate and market shock, particularly for small farmers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Objective</strong></td>
<td>ARM is an institutionalized component of agricultural policy in beneficiary LDCs, LMICs to move away from a culture of coping with disasters towards a smart management of risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Demand for qualified ARM support from Governments and smallholders satisfied; Enhanced national stakeholders’ awareness and capacities to manage agricultural risks; Improved generation, access and sharing of knowledge and learning on holistic ARM in LDCs, LMICs, and interested RECs and AU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PARM Logical Framework

PARM is currently implemented in nine countries in sub-Saharan Africa. The main selection criteria for the countries are based on - a) the commitment of the government to ARM; b) the status of the CAADP implementation; and. c) the diversity in agro-climatic zones, language blocks, and socio-economic standing.22

The countries currently selected include Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Liberia, Mozambique, Niger, Senegal, Uganda, and Zambia. Gambia has also shown interest; however, it was noted that PARM is not carrying out any activities in Gambia as of September 2016.23

PARM’s work is based on six key elements; it includes holistic approach, demand driven standardized methodology and process, embedded in national policies, broad stakeholder basis, and inter-linked to other ARM initiatives.24

---

22 Why PARM? – PARM Secretariat Leaflet
23 In spite of fruitful joint mission to Gambia by PARM and NEPAD, in 2015, activities further activities have been temporarily put on hold due to internal situation at the Ministry of Agriculture (Annual Report 2015, p29)
PARM enters a country in collaboration with NEPAD through the CAADP focal person\textsuperscript{25}, in most cases.\textsuperscript{26} Through discussions with the Government/Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), a PARM focal person is nominated either in the ministry of agriculture (as in the case of Uganda) or with a specialized agency/institution focussed on agriculture sector (reporting to Prime Minister or President as in the case of Ethiopia or Niger), in the country. After the initial setup and launch in the country, in consultation with PARM focal person and/or focal organization (either the ministry of agriculture or the specialized agency), typically PARM advances to the next steps of its five-staged/two-phased country process – phase one (set-up and risk assessment study) and phase two (tools assessment, follow-up and implementation). Figure 3 illustrates the country process.

Figure 3: PARM Country Process

3 Approach and Methodology

Overall, the evaluation used a collaborative and participatory approach. The evaluation approach was process-oriented with a view to improving efficiency and effectiveness of PARM to have a better impact. Overall, the approach examined the strengths and weaknesses of PARM process in Ethiopia, Niger, and Uganda, in addition to assessing the country process with a view to making recommendations to facilitate acceleration of the PARM process in the country including partnership, coordination and integration of ARM into national strategies and investment plans. The approach looked at the PARM process at country level separately for each phase – a) the first

\textsuperscript{24} Background Paper on PARM – December 2013
\textsuperscript{25} The CAADP focal person is nominated by the Ministry of Agriculture in the country
\textsuperscript{26} This may vary in some countries.
phases from setting-up to risk assessment; and, b) the second phase including tools assessment, follow-up and implementation.

Key questions were identified in consultation with PARM Secretariat at two levels - one at the overall coordination and institutional level and the other at the country level. These key questions include:

At the overall coordination and institutional level:

1. How does PARM’s institutional and governance structure facilitate overall coordination at the global-regional level and at country level? What are the strengths and weaknesses? How has it performed in its overall coordination?
2. How effective is the relationship between the Secretariat, Steering Committee, and Advisory Committee? What has worked well? What can be improved?
3. What are the pros and cons of the PARM Secretariat being hosted by IFAD (in the context of PARM being a G20 initiative)?
4. To what extent have the partnerships at various levels been effective? How can they be improved? What complementarities can be leveraged with existing and potential strategic/implementing partners?
5. To what extent has PARM been effective in its knowledge management – in terms of generation, access and sharing of knowledge and learning on holistic ARM in the countries and in RECs/AU? What can be improved?
6. How can the PARM Secretariat’s work be strengthened/ made more effective in terms of interconnections between country processes, knowledge management, capacity development and partnerships?

At the country level:

1. To what extent has PARM been able to meet the demand for ARM support from Government and smallholders in the least developed countries (LDCs) and low-middle income countries (LMICs)? What have been the challenges and how can they be overcome?
2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the PARM process in the target countries (Ethiopia, Niger, and Uganda)?
3. To what extent has PARM been effective in facilitating the integration of ARM into the national strategies and investment plans? What are the key lessons? What have been the challenges?
4. To what extent has PARM enhanced awareness and built capacities of national stakeholders (government, farm organizations, smallholders, etc.) to manage agricultural risks?
5. To what extent have national stakeholders and partners been involved in the PARM process in each country?

At both levels

1. Is the portfolio of services provided by PARM and its business model appropriate to respond to PARM’s goals and objectives? How could they be improved?
The approach reviewed and analysed the coordination structure and mechanisms of PARM with a specific focus on the organization of the Secretariat (including the country staff and network), the partnership and complementarities with the existing (and potentially new) strategic and implementing partners (especially NEPAD), the KM strategy in place (plan and tools), and the capacity development strategy at global, regional and country levels. Furthermore, the approach examined the institutional arrangements of PARM including its hosting by IFAD, and the governance structure of PARM (SC and AC), in the context of PARM being a G20 initiative.

In addition to country-level analysis, the evaluation provides a cross-country analysis. Recommendations include advice to improve the existing KM strategy in order to mainstream PARM concepts and initiatives in Africa.

Key methods used during the evaluation included key informant interview, review of documents and semi-structured observations.

As part of the evaluation, in addition to interviews with Steering Committee and Advisory Committee members, field missions were undertaken to Ethiopia, Niger and Uganda during September 5-23, 2016. Overall during the evaluation, diverse stakeholders (117), including government officials, development partners, private sector companies, universities/research institutions, non-profit organizations and commodity/farmers’ organizations were interviewed (Annex A). Furthermore, the evaluation also reviewed both relevant corporate documents and country documents of PARM, in addition to national documents and relevant literature.

This report addresses the key questions envisaged for the evaluation which in turn addresses DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

## 4 Findings

The findings are presented by DAC criteria – relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, addressing the key evaluation questions. The findings are based on interviews with diverse stakeholders, a review of documents and literature and observations made during country missions.

### 4.1 Relevance

PARM is highly relevant at various levels – global, regional, country and at the farmer levels. The relevance at the global level can be seen from the fact (mentioned earlier), that PARM is an outcome of series of discussions at G8 and G20. The discussions identified improvement and development of risk management tools for governments and farmers as a key priority area of support, building capacity to mitigate and manage risks associated with food price volatility, especially in Africa. The relevance of PARM is also highlighted by the fact that multiple development partners have contributed to the initiative.
The global relevance of ARM and PARM is further strengthened by the fact; PARM is aligned to, among others:

- The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) including the zero hunger goal for 2030;[27]
- The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015-2030), March 2015;[28]
- The Addis Ababa Agenda on Financing for Development, July 2015;[29] and,
- The Paris Agreement on Climate Change, December 2015. 30

At the same time, African Union’s (AUs) NEPAD which has focused on agricultural development through its CAADP has taken initiative and encouraged African countries to integrate risk assessment and management strategies into their agricultural development programmes and CAADP investment plans.31 NEPAD is a strategic partner and an implementing partner of PARM in Africa. This highlights the relevance of PARM to countries in Africa.

Additionally, specific to Africa, PARM is aligned and relevant to the African Development Bank’s (AfDB), *Feed Africa: Strategy for Agricultural Transformation in Africa 2016-2025*,[32] which in turn is aligned with the vision set out in the *2063 Strategy for Africa* – developed jointly by AfDB, the AU Commission and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) – “to consolidate the modernization of African agriculture and agro-businesses”.

Despite government policies and several development partner initiatives, only components of agricultural risk were being addressed. Therefore, there was an overall need for a holistic approach to risk management which focusses on the interactions among various types of risks, complementarities between on-farm based strategies and commercial risk management services and the impact of various government policies on risk management. In this scenario, PARM has therefore been very relevant and timely. At the time of PARM’s launch (and until the time of this report), Forum for Agricultural Risk Management in Development (FARM-D)[34] was the only other initiative which addressed ARM in an integrated manner; there is a huge unmet need globally to manage agricultural risks holistically.[35]

NEPAD promotes the integration of food security and vulnerability issues including risk management tools, into the agricultural investment plans under the CAADP framework. NEPAD/CAADP supports effective risk management strategies at regional and national levels, in

[27] SDGs - [https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/topics/sustainabledevelopmentgoals](https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/topics/sustainabledevelopmentgoals)
[31] The need to integrate a risk management strategy in national investment plans was acknowledged by the Government representatives participating in a NEPAD workshop in Johannesburg on May 16-18, 2012.
[34] The FARM-D, an online knowledge exchange platform, is funded by Swiss Cooperation and Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands with the World Bank’s Agricultural Risk Management Team leading and coordinating the forum ([http://www.agriskmanagementforum.org/content/history-support-and-organization](http://www.agriskmanagementforum.org/content/history-support-and-organization))
[35] As of date FARM-D has completed risk assessment studies in 16 countries with Niger, Senegal and Mozambique overlapping with PARM. ([http://www.agriskmanagementforum.org/content/agricultural-sector-risk-assessment](http://www.agriskmanagementforum.org/content/agricultural-sector-risk-assessment))
order to foster productive investment and achieve the annual target of six percent in agricultural growth.\textsuperscript{36} As envisaged and is evident, PARM complements and adds value to the CAADP process and the compact in the countries. Hence NEPAD’s push on ARM and support to PARM, at policy and ministerial level to facilitate the integration of ARM into government and sector policies and to ensure investment from the government, is important.

At the country level, the evaluation looked at how PARM was addressing the demands for ARM support from the Government and the smallholders in LDCs and LMICs, specifically in the three case study countries – Ethiopia, Niger, and Uganda. A key aspect of PARM process and its relevance to the countries is the Risk Assessment Study (RAS), which becomes the foundation of PARM’s subsequent work in the country.

- PARM has been able to meet the demand for ARM support from Government of Uganda, since the latter half of 2014. The ARM process started in Uganda with NEPAD and FAO spearheading the activities along with Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF), in 2012. This subsequently led to the creation of a National Steering Committee and development of an “ambitious” programme plan, pre-PARM. However, with planning and activities not aligned to funding, the momentum and interest waned. So the entry of PARM at this point in 2014 was very timely and appropriate. This re-started the ARM agenda in the country. This led to a situation where ARM was discussed in the agriculture sector planning process and finally incorporated into the draft Agriculture Sector Strategy Plan 2015/16-2019/2020 (ASSP).

- Since the launch in November 2014 in Ethiopia, PARM has been making progress in its process to meet the demand for ARM support from Government of Ethiopia. The Government of Ethiopia has developed large national (flagship) programmes - Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP), Agricultural Growth Programme (AGP), Sustainable Land Management Programme (SLMP) and Pastoral Resilience Programme - managed by its Ministries leading the sector, to address/manage risks in the sector. However, there has been a lack of comprehensive analysis and policy on ARM. There was no mechanism to manage agricultural risks holistically in Ethiopia. Development partners who make huge investments in the national programmes are also looking at how to deal with shocks among other agricultural risks. There is a demand from the government to address the need to mainstream ARM in agricultural risk programmes. PARM has brought the issue of ARM to the forefront in Ethiopia. During discussions with stakeholders, it was noted that before PARM, even the ATA which has been driving the transformation agenda in the country had not thought with that “lens”. PARM has highlighted the importance of a holistic approach in ARM with relevant policy decision makers in Ethiopia, in the sector.

- In Niger, the fact that PARM/NEPAD were asked by the Government’s designated agency HC3N to focus on three specific aspects of agriculture risk which required further research to complement and add value to the World Bank’s 2013 risk assessment study, and PARM undertaking studies to only address those aspects (and not a full risk assessment) is

\textsuperscript{36} FAO (2016) Agriculture and Food Insecurity Risk Management in Africa – Concepts, Lessons Learned and Review Guidelines.
evidence of PARM was meeting the specific demand for ARM support from the government. Based on interviews and review of documents, it is evident that there is a large unmet demand for awareness creation and training on ARM, in French, at all levels ranging from inclusion of ARM in the agriculture faculty curricula of Niger’s national and especially regional universities, to in-service training for key officials, non-state service providers and farmer’s organizations in both Niamey and in the regions.

- Furthermore, it was noted from a review of documents, that PARM in agreement with the Government of Senegal undertook RAS in livestock and fisheries subsectors in 2016, to complement the 2014 World Bank study focusing on cereal production.

It is too early to expect PARM to meet the demand for ARM support from smallholders (at the time of this mid-term evaluation). However, it was noted that PARM has been working on putting the building blocks in place to provide capacity building through the extension service system in Uganda and also in Ethiopia.

It is important to understand and note that as per the current mandate PARM is a facilitator and not an implementer. PARM is not a service provider but it provides support to the service provider to render their services. There is no doubt among stakeholders in the countries about the appropriateness and relevance of the portfolio of services provided by PARM. Currently, PARM is primarily focused at the policy level (integrating ARM into NAIP) with an intention to ensure that ARM tools will trickle down to meet the demand at the farmer level either through extension services or other local institution/organizations. Efforts and activities have been taken up in countries by PARM reflect this. However, with PARM’s structure and resources, it cannot by itself reach and build capacities of smallholders in countries, where more than 60 to 70 percent of the population is dependent on agriculture. Identification appropriate national partners (in addition to the PARM focal organization) early in the process and having a clear definition and understanding of roles will help PARM being more relevant and effective in meeting the demand for ARM support specifically for smallholders. ARM support to smallholders can be through the extension services of MOA or through partnerships with agricultural universities or other relevant national institutions in the country.

Portfolio of Services

During discussions with stakeholders and the review of documents, it was noted that the portfolio of services, which include policy support for ARM; development of systems and tools; and, capacity development of stakeholders are appropriate to respond to the goals and objectives of PARM. It is too early to expect a demand for ARM tools as a result of PARM activities. At the grassroots level, only a few farmers have been trained in Uganda (as a pilot) and provision of training through the extension service providers is a work in progress (discussion stage) at the time of this mid-term evaluation. Similarly, it is too early to comment about the uptake of PARM products for mainstreaming and/or investment, as PARM is yet to complete its fourth stage in any of the nine countries; Uganda is the most advanced (closer to completion).

---

37 Ethiopia, Niger and Uganda – visited during this evaluation
There is a general agreement among diverse stakeholders that the business model is sufficient at the current volume of operations. However, it requires some “tweaks” to improve efficiency and effectiveness in the country (discussed later).

**Partnerships**

Partnerships are at the core of the PARM’s work and are cross-cutting into all aspects of PARM including country process, knowledge management, and capacity building, in addition to the overall coordination. At the apex level, the SC is comprised of contributing partners and a strategic partner. The AC is comprised of knowledge partner, private sector partners, development partners and Regional partners. At the country level, PARM along with NEPAD connects through the CAADP focal person to the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) to start its work in the country. NEPAD’s partnership is not only strategic but also crucial for PARM and its success in Africa. The report discusses aspects of PARM’s partnerships at various levels subsequently in the report.

### 4.2 Effectiveness

PARM has been effective in terms of its progress towards achievement of stated results. As at the time of this evaluation PARM was carrying out activities in nine countries simultaneously (Figure 4).

**Figure 4: Overall Progress - PARM Process Snapshot (September 2014 – September 2016)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Setting up (1)</th>
<th>Risk Assessment (2)</th>
<th>Tools Assessment (3)</th>
<th>Follow-up (4)</th>
<th>Implementation (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>††</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VW – Validation Workshop

† The Risk Assessment Report is yet to be finalized
‡ The Risk Assessment Report finalized, but circulated
†† Validation Workshop by end of 2016

Source: Compiled from PARM – Our Results – September 2016
In addition to multiple missions to several countries, bilateral discussions with Governments and development partners, among others, coordinating events and presenting at CAADP annual events, PARM's overall progress in the process, since the launch, included:

- Set-up completed in seven countries and in progress two more countries;
- Risk assessment study and report completed and/or in the process of finalization of report in five countries;
- Validation workshop completed in five countries (three in 2015 and two in 2016) and planned for one more country (before end of 2016);
- Tools development in advanced stages in one country and work is in nascent stages in three other countries; and,
- At least one capacity development conducted in five countries; More than one capacity development work has been done in Uganda.

More detailed discussions on the progress on results, knowledge management, capacity building, and partnerships are presented in this section.

Integration of ARM into National Strategies

PARM has been effective in its work to facilitate the integration of ARM into the national strategies/sector plans and national agricultural investment plans (NAIPs); however, this is still a work in progress in many countries. ARM has been integrated into national agricultural sector investment plans in Uganda and Niger (two out of nine PARM countries).

- The PARM has been successful in Uganda to mainstream ARM in the planning process of the agricultural sector. In the process of developing the draft Ugandan Agricultural Sector Strategic Plan 2015/16-2019/20 (ASSP)\(^\text{38}\), which is the new agricultural sector investment plan, ARM\(^\text{39}\) was taken care of in all the components/themes. The draft ASSP will be implemented not only by the agriculture sector but also by other relevant Ministries and Departments (e.g. Ministry of Water and Environment, Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, etc.), which are expected to subsequently be able to incorporate ARM in their respective programmes that are designed to contribute to the draft ASSP. Furthermore, PARM also contributed to ARM being integrated into the new Extension Policy and is in the process of being incorporated into the draft Extension Strategy of the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF). The Extension Directorate was created recently in MAAIF.

- Regarding the national strategies and investment plans of Niger, there is evidence in the draft documents for the Government's 2016-2020 planning cycle that agriculture risk analysis has been taken into account by the international agencies and by the

---

\(^{38}\) Published in June 2016 by Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF), The Republic of Uganda

\(^{39}\) Page 46 of draft ASSP
Government; however, they may not be directly attributable to PARM, as Plan d’Action pour la Gestion des Risques Agricoles du Niger (PAGRA) was finalized before PARM entered Niger. The main work on risk analysis and strategic integration has been led by World Bank’s 2013 Agricultural Sector Risk Assessment in Niger: Moving from Crisis Response to Long-term Risk Management, which led to the 2014 PAGRA, and the design work in 2015 for the two World Bank flagship projects PASEC and the Regional Sahel Pastoralism Support Project (PRAPS). PARM’s Niger Risk Assessment was conducted at the request of the Government to fill the gaps in the World Bank’s assessment and focused on three specific variables that stakeholders need to understand better in order to manage risks: financial access, market access, and information.

- In Ethiopia, PARM’s RAS was completed slightly behind the time schedule for the country planning cycle, and therefore, has not been able to integrate ARM into the Second Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP II). Currently, Ethiopia’s Agriculture Sector Policy Investment Framework II (PIF II) for 2016-2020 is being prepared. Although, GTP II did not explicitly incorporate ARM because the ARM discussion came later; there is an opportunity to link ARM through – productivity and farm risks. This has to be taken up by PARM through ATA. ARM is not specifically mentioned in national policies; nevertheless, it is covered in many ways – e.g. land management, cooperatives, PSNP, market prices, capacity building etc. Discussions with stakeholders revealed that there is a possibility that Climate Resilient Green Economy (CRGE) will be mainstreamed in PIF II; this will mean climate issues and financial risks are likely to be included. However, it is not explicitly evident if this will be due to the efforts of PARM. Currently, in Ethiopia, ARM is integrated into the Agricultural Transformation Agency (ATA). It has been mainstreamed and ARM is being considered as the fifth cross-cutting areas in addition to climate, nutrition, gender, inclusiveness (youth, and pastoralists) and biodiversity. This (consideration as a cross-cutting theme) is a positive step, as ATA is currently organized structurally by key issues – production and productivity; environmentally sustainable and inclusive growth; agribusiness and markets and enhanced implementation capacity; and, agriculture commercialization cluster initiative.

Key lessons from the three case study countries in terms integration of ARM into national policies include:

---

40 In fact the first visit to Niger by PARM along with NEPAD was in June 2014 to attend the workshop to validate the World Bank’s proposed ARM action plan, the PAGRA. By the time PARM entered Niger, key studies on ARM has been undertaken, which include FAO’s 2008 Review of Risk Management Tools and Policies in Niger’s Rural Sector and the World Bank’s 2013 Agricultural Sector Risk Assessment in Niger: Moving from Crisis Response to Long-term Risk Management.  
42 The Second Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP II), National Planning Commission, Ethiopia, September 2015  
43 It was noted that the PARM focal person from the ATA and the CAADP focal person are both involved in the task force developing the PIF II. This might be a good opportunity for ARM to be integrated into the PIF II; however, PARM needs to bring this into the discussions through the ATA, at the earliest.
• Government interest and understanding of ARM is critical in order to integrate ARM into the Sector Plans and NAIPs;
• For ARM to be effectively mainstreamed into the national strategies, it is important the Planning Department of the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) is very much involved in the PARM process (because even if the PARM is working with the specialized agency, at Government’s request, the NAIP, and the sector strategy belongs to the Government/Ministry of Agriculture);
• Regular interaction between the PARM focal person (whether they are in MoA or in the specialized agency) and the CAADP focal person is important. In some countries it may be one and the same person, as in the case of Uganda when PARM was launched; this is not the case anymore - it is under two different desks in the Planning Department, MAAIF; Uganda.44 Involving more people facilitates enhanced awareness of ARM and better integration within the MOA structures;
• Institutionalization is important. Involving more than one person in planning and carrying out PARM related activities is important. Otherwise, when the person leaves the capacity and knowledge is lost until an appropriate replacement person is found. This is likely to slow down the process;
• Being on time or synchronizing with the government’s country planning cycle is crucial to have ARM integrated (it is not clear yet as what steps PARM would undertake if it misses the country planning cycle – an area of process improvement for PARM); and,
• In addition to the focus on integrating ARM into national strategies and investment plans, it is also important for PARM/ARM to be integrated into the Ministry of Agriculture structures, an area to improve. Therefore, it is important to understand broadly how the Ministry is structured.

The theory of change of PARM’s process and its business operations model is that PARM’s work will lead to the integration of ARM into NAIP. However, as mentioned earlier, it is likely that in many countries PARM will miss the country planning cycle and therefore the integration into NAIP. With most country planning cycles for agriculture sector aligned to CAADP process, it is likely that by the time the RAS’ are completed the five-year plan (2016-2020) implementation has already started in most countries and hence may be difficult to integrate ARM into the current sector plan and NAIP. For this reason, PARM should have steps defined for an alternate course of action to ensure that it is integrated into the subsequent plan and/or how it can fit into the national annual budget45 (it may not be holistic without PARM process inputs; however, it would provide ARM continuity in the current national plan, as the current PARM country processes, are likely to have been completed before the next NAIP preparation in 2020). NEPAD/CAADP support

44 In many ways it is good for PARM/ARM as more people are involved.
45 ARM to be include into annual budgets for at least some components of ARM which are already mentioned in the sector planning and investment documents, if any
to PARM in this regard through discussions/advocacy with the government will be vital for long term impact of ARM.46

Another important aspect that is not explicitly evident from the PARM process and its model is, as to how it will attract investment in the country (the implementation stage of the PARM process), whether ARM is integrated into NAIP or not. Most LDCs and LMICs do not have the capacity to finance their sector plans and are often dependent on development partners and private sector, among others for investments. At the same time, development partners would like to align their investments to help LDCs and LMIC national development plans and/or sector strategies. This emphasizes the point that integration of ARM into NAIPs and sector plan is critical to attracting investment. Nevertheless, it should be noted that integration of ARM does not necessarily mean that investment is assured.

Agricultural Risks Identified

The RAS has enabled countries (where they are completed) to identify and prioritize their top risks in the agriculture sector that need to be addressed. It was noted during the evaluation from discussions with stakeholders, that PARM conducted rigorous risk assessments in the selected countries, taking into consideration a wide variety of risks. Information is collected from diverse sources in order to get a clear picture of the risks affecting either the country as a whole and/or in specific regions of the country. The risk identified are then prioritized which then can be addressed using appropriate tools and strategies.

Similar to Niger, in Senegal also PARM’s RAS followed World Bank’s 2014 report on agricultural risk which focused on cereal production. PARM’s RAS in Senegal complemented the work of World Bank and focused on livestock and fisheries to complete the analysis for the whole sector in the country.

PARM has completed RAS in six countries (Uganda, Ethiopia, Niger, Senegal, Cabo Verde and Cameroon) and conducted validation workshops during 2015-2015 in five countries with the exception of Cameroon (planned to be conducted before the end of 2016). At the time of this evaluation, the final report (for RAS) was published only for Uganda. However, from the review of documents and discussions, it was noted that major agricultural risks have been identified through the RAS in Uganda, Niger, Ethiopia, and Senegal. With Cabo Verde and Cameroon RAS reports in the process of being finalized, it is likely PARM will achieve its target to identify and prioritize risks in six countries by the end of 2016.

ARM Tools and Feasibility Studies

From the discussions with stakeholders and the review of documents, it was noted that as per PARM process, once the risks are identified and prioritized, appropriate tools and management strategies have to be developed and aligned to address these risks. At the same time, it was also important to clearly define ARM responsibilities for each stakeholder. In order to ensure this,
PARM worked in partnership with the countries to identify the right set of tools to address the most important risks.

In terms of tools assessed through feasibility studies, the evaluation noted the following progress to its stated results:

- Feasibility study to manage risk linked to pest and diseases in Uganda, undertaken and completed in 2016;
- Ongoing discussions with Makerere University and Directorate of Extension Services, MAAIF, Uganda on ARM capacity development;
- Ongoing discussion with ATA and Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources (MOANR), Ethiopia to conduct a feasibility study on social protection and insurance and the impact of humanitarian programmes on market price; and,
- Furthermore, there is also ongoing discussion with ATA about the possibility of mainstreaming ARM into extension services of MOANR, Ethiopia.

Additionally, PARM has also undertaken two multi-country studies in terms of ARM tools assessment and development. This includes:

- "Warehouse Receipt" Studies in nine countries (including PARM and non-PARM countries)\(^{47}\) jointly with IFAD, AFD and Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (CTA); and,
- "Informational Assessment of ARM Information System" (ARM-IS) in seven countries\(^{48}\) through CEIGRAM.\(^{49}\)

**Enhanced Awareness and Capacities of National Stakeholders to Manage Agricultural Risk**

Increased awareness and adequate capacity are critical to integrating risk management into national policies. PARM has increased the awareness of ARM through successive and successful events organized in various countries. This has contributed to moving the discussions in the sector from a “production” lens to “productivity” and bringing a holistic perspective to ARM.

Based on discussions with various stakeholders and a review of documents it could be said that PARM has contributed to enhanced awareness, increased understanding and capacities of diverse national stakeholders (more than 600 in the nine countries), specifically in the government at various levels, to manage agricultural risks, especially in the case study countries (Ethiopia, Niger, Niger, Senegal and Uganda).

\(^{47}\) In Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cote D’Ivoire, Ghana, Madagascar, Mozambique, Niger, Senegal and Uganda

\(^{48}\) In Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Niger, Senegal and Uganda

\(^{49}\) CEIGRAM (Research Centre for the Management of Agricultural and Environmental Risks) is the organization undertaking the study
and Uganda). As seen from PARM documents, capacities have also been enhanced on ARM in other PARM countries.

Since the last quarter of 2014, PARM has been very active, initially in Ethiopia, Niger, and Uganda and subsequently in other six PARM countries, conducting several activities to enhance awareness and build capacities of stakeholders. The stakeholders reached includes government officials, policy makers, representatives of smallholders, non-governmental organizations, farmer organization and research institutions, among others. The various types of activities undertaken by PARM include Risk Assessment Study (RAS) and identification of key high-risks, validation workshops of the RAS, capacity development seminars on ARM and ARM tools, workshops on information systems for ARM, and workshop on feasibility studies (see Box).

In all these workshops, PARM Secretariat staff have been involved in planning and facilitation of the sessions. Furthermore, PARM Secretariat staff have undertaken several missions to all the nine countries, separately or in conjunction with PARM events, to meet with key national stakeholders and potential partners.

It is evident that these efforts have also enhanced the awareness and/or increased capacities and understanding. Additionally, in the case of Uganda, the dedicated international PARM consultant has also undertaken several missions. All these have also contributed to enhanced awareness about PARM/ARM and also capacity development among national stakeholders, including PARM focal point and/or CAADP focal person.

Capacity building is integral to the country process and is embedded in the risk assessment, tools assessment and follow-up phases of the PARM country process. PARM has developed a Capacity Development Strategy in June 2016.

Key PARM Awareness Creation and Capacity Development Activities
(as of September 2016)

UGANDA
• Feasibility Study Findings Workshop on Plant Pest and Disease Control – September 2016
• Workshop on Information Systems for ARM – May 2016
• 2-day Capacity Development Seminar – “ARM for farmers’ organization” December 2015
• PARM Panel in Africa Day for Food and Nutrition Security (ADFNS) – October 2015
• CD Seminar for farmers and MAAIF staff on ARM
• Risk Assessment Study Validation Workshop – June 2015

NIGER
• RAS Findings Workshop – December 2015
• Capacity Development Seminar – December 2015

ETHIOPIA
• Information Systems on ARM (CEIGRAM Study) – Technical Seminar - May 2016
• RAS Findings Workshop – December 2015
• “Policy Forum” – November 2014

SENEGAL
• RAS Findings Workshop – June 2016
• CD Seminar – March 2016

CABO VERDE
• RAS Findings Workshop – June 2016
• CD Seminar – June 2016

CAMEROON
• Information Systems on ARM (CEIGRAM Study) – Technical Seminar - June 2016
• CD Seminar – June 2016

RAS – Risk Assessment Study; CD – Capacity Development
Source: Compiled from PARM Reports

50 What we do – policy dialogue process, (PARM Factsheet, p.2)
51 Presented as part of 8th Steering Committee Meeting support document
ARM National Stakeholder Committees

One of the stated results of PARM is to establish ARM national stakeholder committees led by the Governments to support and coordinate ARM/PARM initiatives. PARM has been very focussed on carrying out the country process, capacity development workshops and knowledge management and has been successful; however, a key aspect that needs specific attention to make PARM more effective and sustainable is the institutional arrangements. The evaluation noted that this comes too late in the process (refer Figure 2 presented earlier). As noted during the evaluation from the discussions, the “country/national steering committee” has not proved to be a very a successful approach either, which (where present) meets only when PARM staff are on a mission. The institutional arrangement should start early in the process simultaneously along with studies. The CAADP and PARM focal persons should be involved in the discussions of PARM/ARM, preferably together in the planning and country activities. This will build ownership in the country and also enable them to start discussions even while PARM staff is not on a mission, thereby building an informal coordination mechanism. This is important to institutionalize and integrate ARM and to get more staff from MOA involved. This is likely to provide the continuity in discussions and mainstreaming ARM within MOA. The partnership of various types and at various levels is crucial PARM’s effectiveness. While “committees” are important the key focus of PARM should be on creating coordination mechanisms and institutionalizing arrangements within MOA (to carry on with ARM without PARM). This takes time, and therefore it is important to start early in the PARM process. It is important to understand the MOA structure and governance where PARM/ARM focal person and the CAADP person are in the whole structure. The example of MAAIF Uganda is presented in Annex B and it highlights why integrating ARM within MOA structures is critical.

Among the case study countries, Uganda is one country that had a “country/national steering committee”, which had met a few times, albeit changing representatives of the organizations. It was also noted that it met only when PARM Secretariat staff were on a mission in the country. In Ethiopia, the steering committee was created but had never met, although the members of the “said steering committee” have remained involved in PARM through bilateral discussions. While ATA in Ethiopia is the key agency in the sector, it is not the implementer of programmes and therefore it is important to have a strong counterpart in MOANR (in addition to the CAADP focal person) to facilitate mainstreaming within the ministry.

The involvement of development partners has been largely limited to the attendance at PARM events. PARM presented once in the “donor forum” in Uganda; however, there is no clear strategy to reach out to development partners to have an impact and attract investment in PARM’s tools. This was clearly reflected during discussions with development partners in the three countries visited (Uganda, Ethiopia, and Niger). Each development partner in the country has a planning/funding cycle (3-year or a 5-year). It is important that ARM is highlighted in these documents which may include findings from RAS and ARM tools developed by PARM.

52 It is most likely that PARM focal person and CAADP focal person are in the Planning Department of MOA. While this is important they are not implementing or managing programmes in MOA
As noted during the evaluation, engagement of the development partners in the countries is critical to ensure ARM is being mainstreamed in their respective investments and programming in the agriculture sector. For example in Uganda (which is the most advanced country in PARM process), EU is going into the next cycle of 2017-2021 (EDF11); World Bank is planning to invest USD 150 million for Agricultural Cluster Development in Uganda; the Ministry of Netherlands have continued to invest in various targeted value chains for several years; and USAID among others development partners prepare their multi-year country strategy/plans (including investment in agriculture sector). All these reflect the untapped potential for leveraging investment for PARM/ARM in Uganda; yet, work in this direction was not clearly evident.

There is scope to improve the involvement of national stakeholders and development partners in PARM process in the countries. This was partially affected because of limited exposure/presence of PARM in meetings within the country sector institutional structures/mechanisms. For example:

- In Uganda, there is a Sector Working Group with Permanent Secretary as Chair. It meets two to four times a year. As per discussions with stakeholders, ARM has not been a discussion point in this forum, yet;

- There is an Agricultural Development Partners Group in Uganda – currently, co-chaired by FAO and JICA. It meets last week of every month. Although PARM has presented once in this forum, it will be a good for PARM to renew contact to present and update the group to bring PARM/ARM to “the top of the mind” item. Involving MAAIF (the focal person or a senior official from MAAIF) to make the presentation will reflect ownership and commitment from the Government (from a long-term development and sustainability perspective);

- Similarly, in Ethiopia PARM absence in Rural Economic Development and Food Security (RED&FS) Sector Working Group structure and discussions has highlighted in the various discussion. The structure has task forces and technical committees; EU, FAO, and Italy are co-chairs within the structure at various levels. RED&FS supports and coordinates policy investment framework (PIF) for the agriculture sector in Ethiopia. All the development partners investing in the agriculture sector are present in RED&FS (refer Annex C for more detailed discussion on RED&FS);

- Additionally, in Ethiopia, there are development partners coordination groups for each of the four national programmes; and,

- The involvement of private sector, with the exception of one or two insurance companies (in Ethiopia and Uganda) has not been encouraging. This is an area for PARM to improve. The private sector participation in PARM events has been mostly limited to “pseudo-private sector” organizations/institutions. This could be seen from the absence of input companies in the recent findings workshop of pest and diseases risks in Kampala. Again the partnership with insurance companies is also not evident. In July 2016, the Government of Uganda committed USD 1.5 million to the Agro Consortium of the Uganda
Insurers Association to subsidize the premiums paid by smallholders and other farmers. This amount was reported to be for the first year and is expected to double (to USD 3 million) for the subsequent years if there is demand.\footnote{The amount will subsidize 50\% of the premium for smallholder famers and 30\% of the premium for others. A smallholder is defined as one having less than 5 acres, 1-30 cattle, 1-50 pigs, less than 2000 poultry or less than 20 million USH (USD 6,000) in a season.} This is complementary to PARM, yet PARM was not explicitly visible in this area.

An area for improvement for PARM is to enhance the awareness and increase the involvement of stakeholders beyond government, specifically investors (development partners and private sector). Regular discussions with Cargill and Munich-Re (both AC members) could be a good starting point in getting private sector involved. It is important for PARM to have clarity on what type of involvement is required from the private sector (which may vary country to country); at the same time keeping in mind that it should be of relevance to the private sector also. It is important for PARM to define “private sector” so it can have country specific strategy to attract/involve them.\footnote{“Private Sector” could be a trader, SME, processor, transporter, wholesaler/retailer, MFI, banks, insurance companies, etc. The important aspect for PARM is to identify who are relevant to the key risks prioritized in the country and what kind of involvement is required from which specific actor. It may or may not involve all.}

Despite several missions and activities in the three case study countries, there was a perceived notion among all stakeholders that there was a “lack of continuous engagement” in the country. This is because of large time gaps between two PARM events. There is a 12-month gap between the launch and the fist PARM event, most likely the RAS validation workshop. This has given an impression of PARM “going off the radar” between events/missions, as informed by stakeholders. It is also an inherent operational model constraint. When PARM does not have finished products/tools “soon enough” stakeholders lose interest. This also linked to the other issue, “visibility” highlighted by the development partners.

Another key weakness that hinders increased awareness is the absence of “local presence”. This meant missing out country sector forums and sector institutional structures. It was noted that in the recent months PARM has appointed “local PARM liaison officers” as a part-time consultant; this may be a good short-term solution. However, as viewed by stakeholders, this unlikely to build credibility or “visibility for PARM and/or fulfill the gap of “lack of engagement”. As noted in the case study countries, the “visibility” issue is compounded by the fact that even if PARM is known by an individual, it does not mean that it is known organization-wide or known by an individual who is structurally important in decision-making. The evaluation has noted that creating “visibility” takes time (for a new initiative such as PARM), especially when resources are limited and not physically present in the country. However, this is an important aspect for ultimately leading into investment, especially from development partners.
Knowledge Management

As in any initiative similar to PARM, the knowledge management (KM) has had a staggered start. Overall, PARM has produced more than 35 knowledge products – this includes PARM factsheets, PARM annual reports, Risk Assessment Studies, Risk Assessment Study Validation Workshop report and presentations Risk Profile of countries, Capacity Development Seminar reports and presentations, Study reports and findings, ARM tools, and newsletters, among others. This is a good start and achievement by PARM Secretariat in two years, as a new initiative emphasizing a paradigm shift on risk management in agriculture. PARM’s ongoing work on branding all products will help in creating a unique identity for itself.

The small team of PARM Secretariat has been efficient despite facing challenges of not being able to commit the knowledge management person full time, due to lack of personnel to handle administration and finance work. With PARM gaining momentum and with work in progress in nine countries, it is necessary for the KM person to be dedicated full-time work in developing KM products and planning/organizing knowledge sharing events. The recent support hired to handle administration work will greatly help to move the KM agenda forward. PARM has developed the KM strategy was approved in 2016. This is envisaged as a living document to be updated annually. Among others, the KM strategy will give priority to developing pedagogical tools that can be used for increasing knowledge and capacity on ARM. KM is closely linked to capacity development and the country process (risk assessment and tools assessment) and it was very positive to see the team work closely and collaboratively.

As part of enhancing knowledge management activities, PARM has developed and leveraged its relationship with World Bank (an AC member) to use the Forum for Agricultural Risk Management in Development (FARM-D) for conducting webinars and sharing knowledge products (see box). There is potential to leverage the collaboration with FARMD for mutually beneficial partnership. The FARM-D, an online knowledge exchange platform, is funded by Swiss Cooperation and Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands with the World Bank's Agricultural Risk Management Team leading and coordinating the forum.56

PARM has also collaborated with FAO and IFAD in sharing knowledge and learning through targeted events/activities (see box). Furthermore, PARM has contributed to the development of a module (Module 3) on ARM tools in collaboration with FAO for a broader e-learning course on "Agricultural Risk Assessment and Management for Food Security in Developing Countries."57 The event in Ethiopia (see box) was also used to launch PARM in the country.

---

56 FARM-D – [http://www.agriskmanagementforum.org/content/history-support-and-organization](http://www.agriskmanagementforum.org/content/history-support-and-organization)
PARM had been looking into collaboration with local institutions for development of knowledge and capacity development products – Makerere University (in Uganda), the University of Gaston Berger (in Senegal) and AGRHYMET (in Niger). There have been some delays due to various reasons within and beyond PARM’s control. Developing and leveraging partnership with research institutions (including IFPRI, ILRI, other CGIAR consortium members and FARA) and universities in the PARM countries, and in Africa (and in other continents in the future), will help PARM have a multiplier effect on knowledge management, knowledge sharing and capacity development in a more cost effective manner.

PARM has also kept its website, launched in June 2015, updated and has been active on social media (twitter58). The relevance and importance of PARM are evident not only by because of the discussions at G8/G20 but also due to the need to address ARM holistically at the country level. PARM is mentioned on IFAD website59, and this helps in creating awareness to a wider range of audience. It will also help reach broader audience and stakeholders, if financing partners and NEPAD, strategic partner, of PARM, would have a page or a blurb with a link to PARM website. This not only creates wider awareness but also access to useful and relevant knowledge products of PARM to a diverse clientele, including investors. Additionally, PARM could also leverage its relationship with some AC members (e.g. FAO and WFP, among others) to have a link to PARM website.

PARM through its strategic partner, NEPAD, has been able to participate in CAADP events (see box) and share knowledge – by organizing a side event also having a session or two in the main event. As reported during discussions, this has also increased PARM visibility among countries in Africa. PARM contributes to CAADP process and fills the void of ARM; the strength of the NEPAD-PARM partnership. During the side event, the CAADP and PARM focal persons from the PARM countries were able to meet and share experience and notes. This was appreciated by country stakeholders during discussions, as part of this evaluation. PARM and NEPAD have a key role to play as knowledge brokers in Africa.

---

58 174 followers as of October 31, 2016. Twitter since November 2014
59 https://www.ifad.org/topic/overview/tags/parm
PARM has made efforts to be involved in regional events when invited. However, there is scope to be more actively involved. Not having the strong “local presence” also means missing out on information and connections for these key regional events which are relevant to PARM and the countries in the region.\textsuperscript{60} For example, the IGAD event in Djibouti to sign the regional agricultural investment plan (August 2016) and the African Green Revolution Forum in Nairobi (September 2016), which brought together heads of state, farmer organizations, finance and investment leads, private sector business managing commodity value chains and development partners, among others. Presence in these and similar regional events not only increases the awareness and importance of ARM/PARM among policy decision-makers and investors but also enhances the profile of PARM.

The relationship of PARM with RECs (ECOWAS and COMESA) is evolving and is at a nascent stage. However, it must also be noted that RECs as of now do not have a strong role in CAADP implementation. The focus of CAADP has been in the countries. In fact, there is no CAADP regional programming, yet (although a RAIP has been signed recently). Understanding the role of RECs as one of three leading institutions of AU is key for PARM to plan its knowledge management (the roles have been presented as part of overall coordination report - Annex C).

Areas where KM can improve include:

- The knowledge platform is very important in the long-term for PARM’s “legacy”. While the expectation for “platform” is to provide an opportunity for various practitioners to exchange and discuss ideas. PARM could discuss and explore collaboration with FARM-D of World Bank in this regard;
  - While the PARM website is distinct in its content from FARMD, PARM can strive to be the “CGAP” of ARM, in terms of continuing to evolve and consolidating itself as an evidenced-based advocacy and knowledge management platform on ARM;
- There has to be link between PARM’s knowledge management platform and country level activities and practitioners to enable discussions and knowledge sharing;
- As part of next steps, PARM needs to ensure how the implementation will take the ARM from a policy level to the farm level; this will require country level knowledge and capacity development partners (discussed earlier); and,
- Ensure PARM website is linked to relevant organizations and platforms for wider access (potential partnership and linkages discussed earlier). As a knowledge broker and facilitator, PARM should strive to ensure linkages and synergies with various initiatives that address components of ARM – see select examples in Annex E.

\textsuperscript{60} Leveraging connections of SC members’ country offices and NEPAD could prove to keep track of key event in the continent
\textsuperscript{61} 2015 (http://www.nepad-caadp.net/sites/default/files/the_caadp_programme_of_work english 1.pdf)
The interconnections among country process, capacity building, knowledge management, and partnership are very obvious in PARM. The way PARM is structured, partnerships are crucial to leveraging synergies, capacities, and resources to build ownership and ensure institutionalization in the countries. Currently, all these are managed at the PARM Secretariat level, with PARM process making progress, capacity building activities should be carried out through institutions/organization in the country, with PARM providing pedagogical tools, technical expertise, and oversight. Overall, KM should be done at the Secretariat level to ensure knowledge from global and countries are coordinated, organized and made available for everyone in a user-friendly manner; however, knowledge production may happen at various levels within PARM and outside of PARM (by other organizations/development partners or initiatives).

4.3 Efficiency

Governance and Management

As mentioned earlier in the report, PARM is governed by the SC and managed by the Secretariat with technical advice from the AC. These bodies have ensured that the activities of PARM respond to its initial objectives to deliver good quality neutral assistance efficiently and effectively.

The Steering Committee mandated to make budgetary decisions and meets three times a year (once face-to-face and two times virtually). Since the first SC meeting in December 2013 at IFAD headquarters, the SC has met a total of eight times, as of August 2016, and has guided the PARM Secretariat efficiently and effectively. The AC has met only two times virtually (November 2015 and October 2014) and the members who have attended these meetings also varied, with the exception of few such as FAO, WFP, and World Bank, who been actively involved not only in both the AC meetings but also through bilateral discussions with the PARM Secretariat. The working relationship among the three bodies of PARM was found to be efficient, transparent and decisions well documented.

While many stakeholders were of the consensus that having an AC was part of good governance and a good practice, there was no concrete opinion on how to make it active. The challenge comes from the nature and diversity of organizations involved and the early stages of PARM. Key issues that were mentioned during discussions with AC members were not knowing each other and no clearly stated common agenda, so when they met once in a year virtually it was difficult to have the discussion moving. A face-to-face meeting in conjunction with an SC or as a side event to a CAADP event (which PARM ties in with) could be a good start.
Although PARM was launched in December 2013, the PARM Secretariat was established only in September 2014. The time taken to establish the Secretariat was largely due to time to finding the right people for the Secretariat.\(^{62}\)

**Human Resources**

As mentioned earlier, the PARM Secretariat is comprised of a three-member core team\(^{63}\), supported by recently recruited consultants based in IFAD, Rome. Until the recent recruitments, the core team was managing the administration and logistics arrangement work also, in addition to their own respective roles and responsibilities in moving PARM forward through overall coordination and country process.

At the country level, PARM has managed work through consultants (international or national/regional consultants) dedicated to the country or a study/assessment, with coordination and support missions by PARM Secretariat staff. This has ensured PARM to make progress in the country process, within context and factors controllable by PARM. In 2016, PARM has appointed “PARM liaison officers” on a part-time basis, short-term consultants (discussed subsequently). The recent additions will help the PARM core team to focus on their primary roles and responsibilities, in the short-term.

Overall, it was noted that the PARM Secretariat was under-staffed. Addition of a capacity development person to the team will help in terms carrying out the various activities more efficiently. This would ensure that the Technical Advisor could focus more on the country process (including integration of ARM in the country, partnerships within a country, integration into country mechanisms, etc.) and the Senior Programme Manager could focus on building global partnerships, advocacy, and mobilization of resources among others. The capacity development person could then coordinate all capacity development activities in all the nine countries and the KM person could focus specifically on KM activities including KM platform.

It was noted that PARM has been enrolling interns as part of the IFAD’s broader internship. While this helps to develop ARM professional capacities and interest, specifically for interns from countries in Africa, it should not be seen as an alternate option to meet staff requirements.

**Country Process Time**

The country process coordination from start to finish takes a minimum of two years, as it could be seen from the first three countries – Uganda, Niger, and Ethiopia. Even in Uganda, which is the most advanced in terms of the PARM process among all countries, it is likely to exceed more than two years to complete all the activities of PARM process. It was also noted that Uganda has been a pilot for almost all activities implemented and documents developed (including terms of reference for studies and assessments) and hence been a learning ground for PARM. It is expected...

---

\(^{62}\) An aspect not uncommon in many multi-lateral organizations, when initiatives of this nature are being set-up, due to established recruitment process.

\(^{63}\) A Senior Programme Manager, a Technical Advisor and a Knowledge Management Officer, who came on board in July/August 2014.
that this will enhance PARM efficiencies in other countries, in the next two years; however, it must be noted that country contexts and the Government’s interest and commitment to time will vary among the PARM countries. While it is understood that feasibility studies cannot be undertaken without completion of RAS, PARM should continue and ensure looking at starting feasibility studies as soon as risks are prioritized, even if the RAS is at the draft stage after the validation workshop. This is likely to quicken the overall process and reduce time lags between events.

The inherent weakness of PARM’s operational model is that it does not provide the continuity in the country between PARM events/missions. Additionally, there are structures and mechanisms and forums in the country in the agriculture sector, where PARM is not “visible” and/or not present. As remarked in several instances by stakeholders during this evaluation, PARM is good and important conceptually; however, being “part-time” does not ensure momentum sustain interest in the country. While the “presence” on the ground was considered important by stakeholders, this does not necessarily mean posting PARM staff in the country full time.

The time lag between events has also led to a lack of awareness/interest among development partners, especially when there is a turnover of personnel. Another key factor, which gives the perception of “long absence”, is also due to the fact that PARM takes at least 12 months to have the RAS validation workshop,64 after its kick off and there is no activity or workshop other than missions to the country. The only exception has been Uganda, where the RAS validation workshop was conducted in eight months and PARM also had the ADFNS event in that time. When RAS takes a long time to get finalized, PARM should proactively take steps, to conduct a capacity development and/or an awareness creation seminar on ARM/PARM, in consultation with PARM focal organization and other partners. This will also help PARM “continuity” to be in the discussions in the country, after the launch and sustain the interest (and therefore avoid the situation of the country to wait for one year to have a PARM event after kick-off; it will help to avoid to some extent stakeholder comments of “ad-hoc” and “part-time”). Carrying out feasibility studies simultaneously or with a staggered start (instead of one after the other) might also help to address this time-lag issue. These will help PARM improve efficiencies.

Furthermore, turnover of personnel in the partner organizations in the country, specifically in the Ministry of Agriculture, the CAADP focal person or the specialized agency has also led to delays in the PARM process in the countries. Additionally, in the case of Niger, this was compounded by the election and the World Bank’s risk assessment study, its subsequent plan of action, and large project financing, which diverted the attention from PARM. In Ethiopia, both the Ministry of Agriculture and the ATA underwent reorganization. The decision to reorganize by these inistitutions was independent of each other (to meet repsective organizational needs and mandate).

**Financial Resources**

Due to the initial delay in establishing the PARM Secretariat, PARM timelines have been extended until 2018. Hence PARM’s Long-term Plan and Budget is prepared for 2014-2018. Table 2

---

64 The evaluation has taken note that the PARM’ RAS is through and detailed study
presents a snapshot of the expenditure since inception until June 2016. It helps to examine what has been spent so far with reference to the total budget.

Table 2: PARM Expenditure Snap Shot (since inception till June 20, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount in USD*</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016 (as of June 20, 2016)†</th>
<th>Total (USD)</th>
<th>% of Total Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARM Coordination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>142,443</td>
<td>532,550</td>
<td>481,116</td>
<td>1,156,109</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination SC/AC meetings</td>
<td>8,443</td>
<td>2,786</td>
<td>6,222</td>
<td>17,451</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Management</td>
<td>77,632</td>
<td>26,728</td>
<td>28,592</td>
<td>132,952</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total Coordination</strong></td>
<td><strong>228,518</strong></td>
<td><strong>562,064</strong></td>
<td><strong>515,930</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,306,512</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy Services</td>
<td>260,448</td>
<td>25,492</td>
<td>28,937</td>
<td>314,296</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>103,990</td>
<td>46,096</td>
<td>58,774</td>
<td>208,860</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>180,483</td>
<td>54,061</td>
<td>21,520</td>
<td>256,064</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>248,032</td>
<td>52,695</td>
<td>372,727</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>166,449</td>
<td>194,397</td>
<td>420,846</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total Country Activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>676,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>540,130</strong></td>
<td><strong>356,323</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,572,773</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>904,837</td>
<td>1,102,194</td>
<td>872,254</td>
<td>2,879,286</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The figures are all rounded to the nearest dollar value
† Includes USD 403,670 actual disbursed and USD 468,584 amount committed for work in progress, but not disbursed
Source: PARM Annual Report 2015; and PARM Budget Bulletin – Table 1

As of June 2016, PARM has utilized 39.5 percent of the total eligible funds⁶⁵ (USD 7,297,250) – disbursed (33%) and committed for work-in-progress (6.5%). With the momentum gained and with activities being planned and carried out simultaneously in all nine countries, PARM is likely to utilize the funds by 2018. With technical expertise and knowledge management at the core of PARM in addition to the overall coordination efforts, about 50 percent of the costs, as of date, were pertaining to human resources (40.2%) and consultants (10.9%).

As per the PARM Long-Term Plan and Budget 2014-2018, 32.8 percent of the total four-year budget (of PARM) was planned for PARM coordination and 62.7 percent for country activities.⁶⁶ The balance 4.5 percent was for contingency. As of June 2016, PARM has spent about USD 2.9 million (including commitments for work-in-progress) of which 45.4 percent is for coordination (12% higher than the planned proportion of the overall budget) and 54.6 percent for country

⁶⁵ Out of the total funds of USD 7,775,000, 7% IFAD management fee has been deducted
⁶⁶ PARM Long-Term Plan and Budget 2014-2018 (USD)
activities (eight percent lower than the planned proportion of the overall budget). PARM has not used any of the amount budgeted for contingency.

The evaluation noted, from the review of documents, that USD 451,300 was the planned cost per country to complete country activities; this included, five missions to the country (including stakeholder workshops), one risk assessment study, three feasibility studies, two capacity building activities, and a monitoring and evaluation study). With activities still ongoing, the evaluation was not able to get the exact expenditure for each country to make comparisons of what has been spent to accomplish (progress) in terms of country activities vis-à-vis the budgeted amount. The various activities completed in the countries (does not include missions) are presented (refer Box) earlier in the report.

PARM has been efficient in combining missions along with country events and also by organizing back to back events/missions in two or more countries so that it could be covered in one round trip. The planning, timing, and organizing of trip are complex due to the readiness of the country, and availability of multiple stakeholders.

**Partnering with National Institutions/Organizations for Capacity Building on ARM**

While PARM’s intention is to ensure capacity building and making available ARM tools for farmers, PARM should not plan to carry out capacity building workshops/seminars directly (by itself) at sub-national level, as it would not be feasible option to organize and conduct within and through its own limited resources, in nine countries. There has been an instance of PARM carrying out training for farmers on the ground in Uganda, which should be seen as a pilot. PARM should focus and support the development of capacity development modules and tools in ARM in collaboration with MOA and local institutions - examples noted include Makerere University in Uganda, AGRHYMET in Niger or UGB in Senegal, with whom, PARM is in discussion with currently. The implementation of capacity building should be through the extension system in the country (preferably) and/or through the local institutions that developed the modules or farmers organization. This will be a more efficient, cost-effective and appropriate to the context. Identifying the right partner institution and facilitating the capacity building would be the key essence to PARM’s success, in this regard.

### 4.4 Sustainability

By design, PARM is focused on capacity building, partnerships, and integration into national policies and strategies. In doing so, it is expected that the institutional, technical, and financial sustainability are increased; nevertheless, the realities may differ. Although it is too early in PARM’s life to assess sustainability, it is an appropriate time to examine to ensure that necessary steps are put in place before the end of 2018.

The holistic perspective that PARM brought into the concept of ARM will continue (even after PARM). It is just a start. With only two years since the start of PARM, it has begun to create the
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paradigm shift to look at ARM holistically (or in a more integrated manner). FARMD is the only other initiative with a similar perspective. This will take longer time, given the fact that FARMD has been operational since 2009.

In terms capacities built, it should be noted that while individuals who attended meetings, workshops, and seminars of PARM have increased awareness and/or developed capacities on ARM; it is too early to expect that knowledge and capacities have been transferred to others or institutionalized in their respective organizations. It is also likely, as noted during a discussion with a stakeholder, that attending PARM event(s) could be “conceptually stimulating” but does not go beyond the person to be institutionalized into programming or investment in the organization. Institutionalization is very critical for long-term sustainability and impact.

In this regard, integration of ARM into national policies, strategies, and investment plan is critical for sustainability. With only two out of nine countries that have ARM integrated into national sector plan and investment plan, it is not explicitly evident how PARM will ensure the sustainability of ARM in other countries, especially in attracting investment (when it is not integrated into national policies and strategies) from the government and other investors (including development partners and the private sector). Investment is critical for investment and impact. Even, in Uganda where ARM has been integrated, investment is a requirement for the “implementation” stage of the PARM process to ensure there is an impact. Stakeholders in Uganda pointed out that only about 30 percent of the planned investment budget was made available for the previous plan. This also highlights the fact that investment from development partners is crucial for successful implementation of NAIP.

One key area for improvement is to leverage the good relationship and support at the corporate level (SC/AC) to country level. This will greatly help in promoting and sustaining PARM/ARM in the country, both in the short-term and in the long-term (even if PARM ends). This should be ideally carried out in two ways – a) the SC/AC members should advocate for PARM through their internal communications in their respective organizations (in countries where PARM is working or plans to launch); and, b) PARM Secretariat should specifically focus to meet and have discussion with relevant programme and country officials in the respective country offices, as part of the each mission (especially with the country offices of SC members). This can improve in-country connections, “visibility” and “voice” for PARM. It also helps PARM to get a better picture of the country and sector dynamics from a different “lens”, so it can plan its activities and meetings accordingly. This will also facilitate and improve the likelihood of mainstreaming ARM into the country programming of development partners (starting with country offices of SC/AC members) which contributes to the Government's national plan/strategy.

Involvement of one of the SC or AC members’ country office to act as “voice” for PARM in the country will give a boost for PARM/ARM in the country, in terms of “visibility” and being on the agenda. This could be IFAD, EU or FAO country offices. This would facilitate keeping the PARM/ARM agenda during meetings in the country. The country offices are not taking any additional burden of oversight or carrying out PARM activities, but keeping the PARM in the picture. This will in many ways help to address the situation of lack of “visibility” and also provide continuity in the country.
Integration into the Country Structures

There are two aspects that PARM needs to look into in terms of integration into structures, which are important for sustainability: one is the integration of ARM into MOA structures and the other is being present in country “sector structures”

Although PARM has attempted to create “country steering committees” with mixed results (discussed earlier), PARM should ensure how national stakeholders (specifically within the Ministry of Agriculture) can be involved on a regular basis in planning, implementation of studies and events, without slowing the process and transferring funds to organize events. It is a lesson to be considered in countries, to increase engagement of national partners beyond sending meeting invites and chairing the meetings. It is important that this coordination mechanism is started early in the PARM process, as this takes a longer time (to make it a practice). This could start with PARM focal person and CAADP person and subsequently, evolve into including persons from other relevant Directorates/Departments within the ministry (e.g. Crop or Extension). This will also facilitate meetings on ARM/PARM within the ministry and in the country when PARM staff and/or consultant are not on a mission in the country. It also creates ownership and enables sustainability, in addition to better impact. Involving other ministries will take a much longer time; however, consideration to involving Ministry of Finance will help sustainability, especially in terms of budget and investments.

Each country has a unique country “sector structure/mechanism” where the government and all other actors (including development partners and private sector) meet and have discussions (e.g. Agricultural Sector Working Group). These are usually chaired or led by the government. Within this main structure, there are sub-groups (task-forces or technical committees, etc.). In some countries, the development partners meet separately (e.g. development partners’ working group) in addition to the main structure/mechanism. It is important, that PARM during its time in the country as part of the process should ensure that ARM becomes a discussion point in these forums to ensure sustainability and investment for impact.

Possible Long-term Scenario for PARM

The scale and continuity of PARM operations and the Secretariat in the long-term will depend on subsequent contributions from development partners. Alternatively, if no funding is available, likely scenario could be to integrate PARM into IFAD. Another scenario that could be explored would be that it is jointly managed/hosted by FAO and IFAD. It would not only provide continuity but also likely to ensure that there is ready demand and immediate uptake for PARM products and tools at least within these organizations. This may possibly facilitate institutionalized investment for PARM tools.

For the long-term sustainability and impact, IFAD should reflect about which unit should host and also if the PARM Secretariat should administratively report to a Director in IFAD if it grows beyond rural finance unit.
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Reporting to a Director would raise awareness of PARM within IFAD and how it complements IFAD’s overall mandate in internal high-level meetings. This could possibly facilitate mainstreaming of ARM/PARM into IFAD programming especially in countries globally, beyond PARM countries in Africa. This does not mean that in the current arrangement it is not being promoted within IFAD, but a point for consideration to further raise the profile of PARM, keeping mind long-term impact and sustainability.

4.5 Impact

It is too early to talk about impact, at the time of the mid-term evaluation, of an initiative of this nature (which is process-oriented), especially when the country process is still ongoing in all the nine countries, in varying degrees.

Even in Uganda where PARM has had a strong start, it is a long road ahead to see the impact of ARM integration. Among other aspects discussed in sustainability earlier, the key aspect that is required for PARM to have an impact is the uptake of PARM tools attracting investments. It is not clear yet, how PARM will ensure this, as the country process, ends at stage-4 before implementation (stage-5), as PARM is not envisaged to implement.

Although the focus of KfW funding to NEPAD is on infrastructure projects, PARM and NEPAD should make efforts to leverage the funds (where feasible and relevant) to facilitate implementing pilot projects emerging out of PARM process and studies – for example it could be small infrastructure projects on information technology or projects pertaining to reduction of agricultural losses, among others. This will help in showcasing the importance and impact of PARM tools. This will be vital for PARM.

Some aspects of how PARM should take up activities to attract interests of development partners at the country level has been discussed earlier. This includes being present in country sector structures and mechanisms and getting the SC/AC members’ country offices involved in the country process right from the launch, among other. These efforts are likely to increase the possibility of mainstreaming into agricultural programming in the country and also in the respective 5-year country strategies of development partners.

The casual logic of PARM process indicates that PARM’s work will lead to the integration of ARM and ARM tools into national policies and private sector activities. While this is important to have an impact, it is not evident how this will be accomplished when PARM enters a country in the middle of the plan (e.g. in this case in between 2016 and 2020, when the plan is already prepared). It is important that PARM along with NEPAD have a clear strategy for each of the seven countries, where it is not likely to be integrated, to have better and sustainable impact.

The ultimate success and value addition of PARM will be based on how the studies and assessments, capacity development, and knowledge management activities have translated into uptake and/or integration of PARM/ARM tools and products into investments.
5 Conclusions

PARM is highly relevant at various levels – global, regional, country and at the farmer levels. In addition to PARM being an outcome of G8/G20 discussions, it is co-financed by multiple development partners. Additionally, PARM is aligned with various global frameworks and agendas, including SDGs and its “zero hunger” goal. Among other regional strategies, PARM contributes to CAADP process. At the country level, it works with the Government and Ministry of Agriculture to integrate ARM into national policies and investment plans. While PARM has been able to meet the demand for ARM support from the Government, successfully, it is too early to expect PARM to meet the demand for ARM support from smallholders (at the time of mid-term evaluation).

PARM has been effective in terms of its progress towards achievement of stated results. At the time of this mid-term evaluation, PARM was carrying out activities simultaneously in nine countries in sub-Saharan Africa. PARM has been effective in facilitating the integration of ARM into the national strategies and investment plans. ARM has been integrated into national sector investment plans in Uganda and Niger (two out of nine countries). With country planning cycles aligned to CAADP process, PARM will have to explore along with NEPAD as to how ARM can be integrated into other seven countries.

PARM has completed RAS in six out of nine countries. While only one RAS (Uganda) has been published at the time of the mid-term evaluation; others are in various stages of being finalized. Validation workshops have been completed in five countries (Uganda, Ethiopia, Niger, Senegal, Cabo Verde and Cameroon). Risks have been prioritized in four countries (Ethiopia, Niger, Senegal, and Uganda); with Cabo Verde and Cameroon report being finalized, PARM will achieve its target of six countries by 2016 (with risks prioritized). PARM has undertaken two multi-country studies to development ARM tools – Warehouse Receipts System and ARM Information System; however, the only feasibility study that has been completed in the countries is in Uganda on risks of crop pest and diseases. Discussions are in progress on to conduct feasibility studies as the RAS reports are being finalized.

PARM has increased awareness and capacities of national stakeholders (more than 600) on ARM through successive and successful events organized in various countries. Stakeholders reached included policy makers, technical staff of MOA, research institutions, development partners, insurance companies and farmers. This has contributed to moving the discussions from “production” to “productivity” and bringing a holistic perspective to ARM. Nevertheless, it is too early to expect these individual capacities being transferred or institutionalized in their respective organizations. PARM’s effort to integrate ARM into extension service is a positive step in meeting the demand for ARM tools and capacity development at the farmer level (e.g. Uganda and Ethiopia).
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At the country level, the partnership MOA or its specialized agency has worked well, but other partnerships are still a work in progress and are at various stages in different countries. Partnership with development partners and the private sector in the country is an important area to be improved for PARM. PARM also needs to strive to be part of country “sector mechanisms” where all investors come together.

PARM has been involved CAADP events and other regional events in Africa and has jointly organized events with FAO, IFAD, and FARM-D, in terms knowledge sharing. However, there is scope to be strategically involved in various regional events to share knowledge and raise the profile of PARM. As a facilitator and knowledge broker, PARM should ensure linkages with various initiatives and platforms that address components of ARM.

PARM has an efficient and effective governance and management structure. Despite the delay in setting up the PARM Secretariat, PARM has gained momentum in the last year and a half. PARM has spent only about 40 percent of its overall budget and is on track to spend all the rest of the budget within the time frame with activities being carried out in nine countries. About 50 percent of the costs are pertaining to human resources including consultants and about 45 percent of the costs are pertaining to overall coordination and the rest for country activities. There is scope to manage the country process time more efficiently and effectively to sustain the interests of national stakeholders.

Sustainability of PARM is mixed. The holistic perspective introduced by PARM and the individual capacities developed will continue. The knowledge products created by PARM will be referred to in the future. However, the integration of ARM into national policies and attracting investment to use the ARM tools is critical for long-term sustainability and impact. Sustainability of PARM itself depends on development partner finance. One option to ensure continuity of PARM is to integrate it into IFAD or other development banks.

In terms of business model, PARM should remain a facilitator, in general, providing public goods and being a knowledge broker. PARM could look at evolving into a “CGAP” of ARM. While continuing the policy process approach to integrate ARM into national policies and strategies, PARM should also endure to evolve and consolidate itself as an evidenced-based advocacy and knowledge management platform on ARM.

ARM is a critical and important aspect that has been neglected and not been looked at holistically, so far, even though government and development partners have been supporting farmers. The continuation of PARM Secretariat as a knowledge management platform and knowledge broker is crucial to continue the paradigm shift of thinking holistically about ARM. Hence it is important that PARM should not come to an end, after “opening the eyes” and starting the paradigm shift. The business operations model that PARM should evolve into in the next two years should take into consideration a combination of some or all of the aspects mentioned in the recommendations, in order to ensure continuity and have a larger impact.

The ultimate success and value addition of PARM will be based on how the studies and assessments, capacity development, and knowledge management activities have translated into uptake and/or integration of PARM/ARM tools and products into investments.
6 Recommendations

The recommendations are provided keeping in mind both short/mid-term and long-term aspects of PARM. It has also taken into consideration aspects that PARM should take into account – a) from the perspective of carrying out its country process efficiently and effectively; and, b) from the perspective of how the implementation (stage 5) will be carried out to ensure an impact. The recommendations are inter-connected in many ways and address areas to make PARM more effective.

b) Leveraging country offices (of SC members) support/partnership during and after the country process. Both the SC and PARM Secretariat should strive to achieve this through messaging at a corporate level and PARM staff meeting with country offices with country representatives and relevant programme managers. This is important from two aspects:

- One of the country offices (of SC members) could act as the “voice” for PARM in the country. This does not mean staff paid by PARM or additional responsibility for the country office. The person from the country office (IFAD or one of the SC members) can bring the topic of ARM/PARM in appropriate forums in the country. It provides credibility and sustained interest by keeping ARM/PARM on the agenda in the country. This way PARM/ARM will be discussed in donor forums and sector working group meetings among others, even when PARM staff are not on a mission.

- It also means that PARM/ARM will be on the agenda of country offices (of SC members) and thereby considered during their country planning cycles and hence the likely integration of ARM for investment.

- PARM should also consider involving one of the country offices of SC members’ to co-chair PARM events in the country, along with its national partners – MOA or the specialized agency.

c) PARM should plan to be present in the country “sector structures” in the country (e.g. donor working groups, sector working group). This is crucial to gain visibility. This is an important aspect that needs to be addressed early in the country process and should continue throughout the country process. It also adds credibility which is required to get investment and integration of ARM into development partner programmes, the private sector, and other investors. Being present in the “sector structures” also gives the opportunity to present PARM’s work, exclusively for them and discuss their interests.

- This will lead to better connections and “visibility/awareness with development partners and other investors who are key actors to invest and implement.
d) Creating “informal” coordination mechanism in the country along with PARM focal person within the ministry of agriculture or across ministries would help institutionalization and ownership right from the beginning. PARM should involve both the PARM and CAADP focal persons together during planning/discussions at MOA and ensure that there is a mechanism for them to have regular discussions on ARM. This also helps to move away from a single-person dependency. This should start early in the process and building capacity to coordinate is also crucial.

e) Ensure private sector involvement and facilitate investment. Leveraging the expertise and experience AC members, to start with to understand how to get private sector interested in PARM’s work at the country level. The private sector plays a big role in the agriculture sector, in the entire value chain - input companies, processors, aggregators, traders, packaging, warehousing, distribution to markets (internal and international), among others.

   o Partnering with the private sector could help in leveraging resources and expertise at the country level from an industry and commercial perspective. PARM should identify and appropriate private sector firms to partner with depending on the risks prioritized for a country.

f) Partnering with local universities and national/regional institutions is important to leverage and bring ARM knowledge and capacity from policy level to farmer level at the grassroots. This will be in addition to work through extension services through the ministries of agriculture, as appropriate. Cementing the discussions already started (with Makerere University in Uganda, AGRHYMET in Niger and UGB in Senegal) into partnerships will help PARM’s work and effectiveness in the respective countries. Similarly, PARM should identify capacity building partners in other countries.

g) PARM should create and strengthen synergies and collaborations with other relevant knowledge platforms/initiatives and establish links. This will increase visibility and create awareness about PARM products and portfolio of services. It will also position PARM as a knowledge broker on ARM and will also leverage PARM’s effort to become a Global Platform.

   o Work with partners and other relevant organizations to have links to PARM website. The SC and AC partners can provide a page or blurb with a link to PARM website. It creates access to PARM library to wider audience;

   o PARM should connect with initiative and platforms, even if they address only components of ARM. They add value and bring synergies under PARM, as a knowledge broker and platform on ARM.

   o In addition to highlighting PARM’s effort and ARM uptake in G20 discussions, facilitate global level discussions and/or bilateral consultations on ARM to ensure that it is
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getting integrated into agricultural sector programmes of bilateral and multilateral development partners and global foundations.

h) In countries where PARM has not been able to integrate ARM into NAIP (due to entering a country after the plan has been finalized), **PARM should have a concrete steps defined for course of action to ensure that ARM is integrated into subsequent plan** and/or how it can fit into national annual budget in the current plan, even if it is addressing only components of ARM. NEPAD/CAADP’s support and advocacy is very vital in this regard.

i) PARM should **improve its country process** which can improve perceptions on time lag between activities, in addition to improving overall efficiency, and reduced time frame in a country.

   - With a time gap of 12 months between launch and RAS validation workshop, where feasible, PARM should organize a capacity development or ARM awareness creation **workshop/seminar in the first twelve months**; this will help PARM having an activity (in addition to missions undertaken) to stay connected with national stakeholders and sustain their interests.

   - Furthermore, PARM should continue to ensure **conducting feasibility studies simultaneously** or with a staggered start, instead of completing one before starting another.\(^\text{72}\) This will help national stakeholders to stay involved continuously with regular outputs.

j) **In the long-term, PARM can be mainstreamed or “integrated” into IFAD** (since it was the organization of choice to host PARM) or another multilateral institution such as FAO.\(^\text{73}\) This would mean that there is a ready uptake of PARM products into programming and its investment in the countries, at the same time provide continuity as ARM proponent. There have been examples of integration of “hosted facilities” being integrated into IFAD, and still continuing.\(^\text{74}\)
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\(^{73}\) In the event of no further funding from resource partners

\(^{74}\) For example Weather Risk Management Facility (WRMF) in IFAD
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alessandro Marini</td>
<td>Country Representative, IFAD Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Ogang</td>
<td>President of Uganda National Farmers Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avu Elly Biliku</td>
<td>Principal Economist, Ministry of Finance, Planning, and Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Oryokot</td>
<td>Senior Agriculture Specialist, World Bank Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damalie Lubwama</td>
<td>Production and Market Information Manager, Cotton Development Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Institution/position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Fowler</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Livelihoods Advisor, USAID Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon Badagawa</td>
<td>Executive Director, Private Sector Foundation, Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sembambo Muhammed</td>
<td>Senior Climate Change Officer, Ministry of Water and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephat Byaruhanga</td>
<td>Senior Policy Officer – Agriculture and Agribusiness, Embassy of Kingdom of Netherlands, Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddharth Krishnaswamy</td>
<td>Head of Analysis, Monitoring &amp; Evaluation (AME), WFP Uganda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Niger (September 19-23, 2016)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HC3N</th>
<th>• Adamou Danguoua, DPEP &amp; Point focal/PARM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Arimi Mahamado, DSEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Matthias Benzhaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECA</td>
<td>• Delmas Philippe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aissa Kimba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>• Hama Ibrahim, Project Coordinator – Agricultural Risk and Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREN</td>
<td>• Abdou Amadou, Head of Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICCT/Cab/PM</td>
<td>• Ag Arya Moussa, Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU – Rural Development, Food Security and Decentralization Section</td>
<td>• Nicoletta Avella, Head of Programmes – Rural Development and Food Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assoumane Oumarou, National Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss Development Cooperation</td>
<td>• Boureima Adamou, Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECOR/CNRA</td>
<td>• Abdou Affanu. Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARM (étude)</td>
<td>• Abdoukader AFANE, Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>• Ba Amadou, Team Leader – Agricultural Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEDD</td>
<td>• Kamaye Maazou, Executive Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ/PromAP</td>
<td>• Thuweba Diwani, Manager Economic Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Raymond Mehou, Manager Farmer Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC3N</td>
<td>• Matthias Benzhaf, Technical Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRHYMET</td>
<td>• Atta Sanoussi, Head of Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Etienne Sarr, Training Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Directorate of Rural Engineering, DGGR/MAGEL</td>
<td>• Chaibou Amadou, Director - Planning of Land and Irrigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Directorate for Plant Protection (DGPV)</td>
<td>• Sani Mamane Moudi, Director General – Plant Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC3N</td>
<td>• Mahaman Sani Abdou, Secretary General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ibrahim Lemane (DSEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Saley Mahamadou (DMRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aboubacar Mahamadou (ATN/Nutrition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Banzhaf Matthias (AT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Diakite Mado (AT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAM (by Skype)</td>
<td>• Jerome Costa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank – FARM-D</td>
<td>• Vikas Choudhry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAAIF has four directorates – Crop Directorate, Animal Directorate, Fisheries Directorate and the newly created Extension Directorate. Each Directorate has three departments and under each department, there are many divisions. Each Directorate is headed by a Director. In addition to this, there are three stand-alone Departments including Planning and Development and, Administration and Finance Department. These stand-alone Departments, that support all four Directorates, are headed by a Commissioner. The Planning and Development Department has four divisions, each headed by an Assistant Commissioner; these include Statistics Division; Planning Division; M&E Division; and, Policy Analysis Division. While ARM was introduced into Statistics Division after the draft ASSP, so that there is a “home” for ARM in the MAAIF structure, the PARM focal person and CAADP focal person (who were already nominated by MAAIF) are in the Planning Division. The Figure above indicates where the PARM and CAADP focal persons are in the MAAIF structure and why integration and mainstreaming into the MAAIF structure is critical for a greater PARM impact and ARM sustainability in Uganda. ARM having a “home” in Statistics Division,\(^75\) is a positive sign of commitment from the Government. Understanding where PARM/ARM is in a structure in terms of decision-making and influence within MOA is important.

\(^75\) The Division is headed by Assistant Commissioner. This will also help PARM to get into higher level of discussions in the MAAIF structure.
The Rural Economic Development and Food Security (RED&FS) Sector Working Group

The Rural Economic Development and Food Security (RED&FS) Sector Working Group was established in 2008 to provide a platform for the Government of Ethiopia (GoE), represented by the then Ministry of Agriculture with its major multi and bi-lateral development partners (DPs). The RED&FS is governed by an Executive Committee (EX-COM) composed of the State Ministers and Heads of development partners. The EX-COM is Chaired by the two Ministers (Agriculture and Livestock) and co-Chaired by two development partners on a rotation basis - at the time of this report, the World Bank and the EU were the co-Chairs.

At the time of establishment, the RED&FS mirrored the institutional structure of the then Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MOARD) and consisted of three Technical Committees (TC) corresponding to the three State Ministries: Agricultural Growth, Sustainable Land Management, and Disaster Risk Management (DRM) and Food Security (FS). Following the Government restructuring in Fall 2015, the Ministry was split into two – Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources (MOANR) and Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries (MOLF). After a series of discussion within the EX-COM, it has been agreed that the RED&FS be expanded to include two technical committees from the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries.

Furthermore, the restructuring led to the separation of DRM from Food security. The former renamed as National DRM Coordination Commission is currently situated under the Prime Minister's Office. The latter placed under a new State Ministry for Rural Job Opportunities Creation and Food Security. Accordingly, the RED&FS now has five technical committees. Each TC has a number of taskforces (see Figure below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RED&amp;FS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Growth Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Land Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Production Technical Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Health and Regulatory Technical Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Job Creation and Food Security Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each Technical Committee (TC) is chaired by the relevant State Minister and co-Chaired by two DPs on a rotation basis. Members are directors (from the ministries) responsible for implementing the major projects in the sectors also known as flagship projects (e.g. AGP, PSNP, and SLMP) and development partners supporting same. For example, the Agriculture Growth TC is co-Chaired by Canada and Italy.

Each Technical Committee has special interest Taskforces (TF). The membership is open to development partners, NGOs and the private sector. Each TF is chaired by a government department or agency on a permanent basis and development partners on a rotation basis. For example, the Private Sector Development Taskforce is situated within the Agriculture Growth TC and presently chaired by ATA and co-Chaired by USAID.
## Annex D – PARM Logical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Sources and Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td><strong>Sustainable agricultural growth in beneficiary LDCs, LMICs improving resilience to climate and market shocks, in particular for small farmers</strong></td>
<td>Increase % of food security indicators and status through the investments in the agriculture sector in the LDCs, LMICs, and RECs/AU1. % of targeted farmers have access to the prioritized ARM tools and techniques that improve their resilience</td>
<td>Investments and initiatives on ARM with special focus on long-term results: policy and private sector ARM initiatives underway</td>
<td>National statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Objectives</td>
<td><strong>Agricultural risk management (ARM) is an institutionalized component of agricultural policy in beneficiary LDCs, LMICs to move away from a culture of coping with disasters towards a smart management of risks</strong></td>
<td>Integration of at least two ARM tools into the national policy and/or private sector activities initiated in at least 6 of the targeted LDCs and LMICs</td>
<td>Mid-term and Final evaluation of PARM process by an external evaluator in the selected countries. Information to be provided by the Government, private sector, and farmers organizations</td>
<td>Political decision and readiness in LDCs and LMICs to integrate and prioritize ARM in national policies and investment plans. Strong commitment to the contribution of ARM to sustainable agricultural sector by Governments of participating LDCs and LMICs and strategic partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results and Activities</td>
<td><strong>R1 - Demand for qualified ARM support from Governments and smallholders satisfied</strong></td>
<td>1.1 National strategies to integrate ARM identified by local Governments during PARM inception phase in at least six countries 1.2 Major agricultural risks (AR) identified and prioritized through risk assessment studies in at least six countries by 2016 1.3 Two potential ARM tools assessed through feasibility studies (including Information data systems) in each targeted country by the end of</td>
<td>Country road maps PARM annual report and monitoring reports Reports (studies) published on PARM website and/or available at regional/country level M&amp;E/Survey reports by</td>
<td>Beneficiary LDCs and LMICs Commitment Social and political stability during PARM process implementation Information and data available at regional, national and community level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention Logic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sources and Means of Verification</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assumptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| the study results and AR prioritization  
- Develop the ToRs and select the experts to carry out the evaluations and surveys of PARM process | PARM process  
1.4 The mid-term and final evaluation of PARM process undertaken in at least two countries | external evaluators  
Government and stakeholders websites and responses to surveys |  |
| **R2 - Enhanced national stakeholders' awareness and capacities to manage Agricultural Risks (AR)**  
Activities  
- Drafting a capacity development plan (modules/training/dissemination)  
- Developing two training modules: general risk assessment/management and for specific ARM Tools  
- Organizing the training sessions and select the experts on ARM (holistic concept and management tools)  
- Assessing the ARM related initiatives and existing platforms/coordination mechanisms | 2.1 ARM National Stakeholder committees to support and coordinate P-ARM initiatives are established and headed by Governments at the beginning of the process in at least six countries  
2.2 Capacity development plan developed during the PARM inception phase in at least six countries and supervised by local Governments  
2.3 Roles and responsibilities to manage AR are known by national stakeholders at the end of PARM process in the selected countries | Country Capacity Development plan  
Training reports  
Contact list per country  
Government and stakeholders websites and responses to surveys | Availability of satisfactory services providers and experts  
National stakeholders interest and participation |
| **R3 - Improved generation, access and sharing of knowledge and learning on holistic ARM in LDCs, LMICs and interested RECs/AU**  
Activities  
- Identifying the national strategies and plans to integrate ARM  
- Developing a PARM KM plan and strategy  
- Organizing and attending events to mainstream the holistic P-ARM approach and sharing experiences | 3.1 Number of national and regional events to which PARM make an active contribution on mainstreaming ARM holistic approach (at least two per year)  
3.2 Official initiatives taken by Governments to sensitize and mainstream ARM concepts at national and regional level in at least six countries  
3.3 Number of ARM knowledge tools developed and available at national, regional and global level (at least 16 publications of studies and/or related ARM analysis..., PARM website regularly updated...) | Reports from event in national communication and information systems  
Official documents and/or communications provided by local Governments.  
KM strategy, plan tools and publications | Coordination among actors active on ARM at national, regional and global level  
Alignment of ARM tools with national policy and plans prioritized by Governments |
## Annex E – Selected Initiatives and Platforms of Relevance to PARM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives and Platforms</th>
<th>Key Contributing Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Consultative Group to Assist the Poor (CGAP)</td>
<td>34 organizations (bilaterals, multi-laterals, and foundations among others) including European Commission, AFD, IFAD, KfW, and Italy. Housed in World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://www.cgap.org">https://www.cgap.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farm Risk Management for Africa (FARMAF)</td>
<td>Funded by EU and AGRINATURA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rural Finance and Investment Learning Centre (RFILC)</td>
<td>Funded by IFAD, FAO, GIZ/BMZ&lt; UNCDF and the World Bank and managed by FAO (CABFIN Partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity4Dev (European Commissions’ online knowledge sharing platform)</td>
<td>Funded by European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/content/about-us">http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/content/about-us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance for Resilience (AGIR)</td>
<td>An initiative of EU, ECOWAS, UEMOA and CILSS, under the leadership of latter three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://www.oecd.org/site/rpca/agir/">https://www.oecd.org/site/rpca/agir/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Index Insurance Facility (GIIF)</td>
<td>Funded by European Union, Japan, and the Netherlands and managed by the World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://www.indexinsuranceforum.org/">https://www.indexinsuranceforum.org/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Market Information System (AMIS)</td>
<td>Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Japan, France, The World Bank, FAO, IFAD, and OECD, among others. Hosted by FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA)</td>
<td>AfDB, Canada, DANIDA, DFID, EC, The World Bank, USAID, NORAD and Syngenta, among others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://faraafrica.org/">http://faraafrica.org/</a></td>
<td>Partner include IFAD, FAO, Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (CTA), Desjardins Development International (DID) MFW4A, AFD, AGRA and African Institute for Remittances (AIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Rural and Agricultural Credit Association (AFRACA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://afraca.org/about/">http://afraca.org/about/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Risk Early Warning Systems (CREWS)</td>
<td>France, Norway, the World Bank, UNISDR, WMO. Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction (GFDRR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfDB</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>African Risk Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARM</td>
<td>Agricultural Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATA</td>
<td>Agricultural Transformation Agency, Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMZ</td>
<td>The Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAADP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme</td>
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<td>COMESA</td>
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<td>Government of Italy</td>
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<td>Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC3N</td>
<td>Haut-Commissariat à la mise en œuvre de l’Initiative 3N « les Nigériens Nourrissent les Nigériens », Niger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGAD</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Authority on Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFPRI</td>
<td>International Food Policy Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILRI</td>
<td>International Livestock Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KfW</td>
<td>KfW Development Bank, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM</td>
<td>Knowledge Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDC</td>
<td>Least Developed Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIC</td>
<td>Low Income Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAIF</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOA</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOANR</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD</td>
<td>The New Partnership for Africa’s Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARM</td>
<td>Platform for Agriculture Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS</td>
<td>Risk Assessment Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Regional Economic Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED&amp;FS</td>
<td>Rural Economic Development and Food Security, Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>PARM Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGB</td>
<td>University of Gaston Berger, Senegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNECA</td>
<td>United Nations Economic Commission for Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

Introduction
The Platform for Agricultural Risk Management (PARM), a G8-G20 initiative hosted by International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), is a multi-donor partnership co-financed by the European Commission (EC), Agence Française de Développement (AFD), the Government of Italy (DGCS), and IFAD to support government and stakeholders on Agricultural Risk Management (ARM). PARM works in strategic partnership with the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD). Since its launch in December 2013, PARM has made progress and is in various stages in nine countries in sub-Saharan Africa.

Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation
As envisaged in the monitoring plan the mid-term evaluation was undertaken with a purpose to provide the PARM Secretariat, the Steering Committee (SC) and the development partners an assessment of the strengths and weakness of PARM processes – including the methodology and its application at overall coordination and at country levels. The main objective of the evaluation was to provide an independent external view of the overall PARM process, achievements in the selected countries (Ethiopia, Niger and Uganda), and the performance of the overall coordination mechanisms (from launch until August 2016). This is the summary of findings for the overall coordination.

Context
In the past decade, several institutions have placed significant emphasis on ARM. A number of development partners also have set-up initiatives/structures dedicated to specific components of ARM. In this context, the meeting of the G20 Ministers for Agriculture in Paris on June 2011 identified improvement and development of risk management tools for governments, and farmers as a major priority area of support building capacity to mitigate and manage associated with food price volatility, especially in Africa. At the same time, African Union’s (AU) NEPAD which has shown a strong focus on agricultural development through its Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) took the initiative and encouraged African countries to integrate risk assessment and management strategies into their agricultural development programmes covering agriculture, livestock and fisheries, and CAADP investment plans. Hence there was a need for a holistic risk management approach which focuses on the interactions among various types of risks, complementarities between on-farm based strategies and commercial risk management services and the impact of various government policies on risk management.

---

1 In 2016, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany (BMZ) and KfW Development Bank joined the Steering Committee of PARM and provided USD 5 million to NEPAD to build capacity and to carry-out project emerging from PARM activities
2 The need to integrate a risk management strategy in national investment plans was acknowledged by the Government representatives participating in a NEPAD workshop in Johannesburg on May 16-18, 2012.
**Approach and Methodology**

The evaluation used a collaborative and participatory approach. The evaluation approach was process-oriented with a view to improving efficiency and effectiveness of PARM to have a better impact. Key methods used during the evaluation included key informant interview, review of documents and semi-structured observations. Country missions to Ethiopia, Niger, and Uganda were undertaken during September 5-23, 2016. As part of the evaluation diverse stakeholders (117), including SC/Advisory Committee (AC) members, PARM Secretariat, government officials, development partners, insurance companies, research institutions and non-profit organizations were interviewed. Furthermore, the evaluation also reviewed both relevant corporate documents and country documents of PARM, in addition to national documents and relevant literature.

**Key Findings and Conclusions**

PARM is the only initiative/platform, alternative to FARMD with a holistic approach to ARM. With a dedicated small core team at the PARM Secretariat and an engaged Steering Committee, PARM has done well in overall coordination within a short period of two years, since the establishment of the PARM Secretariat. Having NEPAD as a strategic partner has helped in making connections in the country and get the government interested. **Overall, the relationship between SC, AC and the PARM Secretariat was found to work well with transparent discussions well documented.** Bilateral discussions with few AC members have helped PARM; nevertheless, overall there is scope to improve the involvement of AC members.

A key area for improvement for PARM is to leverage and translate the good corporate relationship (at SC and AC) to the country level – country offices. The country offices of the financing partners could also act as the “voice” for PARM in the country forums and discussions. This increases visibility and gives “continuity” to some extent between PARM events/missions.

At the country level, the partnership MOA or its specialized agency has worked well, but other partnerships are still a work in progress and are at various stages in different countries. Partnership with development partners and the private sector in the country is an important aspect for improvement for PARM. **PARM also needs to strive to be part of country “sector mechanisms” where all investors come together.**

The overall coordination has helped PARM to make progress and achieve results in the country. While PARM is very focused on completing the assessment and studies and carrying out, there is **scope to take up efforts of institutional arrangements and laying the foundation of “country coordination mechanism” early in the PARM process.** Involving national partners will help to create ownership and to mainstream/integrating ARM better in the country structures within MOA and the government structures. While the theory of change of PARM assumes that PARM activities will lead to ARM integration into NAIP, it is not evident from the process how ARM will be integrated into the subsequent plan; in countries where PARM has entered after the current plan has been finalized and is in the process of implementation.

PARM has been involved CAADP events and other regional events in Africa and has jointly organized events with FAO, IFAD, and FARMD, in terms knowledge sharing. However, **there is scope to be strategically involved in various regional events to share knowledge and raise**
the profile of PARM. As a facilitator and knowledge broker, PARM should ensure linkages with various initiatives that address components of ARM.

While context and challenges are unique to each country, PARM has been able to overcome and gain momentum and carry activities simultaneously in nine countries. Capacity building is integral to the country process, and knowledge management is linked to both country process and capacity building which generate the knowledge products. The interconnection among the three components is therefore very evident. Capacity development should be carried out through national institutions and organizations at sub-national levels to be more efficient and effective.

IFAD was seen as the ideal organization to host PARM. Integration of PARM knowledge products into IFAD and other SC development partners at the corporate level is an opportunity for PARM to leverage, to facilitate investment in ARM. PARM has a strong focus on completing the country process, knowledge management, and capacity development activities; it is not evident from the PARM process how the investment will be attracted for "implementation" (stage 5). KfW-NEPAD funding could help to start a few pilot projects emerging out of PARM activities.

ARM is a critical and important aspect that has been neglected and not been looked at holistically, so far, even though government and development partners have been supporting farmers. The continuation of PARM Secretariat as a knowledge management platform and knowledge broker is crucial to continue the paradigm shift of thinking holistically about ARM. PARM could look at evolving into a “CGAP” of ARM. Hence it is important that PARM should not come to an end, after “opening the eyes” and starting the paradigm shift. The business operations model that PARM should evolve into in the next two years should take into consideration a combination of some or all of the aspects mentioned in the recommendations, in order to ensure continuity and have a larger impact.

**Recommendations**

The recommendations are provided keeping in mind both short/mid-term and long-term aspects of PARM. It has also taken into consideration aspects that PARM should take into account – a) from the perspective of carrying out its country process; and, b) from the point of view of how to ensure the implementation (stage 5). The recommendations are inter-linked in many ways and address areas to make PARM more effective.

a) **Leveraging country offices (of SC members) support/partnership during and after the country process.** Both the SC and PARM Secretariat should strive to achieve this through messaging at a corporate level and PARM staff meeting with country offices with country representatives and relevant programme managers. This is important from two aspects:

  - One of the country offices (of SC members) could **act as the “voice” for PARM in the country.** This does not mean staff paid by PARM or additional responsibility for the country office. The person from the country office (IFAD or one of the SC members) can bring the topic of ARM/PARM in appropriate forums in the country. It provides credibility and sustained interest by keep ARM/PARM in the agenda in the country. This way
PARM/ARM will be discussed in donor forums and sector working group meetings among others, even when PARM staff are not on mission.

- It also means that PARM/ARM will be on the agenda of **country offices** (of SC members) and thereby considered during their country planning cycles and hence likely integration of ARM for investment.

- PARM should also consider involving one of the country offices of SC members’ to co-chair PARM events in the country, along with its national partners – MOA or the specialized agency

b) **PARM should plan to be present in the country “sector structures”** in the country (e.g. donor working groups, sector working group). This is crucial to gain visibility. This is an important aspect that needs to be addressed early in the country process and should continue throughout the country process. It also adds credibility which is required to get investment and integration of ARM into development partner programmes, private sector and other investors. Being present in the “sector structures” also gives opportunity to present PARM’s work, exclusively for them and discuss their interests.

- This will lead to **better connections and “visibility” with development partners** and other investors who are key actors to invest and implement.

c) Creating “informal” coordination mechanism in the country along with PARM focal person within the ministry of agriculture or across ministries would help institutionalization and ownership right from the beginning. PARM should involve both the PARM and CAADP focal persons together during planning/discussions at MOA and ensure that there is a mechanism for them to have regular discussions on ARM. This also helps to move away from a single-person dependency. This should **start early in the process** and building capacity to coordinate is also crucial.

d) **Ensure private sector involvement and facilitate investment.** Leveraging the expertise and experience AC members, to start with, to understand how to get private sector interested in PARM’s work at the country level. The private sector plays a significant role in the agriculture sector, in the entire value chain - input companies, processors, aggregators, traders, packaging, warehousing, distribution to markets (internal and international), among others.

- Partnering with the private sector could help in leveraging resources and expertise at the country level.

e) **Partnering with local universities and national/regional institutions** is important to leverage and bring ARM knowledge and capacity from policy level to farmer level at the grassroots. This will be in addition to work through extension services through the ministries of agriculture, as appropriate. Cementing the discussions already started (with Makarere University in Uganda, AGRHYMET in Niger and UGB in Senegal) into partnerships will help

---

3 Without necessitating financial requirements and naming it a Steering Committee
PARM’s work and effectiveness in the respective countries. Similarly, PARM should identify capacity building partners in other countries.

f) PARM should create and strengthen synergies and collaborations with other relevant knowledge platforms/initiatives and establish links. This will increase visibility and create awareness about PARM products and portfolio of services. It will also position PARM as a knowledge broker on ARM and will also leverage PARM’s effort to become a Global Platform.

- Work with partners and other relevant organizations to have links to PARM website. The SC and AC partners can provide a page or blurb with a link to PARM website. It creates access to PARM library to wider audience;

- PARM should connect with initiative and platforms, even if they address only components of ARM. They add value and bring synergies under PARM, as a knowledge broker and platform on ARM.

- In addition to highlighting PARM’s effort and ARM uptake in G20 discussions, facilitate global level discussions and/or bilateral consultations on ARM to ensure that it is getting integrated into agricultural sector programmes of bilateral and multilateral development partners and global foundations.

g) In countries where PARM has not been able to integrate ARM into NAIP (due to entering a country after the plan has been finalised), PARM along with NEPAD/CAADP should have a concrete steps defined for course of action to ensure that ARM is integrated into subsequent plan and/or how it can fit into national annual budget in the current plan, even if it is addressing only components of ARM.

h) Where applicable, if PARM continues to recruit part-time PARM liaison officers. However, they should not be at the junior level (event/logistics coordinator) and should be linked (attached) to IFAD or one of the development partner’s (of SC/AC) office, depending on who provides the “voice” (see earlier recommendation).

i) In the long-term, PARM can be mainstreamed or “integrated” into IFAD (since it was the organization of choice to host PARM) or another multilateral organization such as FAO. This would ensure a ready uptake of PARM products into programming and its investment in the countries. There have been examples of integration of “hosted facilities” being integrated into IFAD, and still continuing.
Introduction

Risk and uncertainty are inherent to agriculture. To some extent, government policies and interventions of development partners address risks in agriculture either implicitly or explicitly; nevertheless, these vary widely between countries. Lack of capacity, inadequate knowledge transfer among countries, and low uptake of innovation still remain as constraints in agricultural risk management.

The Platform on Agricultural Risk Management (PARM), an outcome of G8 and G20 discussions, was launched in December 2013 to support the development of a holistic approach to risk management in agriculture. PARM is a new partnership between development partners and developing countries to ensure risk management as an integral part of policy planning and implementation in the agricultural sector. PARM, a four-year multi-donor initiative, is co-financed by the European Commission (EC), Agence Française de Développement (AFD), the Government of Italy (DGCS), and IFAD, established with a budget of USD 7,775,000 (EUR 5,980,789). PARM is managed by the PARM Secretariat, hosted by IFAD. The PARM is governed by a Steering Committee (SC) and an Advisory Committee (AC), and managed by the Secretariat. PARM works in strategic partnership with The New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD).

As envisaged in the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan, approved by the fifth PARM Steering Committee in July 2015, this mid-term evaluation was undertaken.

Purpose and Objective of the Mid-term Evaluation

The overall purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to provide the PARM Secretariat, the Steering Committee, and the development partners an assessment of the strengths and weakness of PARM processes – including the methodology and its application at the overall coordination and at the country level. The findings of this evaluation are expected to contribute to improved efficiency of PARM and facilitate acceleration of the PARM process.

The main objective of the evaluation is to provide an independent external view of the overall PARM process, achievements in the three selected countries, and the performance of the coordination mechanisms since the launch until August 2016. This mid-term evaluation aims to:

a) Assess the performance of the overall PARM programme coordination; and,

b) Assess the country level activities, and provide suggestions for improvement.

As the part of the mid-term evaluation, in addition to assessing the progress and country process in three countries (Egypt, Niger, and Uganda), the evaluation also reviewed PARM’s overall coordination mechanism and structure with a specific focus on organization of the Secretariat

---

1 June 2011 - G20 meeting of Agriculture Ministers in Paris’ November 2011 - G20 leaders Cannes Declaration; May 2012 – G8 Factsheet on Action on Food Security; and June 2012 - G20 Los Cabos Declaration

5 In 2016, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany (BMZ) and KfW Development Bank joined the Steering Committee of PARM and provided USD 5 million to NEPAD to build capacity and to carry-out project emerging from PARM activities
(including country staff and network); the partnership and complementarities with existing (potentially new) strategic and implementing partners; and the knowledge management strategy and capacity development strategy at the global-regional and country levels. Furthermore, the evaluation also examined institutional arrangements and the governance structure of PARM, in the context of PARM being a G20, initiative.

This report specifically focuses on the assessment of the overall coordination of PARM.

### Context

The higher propensity of covariate risks\(^6\) in agriculture is a major reason that informal risk management arrangements break down and risk transfer products become expensive or unaffordable to many farmers in rural areas in developing and least developed countries. The most common risks in agriculture could be natural disasters, weather-related, biological and environmental, market-related, logistical and infrastructural, management and operations, public policy and institutional and/or political.\(^7\)

In the past decade, several institutions including the World Bank, the EU, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, (FAO), the World Food Programme (WFP), and IFAD have placed significant emphasis on Agricultural Risk Management (ARM). A number of development partners also have set up initiatives/structures dedicated to particular components of ARM.

The meeting of the G20 Ministers for Agriculture in Paris on June 2011 identified improvement and development of risk management tools for governments, and farmers as a major priority area of support building capacity to mitigate and manage associated with food price volatility, especially in Africa. At the same time, the African Union’s (AUs) NEPAD which has shown strong focus on agricultural development through its Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) took initiative and encouraged African countries to integrate risk assessment and management strategies into their agricultural development programmes covering agriculture, livestock and fisheries, and CAADP investment plans.\(^8\) Hence there was a need for a holistic risk management approach which focuses on the interactions among various types of risks, complementarities between on-farm based strategies and commercial risk management services and the impact of various government policies on risk management.

---

\(^6\) Covariate risks are those risks that affect many farmers simultaneously (e.g. floods, droughts, market prices, etc.)


\(^8\) The need to integrate a risk management strategy in national investment plans was acknowledged by the Government representatives participating in a NEPAD workshop in Johannesburg on May 16-18, 2012.
In this context, subsequent G8 and G20 discussions\(^9\) led to the creation of PARM, which was launched in December 2013 in IFAD, Rome. The NEPAD is an integral part of this initiative. PARM processes are aligned with the intervention strategy and approach of NEPAD – integration into the CAADP process and investment plans.\(^{10}\)

### Approach and Methodology

Overall, the evaluation used a collaborative and participatory approach. The evaluation approach was process-oriented with a view to improve efficiency and effectiveness of PARM to have better impact. Overall, the approach examined the strengths and weaknesses of PARM process in Uganda, in addition to assessing the country process with a view to making recommendation to facilitate acceleration of the PARM process in the country including partnership, coordination and integration of ARM into national strategies and investment plans. The approach looked at the PARM process at country level separately for each phase – a) the first phase from setting-up to risk assessment; and, b) the second phase including tools assessment, follow-up and implementation.

Key questions addressed as part of this mid-term evaluation on overall coordination and at the institutional level, included:

1. How does PARM’s institutional and governance structure facilitate overall coordination at the global-regional level and at country level? What are the strengths and weaknesses? How has it performed in its overall coordination?
2. How effective is the relationship between the Secretariat, Steering Committee and Advisory Committee? What has worked well? What can be improved?
3. What are the pros and cons of the PARM Secretariat being hosted by IFAD (in the context of PARM being a G20 initiative)?
4. To what extent have the partnerships at various levels been effective? How can they be improved? What complementarities can be leveraged with existing and potential strategic/implementing partners?
5. To what extent has PARM been effective in its knowledge management – in terms of generation, access and sharing of knowledge and learning on holistic ARM in the countries and the RECs/AU? What can be improved?
6. How can the PARM Secretariat’s work be strengthened/made more effective in terms of interconnections between country processes, knowledge management, capacity development, and partnerships?
7. Is the portfolio of services provided by PARM and its business model appropriate to respond to PARM’s goals and objectives? How could they be improved?

\(^{9}\) November 2011 - G20 leaders Cannes Declaration; May 2012 – G8 Factsheet on Action on Food Security; and June 2012 - G20 Los Cabos Declaration

\(^{10}\) Background Paper on PARM, December 2013, p7
Key methods used during the evaluation included key informant interview, review of documents and semi-structured observations.

As part of the evaluation, in addition to interviews with Steering Committee and Advisory Committee members, field missions were undertaken to Ethiopia, Niger, and Uganda during September 5-23, 2016. Overall during the evaluation, diverse stakeholders (117), including government officials, development partners, private sector companies, universities/research institutions, non-profit organizations and commodity/farmers’ organizations were interviewed (Annex A). Furthermore, the evaluation also reviewed both relevant corporate documents and country documents of PARM, in addition to national documents and relevant literature.

### Findings

1. **How does PARM’s institutional and governance structure facilitate overall coordination at the global-regional level and country level? What are the strengths and weaknesses? How has it performed in its overall coordination?**

PARM is governed by a Steering Committee (SC) and managed by the Secretariat with technical advice from an Advisory Committee. These bodies have ensured that the activities of PARM respond to its initial objectives to deliver good quality neutral assistance (Figure 1).

The Steering Committee consists of contributing development partners (EC, AFD, DGCS and IFAD, with BMZ/KfW11 joining in 2016) and NEPAD as a strategic partner for Africa. The Steering Committee mandated to make budgetary decisions and meets three times a year (once face-to-face and two times virtually). Since the first SC meeting in December 2013 at IFAD headquarters, the SC has met a total of eight times, as of August 2016. It was noted that NEPAD is not only a member of SC but also an implementer for PARM. The funding by BMZ/KfW is expected to build capacity in NEPAD and facilitate implementing selected pilot projects emerging out of PARM processes in the countries.

During the second SC (in April 2014) the AC members were identified. Having an AC is among the good practices of similar initiatives and other organization (including foundations). The AC members are key partners in the implementation, and currently include: knowledge partners (AGRHYMET, Agrinatura); private sector partners (Cargill, Munich-Re); Regional Economic

---

11 The funding of BMZ/KfW (€ 5 million) is directly to NEPAD
Community (REC) partners (COMESA, ECOWAS); cooperation partners (FAO, WFP, World Bank); and, farmer organizations (EAGC and ROPPA).

The AC has met only two times virtually (November 2015 and October 2014). The members who have attended these meetings also varied, with the exception of few such as FAO, WFP, and World Bank, who been actively involved not only in both the AC meetings but also through bilateral discussions with the PARM Secretariat.

The Secretariat established in September 2014, with a three-member core team, is supported by recently hired short-term consultants (based in IFAD, Rome). The Secretariat manages the overall coordination and the implementation of the PARM processes in the countries and reports to the SC. The delay in the establishment of the PARM Secretariat has been due to the established recruitment processes and procedures of IFAD (an aspect not uncommon in many multi-lateral organizations, when initiatives of this nature are set-up) and finding the appropriate competent people. This also meant that PARM Secretariat lost about nine months of its implementation time (in its total time of four years).

PARM enters a country in collaboration with NEPAD through the CAADP focal person, in most cases. Through discussions with the Government/Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), a PARM focal person is nominated either in the MOA (as in the case of Uganda) or with a specialized agency/institution focused on agriculture sector (reporting to Prime Minister or President as in the case of Ethiopia or Niger), in the country.

After the initial setup and launch in the country, typically PARM advances to the next steps of its five-step/two-phased country process – phase one (set-up and risk assessment study) and phase two (tools assessment, follow-up, and implementation) – in consultation with PARM focal person and/or the focal organization (either the ministry of agriculture or the specialized agency) - see Annex B for full details of the country process.

At the country level, PARM has managed work through consultants (international or national/regional consultants) dedicated to the country or a study/assessment, with coordination and support missions by PARM Secretariat staff. This has helped in progressing in the country process, within context and factors controllable by PARM. During discussions with stakeholders in the country, who although appreciated the PARM process and missions by PARM Secretariat staff, viewed that the process was “ad hoc” or “lacked the continuity”. The lack of local presence has affected PARM’s “visibility” and connection to forums/working groups in the agricultural sector in the country. With PARM scaling-up from three to nine countries (and possibly more, in the future/next phase), it makes the task all the more difficult for PARM Secretariat. PARM has to look at innovative ways to have a “voice” in the country to ensure the continuity – one option can be

12 There are eight Regional Economic Communities in Africa - Arab Maghreb Union (UMA); Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA); Community of Sahel-Saharan States (CEN-SAD); East African Community (EAC); Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS); Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS); and Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)
13 A Senior Programme Manager, a Technical Advisor and a Knowledge Management Officer, who came on board in July/August 2014
14 The CAADP focal person is nominated by the Ministry of Agriculture in the country
15 This may vary in some countries.
through leveraging country level partnerships with country offices of financing partners (present in the SC) including IFAD or EU.\textsuperscript{16}

The recent appointment of a “PARM liaison officer” on a part-time basis in Uganda and in other countries is a positive step forward to address this gap. This will help in the short-term and in completing country process and may increase the visibility to some extent; however, it may not lead to sustainability, long-term impact and investment (discussed further later). Some of the challenges in this “part-time PARM liaison officer” structure are:

- The capacity and capability of the part-time consultant recruited varied – e.g. A senior person with experience and connections in the ministry (in Uganda) vis-à-vis a junior “event coordinator” (in Ethiopia);
- Acceptance of the person (part-time consultant) as a PARM representative and as an advocate of ARM/PARM in the country by development partners and other agencies (beyond informing about next meetings and PARM missions and attending meetings); and,
- Although there is a PARM focal person/organization in the country, PARM also needs a “voice” (a champion /driver) in the country. It is unlikely that is role can be filled in by the part-time “PARM liaison officer”.

The key \textbf{strengths of PARM’s governance structure and facilitation of overall coordination} includes:

- Dedicated professional “core team” at the PARM Secretariat and their ability to manage coordination to achieve intended results;
- Committed and engaged development partners as part of the Steering Committee;
- The presence of key stakeholders in the two governance committees gives PARM a ready network;
- Having NEPAD as a strategic partner helps in making connections into a country’s political structures and to enter a country in Africa;
- Standardized and structured country process with flexibility; and,
- Ability to coordinate and organize events at the regional level in conjunction with NEPAD/CAADP\textsuperscript{17} events.

The \textbf{weaknesses in PARM’s overall coordination} include:

- Limited resources keeps PARM small on how it can carry out its coordination and country process work;
- Linked to above is that its inability to become a Global Platform;
- Delays in decisions/process concerning recruitment of staff/consultant delays and affects the process in achieving results – as country cycles to develop plans/strategies/ budget are carried out to set timetables by governments and development partners;

\textsuperscript{16} A lesson from FARM-D – it does not enter a country if the Agriculture Sector Team Task Leader is not interested in being the link. The assessments are coordinated from Washington DC, but there is a link in the country. This makes a huge difference.  

\textsuperscript{17} 11\textsuperscript{th} and 12 CAADP Partnership Platforms in Johannesburg (2015) and Accra (2016)
• The time lag between missions to a country (result of managing nine countries by three people\textsuperscript{18}) inherently, affects the continuous engagement in the country;
• The countries were selected before the PARM Secretariat team joined;
• The enthusiasm of development partners in the SC and AC has not trickled down to or not capitalized at the country level by PARM; and,
• The low visibility of PARM among development partners in the countries linked with not being present country “sector structures and mechanism”; and,
• Too focused on country process and likely to miss out on key regional events which also have an impact on the PARM countries (partly linked to small team that is stretched); and,
• Overall coordination does not implicitly address the “implementation” step.

PARM has done well in the overall coordination within the short-time timeframe of two years with limited human resources. The overall coordination has also helped PARM to make progress and achieve results in the country. The overall coordination efforts are currently focussed in Africa (in 9 countries) for the country process and with World Bank (with FARM-D)/IFAD/FAO on knowledge management and bilateral discussions with selected AC members on capacity building (FAO), technical aspects (FAO/WFP) and connections in the country. The progress is in various stages in the nine countries (Figure 2).

**Figure 2: Overall Coordination and PARM Process Snapshot (September 2014 – September 2016)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Setting up (1)</th>
<th>Risk Assessment (2)</th>
<th>Tools Assessment (3)</th>
<th>Follow-up (4)</th>
<th>Implementation (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>††</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia Mozambique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*VW – Validation Workshop
† The Risk Assessment Report is yet to be finalized
‡ The Risk Assessment Report finalized, but circulated
†† Validation Workshop by end of 2016

Source: Compiled from PARM – Our Results – September 2016

\textsuperscript{18} in spite of 8 missions in first six months by one staff in PARM Secretariat
In addition to multiple missions to several countries, bilateral discussions with Governments and development partners, among others, coordinating events and presenting at CAADP annual events, PARM’s overall coordination since the launch included:

- Set-up completed in seven countries and is in progress in two more countries;
- Risk assessment study and report completed and/or in the process of finalization of report in five countries;
- Validation workshop completed in five countries (three in 2015 and two in 2016) and planned for one more country (before end of 2016);
- Tools development in advanced stages in one country and work is in nascent stages in three other countries; and,
- At least one capacity development event conducted in five countries; More than one capacity development work has been done in Uganda.

More detailed discussions on knowledge management, capacity building, and partnerships are presented subsequently in this report.

2. **How effective is the relationship between the Secretariat, Steering Committee and Advisory Committee? What has worked well? What can be improved?**

Overall, the relationship between the Secretariat, the Steering Committee (SC) and the Advisory Committee (AC) has worked well. The evaluation found that the SC has been very engaged at a high level. The SC also selected the countries for PARM implementation. The Secretariat reported to the SC regularly. The SC has met eight times so far (up to July 2016) and has guided PARM Secretariat effectively. The discussions have been transparent and well documented.

Having an AC is seen as a best practice and good model for governance of global initiatives like PARM. Structurally, the AC is to provide technical and strategic advice to PARM and its activities. The members of PARM AC bring diverse expertise/experience and technical knowledge relevant to PARM. However, this has yet to be leveraged by PARM. The AC has met twice virtually, since the inception of PARM and not many members have attended both meetings. One of the reasons mentioned by stakeholders (AC members interviewed) was that there no common topic of interest for discussion and it was also too early in the “life of PARM” to contribute. At the same time, PARM has sought and had very valuable discussions with few of the AC members, both in terms of technical advice and collaboration. These bilateral discussions have proved to be more effective, (e.g. PARM Secretariat and WFP or FAO or the World Bank) than the discussions as an AC.

It is also noted that PARM is at its early stage and just beginning to gain momentum and it is likely that there will be more opportunities tap into the expertise and experience of AC members. It is important that PARM Secretariat reaches out to AC members to seek their expert advice, guidance and inputs/insights on projects/tools in addition to keeping them posted of various activities and studies after completion. This does not mean day to day consultation.

19 Knowledge partners, cooperation partners, private sector partners, RECs and farmer organizations
Overall, regarding what has worked well in the governance structure, highlights include:

- The working relationship between SC and the PARM Secretariat; and,
- Bilateral discussions with targeted AC members.

However, some aspects could be improved, included:

- Having at least two AC meetings in a year;
- Having a common agenda of interest at the AC meeting for discussion; and,
- The relationship between SC and AC members and PARM Secretariat to be translated/leveraged at country level

While many stakeholders were of the consensus that having an AC was part of good governance and good practice, there was no concrete opinion on how to make it active. The challenge comes from the nature and diversity of organizations involved and the early stages of PARM. Key issues that were mentioned during discussions with AC members was not knowing each other and no clearly stated common agenda; so when they met once a year virtually, it is hard to have the discussion moving. A face-to-face to meeting in conjunction with an SC or as a side event to a CAADP event (which PARM ties in with) could be a good start.

One key area for improvement is to leverage the good relationship and support at the corporate level (SC/AC) to country level. This will greatly help in promoting PARM in the country, both in the short-term and in the long-term. This should be ideally carried out in two ways – a) the SC/AC members should advocate for PARM through their internal communications in their respective organizations (in countries where PARM is working or plans to launch); and, b) PARM Secretariat should specifically focus to meet and have discussion with relevant programme and country officials in the respective country offices, as part of the each mission (especially with the country offices of SC members). This can improve in-country connections, “visibility” and “voice” for PARM. It also helps PARM to get a better picture of the country and sector dynamics from a different “lens,” so it can plan its activities and meetings accordingly. This will also facilitate and improve the likelihood of mainstreaming ARM into the country programming of development partners (starting with country offices of SC/AC members) which contributes to the Government’s national plan/strategy.

3. **What are the pros and cons of the PARM Secretariat being hosted by IFAD (in the context of PARM being a G20 initiative)?**

PARM is too small to be on its own and has to be hosted by a development partner, specifically an organization focused on the agriculture sector. The hosting of PARM by a multilateral organization brings the neutrality of the initiative to a great extent. There is a general consensus that IFAD was the right organization to host PARM. There was no one “cons” mentioned for PARM not be in IFAD. It is viewed to be complementary to IFAD and PARM benefits from being hosted by IFAD.

IFAD is the second largest funder in the agricultural sector, after World Bank. Hosting of PARM in IFAD also means that it can go global when the time and resources are right. IFAD not only focusses on agriculture but also on finance. Risks are linked to investments in the agricultural sector. IFAD also brings the commercial perspective regarding risks and investments.
IFAD is a learning and knowledge driven institution, and hence PARM was seen as a perfect fit. PARM by its mandate enhances knowledge and increases capacity in institutions and government. PARM is an additional element enriching and adding value to IFAD. It provides an opportunity for IFAD to mainstream PARM tools and ARM into its country strategic opportunities programme (COSOP). A recent example was noted in IFAD Ethiopia which included aspects of PARM/ARM incorporated into its COSOP but also in its irrigation project; however this has not been a common occurrence yet, but something that PARM and IFAD should strive to achieve in terms of investment, long-term impact, and sustainability.

Among the Rome agencies, focusing on agriculture, WFP is focussed on humanitarian with resource intensive operations. FAO has good technical know-how but operates more with “donor-tied” resources. FAO is a strong partner for PARM (already an AC member). FAO is very involved as an AC member because of its interest and its initial work in ARM. FAO has also contributed by presenting its work on agricultural information system which is complementary to PARM. IFAD was perceived as a more dynamic among the three organizations by the stakeholders discussed with during the evaluation.

PARM has been situated in IFAD because of its technical assistance. PARM is very technical and hence a natural fit. FAO could also be another organization which could be seen as a partner to host PARM in the future jointly. IFAD also has the ability to raise its resources as a financial institution from the open market.

For the long-term sustainability and impact, IFAD should reflect about which unit should host and also if the PARM Secretariat should administratively report to a Director in IFAD if it grows beyond rural finance unit. For example, the Global Secretariat of the multi-donor funded Global Strategy to Improve Agriculture and Rural Statistics is hosted by the Statistics Division (ESS) of FAO (not a FAO project). The Global Coordinator reports to the Global Steering Committee; nevertheless, he reports administratively to the ESS Director, as a FAO staff). Reporting to a Director would raise awareness of PARM within IFAD and how it complements IFAD’s overall mandate in internal high-level meetings. This could possibly facilitate mainstreaming of ARM/PARM into IFAD programming especially in countries globally, beyond PARM countries in Africa. This does not mean that in the current arrangement it is not being promoted within IFAD, but a point for consideration to further raise the profile of PARM, keeping mind long-term impact and sustainability. Recently, PARM’s efforts and complementarity were highlighted in Executive meetings in September 2016. Efforts of PARM also led to it getting an opportunity to present a session during the Learning Event on the occasion of IFAD Global Meeting Learning Day to raise awareness of PARM/ARM within IFAD, in February 2016; this was organized in collaboration with Weather Risk Management Facility (WRMF) of IFAD. This internal partnership between PARM and WRMF is complementary to each other’s activities. Similar efforts should be explored by PARM to collaborate within IFAD to mainstream ARM.

4. To what extent have the partnerships at various levels been effective? How can they be improved? What complementarities can be leveraged with existing and potential strategic/implementing partners?
Discussions during the evaluation highlighted that partnerships had been the foundation of PARM’s work, especially with limited resources and a small team. Partnerships start in the governance structure – the SC and AC. While the financing partners and strategic partner, NEPAD, form a strong partnership at the apex guiding the PARM Secretariat, the relationships with AC members is still evolving. However, as discussed, AC brings together diverse partners.

**PARM and NEPAD/CAADP**

PARM and NEPAD partnership is at multiple levels. At the country level, PARM along with NEPAD enters the country in most countries through the CAADP focal person (nominated by the country’s ministry of agriculture). NEPAD’s partnership is crucial and strategic to PARM, as NEPAD promotes the integration of food security and vulnerability issues including risk management tools, into the agricultural investment plans under the CAADP framework. NEPAD/CAADP supports effective risk management strategies at regional and national levels, in order to foster productive investment and achieve the annual target at six percent in agricultural growth. As envisaged and is evident, PARM complements and adds value to the CAADP process and the compact in the countries. Hence NEPAD’s push on ARM and support to PARM, at policy and minister level to facilitate the integration of ARM into government and sector policies and to ensure investment from the government, is vital.

PARM should leverage NEPAD’s activities on Agricultural and Food Insecurity Risk Management (AFIRM) and Investment Facilitation Platform (IFP) activities. At the same time, NEPAD as an implementing partner of PARM (the second hat of NEPAD in PARM) should complement PARM with these activities, in the PARM countries.

At the country level, a PARM focal person is identified by the Government in the Ministry of Agriculture or a specialized high-level agency focussed in agriculture. While PARM’s partnership with the Ministry and/or the agency has worked well as in the case of Ethiopia and Uganda, turnover in personnel in Niger has created challenges in partnership and continuity. At the same time, the timing of PARM’s missions has not always been helpful to build on its initial partnership with CAADP person and leverage the influence and connection, as applicable. As noted during the evaluation, both in Niger and Uganda there was a turnover of CAADP person. It takes the time to build the relationship and bring to speed on ARM/PARM, again.

---

20 According to NEPAD, ARM within the NEPAD Agency is designed to foster a shift in mind-set from managing crises to managing risks. This is done by providing support to Regional Economic Communities and African countries to mainstream agriculture and food security risk management in their implementation of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), thereby boosting productivity and profitability. ([www.nepad.org](http://www.nepad.org))


23 The IFP aims to mainstream agricultural finance in the CAADP process where possible, through creating a forum that brings together investors and agricultural value chain stakeholders including development financial institutions, commercial banks, micro-finance institutions (MFIs), agricultural banks, development partner and investment funds, in addition to producers’ organizations and Government ([Compiled from NEPAD progress report to 8th PARM SC and](http://www.nepad.org/content/investment-facilitation-platform-senegal-accelerating-private-sector-investment-agriculture))
A key aspect that PARM should pay attention to in a country is to facilitate and ensure a mechanism of interaction between the CAADP and PARM focal person on ARM/PARM.\textsuperscript{24} This is an important foundation to build on for country coordination mechanism. It may not be uncommon to assume that these two desks interact; it was noted that they might interact with each other as the staff of MOA/its agency or they know each other personally. There is no mandate, structure or mechanism wherein they discuss PARM/ARM. This within-ministry partnership and coordination are crucial for the institutionalization of ARM in the country (starting in MOA) and PARM’s success. This is an area to improve for PARM, based on observations and discussions in the country.

**PARM and other Ministries**

In some countries, MOA includes agriculture, livestock, and fisheries, but in others, each one may an independent ministry. Additionally, irrigation, cooperatives, trade, and industry all contribute to the growth of the agriculture sector and are inter-related. With a holistic approach, it is important to build a relationship with these related ministries also, with MOA at the core. PARM has been discussing with diverse ministries in the countries; nevertheless, there is scope to improve efforts to involve them. Integration of ARM into agriculture sector and national plans is important if the government has to allocate budget. In this regard, building relationship with Ministry of Finance is crucial for ARM/PARM, because budget lines on ARM may be required from other ministries also, beyond MOA, to address agricultural risks holistically. A country “coordination mechanism” needs to evolve over a period of time, starting from mechanism within MOA. This may take a long time, but to lay the foundation during the time when PARM is active in the country is important.

**Country Offices of SC members**

While the financing partners are very engaged in the PARM SC, this working partnership has not trickled down to the country level,\textsuperscript{25} in countries where PARM has been active – specifically in the three countries (Ethiopia, Niger, and Uganda) which were visited as part of the mid-term evaluation. There is scope to improve and leverage the partnership, as this is crucial for the long-term sustainability and implementation (5\textsuperscript{th} step of PARM) in the countries. This should be done through messaging from the corporate level (SC members) to the country offices in PARM countries and also through efforts from PARM Secretariat by meeting and communicating regularly with country representatives and/or appropriate programme managers (discussed earlier also). This could also leverage resources not only for investment but also or capacity development events in the country. PARM should also look at the option of having one the SC members’ country representatives to co-chair events along with MOA.

**Potential Development Partners in-Country**

It is very important to start forging partnerships with development partners right from the time of entering the country and while carrying out the process in the countries. This relationship and partnership have to be strategic with the appropriate unit/initiative in the country. In spite of

\textsuperscript{24} In the past, in Uganda the CAADP and PARM focal person was the same person

\textsuperscript{25} A common issue of HQ programmes versus country programmes and priority
PARM’s active and good work in the countries, it was surprising to note that the awareness about PARM was very low among development partners, with the exception of IFAD country offices in the three countries visited. It is important that PARM plans to meet with targeted development partners, during country missions in addition to inviting them to PARM events or meeting them at PARM events.

The partnership in the country with development partners is essential, as many least developed (LDCs) and low-income countries’ (LICs) governments are dependent investment through development assistance for implementing programmes. Development partners have their cycle of preparing programmes, strategies and plans and PARM should strive to connect to these cycles. The partnership will help to mainstream ARM in their respective investments. This is an area to be tapped into by PARM.

During country missions and discussions for this evaluation, it was noted that PARM had not focussed much on the country “sector mechanisms.” There are nuances in each country. Being present in the structures not only increases “visibility” for PARM but also likely facilitates connection with development partners and thereby mainstreaming of ARM and investment in the country. This could be done by making presentations or providing updates on studies to the “development partners” group separately from the general workshops and thus keep ARM on their agenda. In this regard, having a “voice” in the country through one of the SC members’ country office in these sector structures and meetings will be helpful. It does not mean oversight or carrying out of PARM activities in the respective country offices. There is work to be done in terms developing partnerships with potential development partners at the global level and the country level.

ARM Initiatives / Knowledge Management and Capacity Development Partnerships

The complementarities of FARMD (of World Bank) have to be leveraged. PARM has already hosted webinars on FARMD (see box later). It has to further build its collaboration in more formal and strategic manner, in the areas of knowledge management, knowledge dissemination, learning and capacity development. PARM should explore possibilities to leverage partnerships with AGRINATURA (an AC member) in the area of knowledge management. Additionally, PARM should also establish/strengthen partnerships with research institutions (including CGIAR institutions) and the universities (including PERIPERI University network26) in the country/region. PARM should strive to create linkages with various initiatives (including platforms and forums) addressing components of ARM. Several of these initiatives are funded by one or more of the SC/AC members in collaboration with other development partners, (see discussion later).

Some of the initiatives focussed on agriculture and climate change, which could complement PARM’s work and enhance impact include:

- WFP’s Food Security Climate Resilience Facility (FoodSECuRE - [http://www.wfp.org/climate-change/initiatives/foodsecure]);

---

26 Partners Enhancing Resilience for People Exposed to Risk (PeriPeri) is a consortium of higher education institutions in Algeria, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania and Uganda. ([http://www.riskreductionafrica.org/](http://www.riskreductionafrica.org/))
- WFPs and Oxfam America’s the Rural Resilience Initiative (R4) with support from Swiss Re, an insurance company [https://www.wfp.org/climate-change/initiatives/r4-rural-resilience-initiative];
- The Global Resilience Partnership, launched by Rockefeller Foundation, USAID and Sida [http://www.globalresiliencepartnership.org/aboutus/];
- The UN-led “Anticipate, Absorb, Reshape” (A2R) Initiative [http://www.a2rinitiative.org/]; and,
- Regional Centre for Mapping Resources for Development (RCMRD - [http://www.rcmrd.org/organization/] created by UNECA and AU and funded by USAID, UNEP, UNECA, and UNOSAT among others.

Similarly, PARM should establish partnership at the country/regional level with institutions that can collaborate with MOAs develop curricula and provide training and develop capacities on ARM on a going basis. With its limited resources PARM will be more effective and efficient if it can facilitate capacity building and through partnership. PARM cannot be present at all levels and all events of capacity building. Leveraging partnerships and resources is important to PARM’s success in capacity building. It was noted that PARM had started discussions in this direction with local universities in Uganda (Makerere University) and Senegal (University of Gaston Berger).

**Regional Institutions / Organizations**

Similarly, the regional economic communities (RECs) - ECOWAS and COMESA have a role to play in PARM because of their complimentary responsibilities as one of the three leading AU institutions (Annex C). This is yet to be leveraged by PARM, although both (ECOWAS and COMESSA) are part of AC. Relationship with Inter-governmental Agency on Development (IGAD) is also important because the governments signed the regional agricultural investment plan (RAIP) in August 2016. The signed document will be the basis for NAIPs and for donors to invest at the country level. It would have been good for PARM to have been involved in this meeting as this is very relevant to PARM. As informed by stakeholders, PARM’s “lack of local presence” affected any contribution to the RAIP.

Specific to Africa, PARM should strive to establish a partnership with African Development Bank (AfDB), which has placed a huge focus on agriculture, as part of its “High 5 Agenda”. In September 2016, AfDB launched its Feed Africa: Strategy for Agricultural Transformation in Africa 2016-2025. It was noted that this strategy is aligned to the vision set out in the 2063 Strategy for

---

27 IGAD’s headquarters is in Djibouti. The member states include Djibouti, Ethiopia, Somalia, Eritrea, Sudan, South Sudan, Kenya and Uganda.
Africa – developed jointly by AfDB, the AU Commission, and UNECA – “to consolidate the modernization of African agriculture and agro-businesses.” This brings to the attention that UNECA could provide added synergies as a potential partner for PARM, in Africa.

Another potential partner, which could complement PARM, is the African Risk Capacity (ARC), a specialized agency of African Union (AU), with administrative services agreement with World Food Programme (WFP). PARM should capitalize on the fact that NEPAD and ARC are planning to have an MOU and create a roadmap to formalize implementation of joint activities.

Private Sector

Partnership with the private sector is huge area of improvement for PARM. With the exception of private sector members involved in AC, there has not been much involvement of private sectors. At the country level, a few insurance companies have attended PARM events (e.g. Uganda, and Ethiopia). However, there is little evidence of involvement (attendance) from input companies, processors, and agribusiness, even in PARM events. The recent instance was noted in Uganda at the findings workshop on crop pest and diseases risks; there was no input company from the private sector in attendance. Tapping into the knowledge of Cargill and Munich-Re (AC members) on how to target and get country-level involvement from the private sector would help PARM. At the same time, it is important to ensure PARM’s work is relevant to the private sector investment and operations, in targeted countries/region.

5. To what extent has PARM been effective in its knowledge management – in terms of generation, access and sharing of knowledge and learning on holistic ARM in the countries and RECs/AU? What can be improved?

As in any initiative similar to PARM, the knowledge management (KM) has had a staggered start. Overall, PARM has produced more than 35 knowledge products – this includes PARM factsheets, PARM annual reports, Risk Assessment Studies, Risk Assessment Study Validation Workshop report and presentations Risk Profile of countries, Capacity Development Seminar reports and presentations, Study reports and findings, ARM tools and newsletters, among others. This is a good start and achievement by PARM Secretariat in two years, as a new initiative emphasizing a paradigm shift on risk management in agriculture. PARM’s ongoing work on branding all products will help in creating a unique identity for itself.

32 ARC was established as a Specialized Agency of the African Union (AU), in 2012 to help Member States improve their capacities to better plan, prepare and respond to extreme weather events and natural disasters, therefore protecting the food security of their vulnerable populations. In 2013, ARC Insurance Company Limited (ARC Ltd) was established as a financial affiliate of ARC. United Kingdom (though DFID) and Germany (through KfW on behalf of BMZ) are capital contributors (www.africariskcapacity.org; and http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/resources/wfp257404.pdf)
33 It was noted that many private sector firms conduct their own risk assessment as part of their business planning and forecast
The small team of PARM Secretariat has been efficient despite facing challenges of not being able to commit the knowledge management person full time, due to lack of personnel to handle administration and finance work. With PARM gaining momentum and with work in progress in nine countries, it is necessary for the KM person to be dedicated full-time work in developing KM products and planning/organizing knowledge sharing events. The recent support hired to handle administration work will greatly help to move the KM agenda forward. PARM has developed the KM strategy and was approved in 2016. This is envisaged as living document to be updated annually. Among others, the KM strategy will give priority to developing pedagogical tools that can be used for increasing knowledge and capacity on ARM. KM is closely linked to capacity development and the country process (risk assessment and tools assessment), and it was very positive to see the team work closely and collaboratively.

As part of enhancing knowledge management activities, PARM has developed and leveraged its relationship with World Bank (an AC member) to use the Forum for Agricultural Risk Management in Development (FARMD) for conducting webinars and sharing knowledge products (see box). There is potential to leverage the collaboration with FARMD for mutually beneficial partnership. The FARMD, an online knowledge exchange platform, is funded by Swiss Cooperation and Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands with the World Bank’s Agricultural Risk Management Team leading and coordinating the forum.

PARM has also collaborated with FAO and IFAD in sharing knowledge and learning through targeted events/activities (see box). Furthermore, PARM has contributed to the development of a module (Module 3) on ARM tools in collaboration with FAO for a broader e-learning course on “Agricultural Risk Assessment and Management for Food Security in Developing Countries.”

The event in Ethiopia (see box) was also used to launch PARM in the country.

PARM had been looking into collaboration with local institutions for development of knowledge and capacity development products – Makerere University (in Uganda), the University of

---

34 FARMD – [http://www.agriskmanagementforum.org/content/history-support-and-organization](http://www.agriskmanagementforum.org/content/history-support-and-organization)
Gaston Berger (in Senegal) and AGRHYMET (in Niger). There have been some delays due to various reasons within and beyond PARM’s control. Developing and leveraging partnership with research institutions (including IFPRI, ILRI, other CGIAR Consortium members and FARA), and universities in the PARM countries, and in Africa (and in other continents in the future), will help PARM have a multiplier effect on knowledge management, knowledge sharing and capacity development in a more cost effective manner.

PARM has also kept its website, launched in June 2015, updated and has been active on social media (Twitter\textsuperscript{36}). The relevance and importance of PARM are evident not only by because of the discussions at G8/G20 but also due to the need to address ARM holistically at the country level. PARM is mentioned on IFAD website\textsuperscript{37}, and this helps in creating awareness to a wider range of audience. It will also contribute to reaching broader audience and stakeholders, if financing partners and NEPAD, strategic partner, of PARM would have a page or a blurb with a link to PARM website. This not only creates wider awareness but also access to useful and relevant knowledge products of PARM to a diverse clientele, including investors. Additionally, PARM could also leverage its relationship with some AC members (e.g. FAO and WFP, among others) to have a link to PARM website.

Furthermore, as a knowledge broker and facilitator, PARM should strive to ensure linkages and synergies with various initiatives that address components of ARM. These include examples in Table 1 (not including the ones mentioned earlier).

\textbf{Table 1: Initiatives and Platforms of Relevance to PARM}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives and Platforms</th>
<th>Key Contributing Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Consultative Group to Assist the Poor (CGAP)</td>
<td>34 organizations (bilaterals, multilateral, and foundations among others) including European Commission, AFD, IFAD, KfW, and Italy. Housed in World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://www.cgap.org">https://www.cgap.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farm Risk Management for Africa (FARMAF)</td>
<td>Funded by EU and AGRINATURA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rural Finance and Investment Learning Centre (RFILC)</td>
<td>Funded by IFAD, FAO, GIZ/BMZ&lt; UNCDF and the World Bank and managed by FAO (CABFIN Partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity4Dev (European Commissions’ online knowledge sharing platform)</td>
<td>Funded by European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/content/about-us">http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/content/about-us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance for Resilience (AGIR)</td>
<td>An initiative of EU, ECOWAS, UEMOA, and CILSS, under the leadership of latter three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://www.oecd.org/site/rpca/agir/">https://www.oecd.org/site/rpca/agir/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Index Insurance Facility (GIIF)</td>
<td>Funded by European Union, Japan, and the Netherlands and managed by the World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://www.indexinsuranceforum.org/">https://www.indexinsuranceforum.org/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{36} 174 followers as of October 31, 2016. Twitter since November 2014

\textsuperscript{37} [https://www.ifad.org/topic/overview/tags/parm](https://www.ifad.org/topic/overview/tags/parm)
PARM through its strategic partner, NEPAD, has been able to participate in CAADP events (see box) and share knowledge – by organizing a side event also having a session or two in the main event. As reported during discussions, this has also increased PARM visibility among countries in Africa. PARM contributes to CAADP process and fills the void of ARM; the strength of the NEPAD-PARM partnership. During the side event, the CAADP and PARM focal persons from the PARM countries were able to meet and share experience and notes. This was appreciated by country stakeholders during discussions, as part of this evaluation. PARM and NEPAD have a key role to play as knowledge brokers in Africa.

PARM has made efforts to be involved in regional events when invited. However, there is scope to be more actively involved. Not having the strong “local presence” also means missing out on information and connections for these key regional events which are relevant to PARM and the countries in the region.\(^{38}\) For example, the IGAD event in Djibouti to

---

\(^{38}\) Leveraging connections of SC members’ country offices and NEPAD could prove to keep track of key event in the continent
sign the regional agricultural investment plan (August 2016) and the African Green Revolution Forum in Nairobi (September 2016), which brought together heads of state, farmer organizations, finance and investment leads, private sector business managing commodity value chains and development partners, among others. Presence in these and similar regional events not only increases the awareness and importance of ARM/PARM among policy decision-makers and investors but also enhances the profile of PARM.

The relationship of PARM with RECs (ECOWAS and COMESA) is evolving and is at a nascent stage. However, it must also be noted that RECs as of now do not have strong role in CAADP implementation. The focus of CAADP has been in the countries. In fact, there is no CAADP regional programming, yet (although a RAIP has been signed recently). Understanding the role of RECs as one of three leading institutions of AU is key for PARM to plan its knowledge management (Annex C).

Areas where KM can improve include:

- The KM platform is crucial in the long-term for PARM’s “legacy.” While the expectation for “platform” is to provide an opportunity for various practitioners to exchange and discuss ideas. PARM could discuss and explore collaboration with FARMD of World Bank in this regard;
  - While the PARM website is distinct in its content from FARMD, PARM can strive to be the “CGAP” of ARM. PARM should continue to evolve and consolidate itself as an evidence-base advocacy and KM platform on ARM while pursuing the policy process approach;
- There has to be link between PARM’s knowledge management platform and country level activities and practitioners to enable discussions and knowledge sharing;
- As part of next steps, PARM needs to ensure how the implementation will take the ARM from a policy level to the farm level; this will require country level knowledge and capacity development partners (discussed earlier); and,
- Ensure PARM website is linked to relevant organizations and platforms for wider access (potential partnership and linkages discussed earlier).

6. How can the PARM Secretariat’s work be strengthened/made more effective in terms of interconnections between country processes, knowledge management, capacity development, and partnerships?

The country process starts with a set-up meeting and follows the structured phases and steps. Capacity building is integral to the country process and is embedded in the risk assessment, tools assessment and follow-up phases of the PARM country process. PARM has developed a Capacity Development Strategy in June 2016. In the first two years, since the inception, PARM in addition to developing the process had to develop the methodology and terms of references for conducting the various steps/ phases. Uganda, which has progressed the most; with regard to PARM country

---

39. What we do – policy dialogue process, (PARM Factsheet, p.2)
40. Presented as part of 8th Steering Committee Meeting support document
process, served as a pilot and learning ground for fine-tuning the country process in other countries. While in each country the context and challenges are different, PARM has gained momentum and is moving forward well with activities simultaneously being carried out in nine countries (including the two in early stages of set-up) – refer Figure 2 presented earlier.

The knowledge management is linked to the country process and capacity development. As part of the country process, capacity building seminars are envisaged in stage 2 (risk assessment), stage 3 (tools assessment) and follow-up (stage 4). The Technical Advisor of the PARM Secretariat manages both the country process and the capacity development, as they are closely interlinked. With only three staff in the Secretariat, and no administrative and logistic support (until recent hires) other two team members also provided support with activities at peak momentum (who also have to carry out their own roles and responsibilities). One of the members of the team has to focus on partnerships at multiple levels (other than MOA), resource mobilization and ensuring the presence of PARM at regional and global forums. With recent hires now providing support to country process, the Senior Programme Manager of PARM would be able to focus more on this key aspect.

With country process, in progress in various stages in nine countries, the challenge of organizing the capacity building seminars, PARM events, and country mission logistics has been eased by recruitment of consultants in Rome and PARM liaison officers in some countries, in the recent months. This is a positive step, in the short-term, in enabling the core team to focus and carry out the overall coordination, country process, and building partnership, country institutional arrangements, and resource mobilization. PARM has conducted capacity development seminars in all countries (except in Ethiopia, Zambia, Liberia, and Mozambique). In Ethiopia, with Risk Assessment Study being finalized and more simultaneous studies being planned, capacities building activities are expected to be carried out in 2017. When Risk Assessment Study takes a long time to get finalized, PARM should proactively take steps, to conduct a capacity development and awareness creation seminar on ARM/PARM, in consultation with PARM focal organization and other partners (e.g. Cameroon and Senegal). This will also help PARM “continuity” to be in the discussions in the country, after the launch and sustain the interest (and therefore avoid the situation of the country to wait for one year to have a PARM event after kick-off; it will help to avoid to some extent stakeholder comments of “ad-hoc” and “part-time”).

While PARM’s intention is to ensure capacity building and making available ARM tools for farmers, PARM should not plan to carry out capacity building workshops/seminars directly (by itself) at sub-national level, as it would not be feasible option to organize and conduct within and through its own limited resources, in nine countries. There has been an instance of PARM carrying

41 As noted in the PARM process – “Why PARM” factsheet
42 PARM liaison officers are based in the countries and hired as consultant on a part-time basis.
43 In Cameroon, the launch was in March 2015 and the RAS validation workshop is planned for later in 2016; however a CD workshop was conducted in June 2016. Similarly in Senegal (launched in March 2015), the RAS workshop was conducted in June 2016, but a CD seminar was organized in March 2016.
out training for farmers on the ground in Uganda, which should be seen as pilot. PARM should focus and support the development of capacity development modules and tools in ARM in collaboration with MOA and local institutions - examples noted include Makerere University in Uganda, AGRHYMET in Niger or UGB in Senegal, with whom, PARM is in discussion with currently. The implementation of capacity building should be through the extension system in the country (preferably) and/or through the local institutions that developed the modules or farmers organization. This will be a more efficient, cost-effective and appropriate to the context. Identifying the right partner institution and facilitating the capacity building would be the key essence to PARM’s success, in this regard.

It is not uncommon for knowledge management to have staggered start in many development initiatives. Knowledge management and preparation of knowledge products are linked to the country process and capacity building seminars, in addition to other global PARM efforts. It is important for the lessons from the country to be shared globally. PARM has also undertaken multi-country studies as part of its knowledge management efforts; this includes:

- “Warehouse Receipt” Studies in nine countries jointly with IFAD, AFD and Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (CTA)44; and,
- “Informational Assessment of ARM Information System” (ARM-IS) in seven countries through CEIGRAM45.

The interconnections among country process, capacity building, knowledge management and partnership are very obvious in PARM. The way PARM is structured; partnerships are crucial to leveraging synergies, capacities and resources to build ownership and ensure institutionalization in the countries. Currently, all these are managed at the PARM Secretariat level, with PARM process making progress, capacity building activities should be carried out through institutions/organization in the country, with PARM providing pedagogical tools, technical expertise, and oversight. Overall, KM should be done at the Secretariat level to ensure knowledge from global and countries are organized and made available for everyone in a user-friendly manner; however, knowledge production may happen at various levels within PARM and outside of PARM (by other organizations/development partners or initiatives).

PARM is very focused on carrying out the carry-out the country process, capacity development workshops, and knowledge management and has been successful; however, a key aspect that needs attention to make PARM more effective and sustainable is the institutional arrangements. It was noted that this comes too late in the process (Annex B). As noted during the evaluation from the discussions, the “Steering Committee” has not proven to be a very a successful approach either, which (where present) meets only when PARM staff is on a mission. The institutional arrangement should start early in the process simultaneously along with studies. The CAADP and PARM focal persons should be involved in the discussions of PARM/ARM, preferably together in the planning and country activities. This will build ownership in the country and also enable them to start discussions even while PARM staff is not on a mission. This is important to institutionalize

---

44 In Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cote D’Ivoire, Ghana, Madagascar, Mozambique, Niger, Senegal and Uganda
45 In Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Niger, Senegal and Uganda
ARM and to get more staff from MOA involved. It will also likely provide the continuity in discussions and mainstreaming ARM within MOA. The partnership of various types and at various levels is crucial PARM’s effectiveness. The partnership is not at the core, but also cross-cutting for PARM.

Partnership with development partners at the corporate level and at the country level is very important. The partnership at the corporate level and the collaboration/involvement at the SC have not trickled down to the country level; this is not an uncommon situation for “HQ programmes” of many development partners. While it is important to accomplish tasks set out in the country processes, it is also important for PARM to advocate for ARM mainstreaming into the agricultural programming of development partners from a corporate level (starting with financing partners in the SC and other development partners including AC members). This is also important to enhance the global discussion on ARM to gain critical mass. At the same time, development partners’ funding is crucial in the least developed and low-income countries for agricultural programming and hence targeting the country offices of development partners, those who are funding PARM and others is vital to attracting investment. This is critical to ensure investment at the implementation stage (otherwise, it is likely to remain as a policy document and technical tool). Additionally, development partners in the country could also be potential partners to provide resources for capacity development. For example, IFAD Uganda indicated its willingness to finance MAAIF (Uganda) in capacity development, if the curricula were developed through PARM support.

Each development partner in the country has a planning/funding cycle (a 3-year or 5-year). It is important that ARM is highlighted in these documents which may include findings of RAS and ARM tools developed by PARM and so being present at the planning stage of these cycles is likely to ensure ARM aspects are incorporated into programme plan, and hence funds allocated.

7. Is the portfolio of services provided by PARM and its business model appropriate to respond to PARM’s goals and objectives? How could they be improved?

It is important to understand and note that as per the current mandate PARM is a facilitator and not an implementer. PARM is not a service provider but it provides support to the service provider to render their services. There is no doubt among stakeholders in the countries about the appropriateness and relevance of the portfolio of services provided by PARM. Currently, PARM is primarily focused at the policy level (integrating ARM into NAIP) with an intention to ensure that ARM tools will trickle down to meet the demand at the farmer level either through extension services or other local institution/organizations. Efforts and activities have been taken up in countries by PARM reflect this. However, with PARM’s structure and resources, it cannot by itself reach and build capacities of smallholders in countries, where more than 60 to 70 percent of the population is dependent on agriculture. Identification appropriate national partners (besides the PARM focal organization) early in the process and having a clear definition and understanding
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of roles will help PARM being more effective. Carrying out activities in parallel in a country will increase efficiencies for PARM.

The theory of change of PARM’s process and its business operations model is that PARM’s work will lead to integration of ARM into NAIP. However, it is likely that in some countries PARM will miss the country planning cycle and therefore the integration into NAIP. For this reason, PARM should have steps defined for course of action to ensure that it is integrated in the subsequent plan and/or how it can fit into national annual budget (may not be holistic) in the current plan. Another important aspect that is not explicitly evident from the PARM process and its model is, as to how it will attract investment in the country (the implementation stage of the PARM process), whether ARM is integrated into NAIP or not. Most LDCs and LICs do not have the capacity to finance their sector plans and are often dependent on development partners and private sector, among others for investments.

The inherent weakness of PARM’s operational model is that it does not provide the continuity in the country between PARM events/missions. Additionally, there are structures and mechanisms and forums in the country in the agriculture sector, where PARM is not “visible” and/or not present. As remarked in several instances by stakeholders during this evaluation, PARM is good and important conceptually; however, being “part-time” does not ensure momentum sustain interest in the country. While the “presence” on the ground was considered important by stakeholders, this does not necessarily mean posting PARM staff in the country full time.

An aspect that PARM could look into as part of its business operations or model is to leverage the relationship with country offices of SC members. Involvement of at least one of the SC/AC members’ country office to act as “voice” for PARM in the country will give boost for PARM/ARM in the country, in terms of “visibility” and being on the agenda for discussions in the sector. This could be IFAD, EU and/or FAO. This would facilitate keeping the PARM/ARM agenda during meetings in the country. The country offices will not be taking any additional burden of oversight or carrying out PARM activities, but keeping PARM in the agenda during discussions in the country. This will in many ways help to address the situation of lack of “visibility” and also provide to some extent continuity in the country. It also gives credibility. It also ensures that more organizations are talking about PARM/ARM in the country. This mechanism can also ensure continuity of ARM discussions and/or facilitate investment, after PARM exits (completes its process). Furthermore, PARM should also consider involving one of the country offices of SC members’ to co-chair PARM events in the country, along with its national partners – MOA or the specialized agency. It also provides the “voice” for PARM in the country.

The business process is focussed on conducting the assessment, feasibility studies, development of tools and developing capacities and knowledge. However, institutional mechanisms and structures are not put in place simultaneously to ensure smooth operations continuity of ARM agenda in the country. It is a well-known fact that putting mechanism in place and making it functional, especially when involving government stakeholders, takes time. As per the PARM process, institutional arrangements is towards the end of its process; this should start early in the process and simultaneously with studies. This will ensure better coordination of PARM activities with the involvement national partners (beyond sending meeting invites and chairing meetings).
There is a general agreement among diverse stakeholders that the business model is sufficient at the current volume of operations. Nevertheless, this may not be adequate, if it grows – then it would require a different model and institutional arrangement. It is also possible that PARM can grow beyond the “rural finance unit” in IFAD, but likely to still remain within the division.

Currently, PARM is a well-defined entity hosted in IFAD. It is not an “add-on” in IFAD but in many ways linked to IFAD (although not an IFAD project) and the experience from PARM can be drawn upon by IFAD structures. However, there is scope to “integrate” PARM work into IFAD – this would mean that there is a ready and immediate uptake for PARM and thereby investment. In addition to KfW supported pilot projects envisaged through NEPAD, mainstreaming into IFAD and other SC members or development banks will aid institutionalized investment.

Regarding business model, PARM should remain a facilitator, in general, providing public goods and being a knowledge broker. PARM could look at evolving into a “CGAP” of ARM. Moving to be a service provider could mean moving into an area already crowded by many service providers with adequate established resources.

Conclusions

PARM is the only initiative/platform, alternative to FARMD with a holistic approach to ARM. With a dedicated small core team at the PARM Secretariat and an engaged Steering Committee, PARM has done well in overall coordination within a short period of two years, since the establishment of the PARM Secretariat. Having NEPAD as strategic partner has helped in making connections in the country and get the government interested. Overall, the relationship between SC and the PARM Secretariat and the Advisory Committee was found to work well with transparent discussions well documented. Bilateral discussions with few AC members have helped PARM; nevertheless, overall there is scope to improve the involvement of AC members.

A key area for improvement for PARM is to leverage and translate the good corporate relationship (at SC and AC) to the country level – country offices. The country offices of the financing partners could also act as the “voice” for PARM in the country forums and discussions; this would increase visibility and give “continuity” to some extent between PARM events/missions.

At the country level, the partnership MOA or its specialized agency has worked well, but other partnerships are still a work in progress and are at various stages in different countries. Partnership with development partners and private sector in the country is an important aspect to improve for PARM. PARM also needs strive to be part of country “sector mechanisms” where all investors come together.

The overall coordination has helped PARM to make progress and achieve results in the country. While PARM is very focussed on completing the assessment and studies and carrying out, there is scope to take up efforts of institutional arrangements and laying the foundation of “country coordination mechanism” early in the PARM process. Involving national partners will help creating ownership and mainstreaming/integrating ARM better in the country structures within
MOA and in the government structures. While the theory of change of PARM assumes that PARM activities will lead to ARM integration into NAIP, it is not evident from the process how ARM will be integrated into the subsequent plan; in countries where PARM has entered after the current plan is finalized and is in the process of implementation.

PARM has been involved CAADP events and other regional events in Africa and has jointly organized events with FAO, IFAD and FARMD, in terms knowledge sharing. However there is scope to be strategically involved in various regional events to share knowledge and raise the profile of PARM. As a facilitator and knowledge broker, PARM should ensure linkages with various initiatives that address components of ARM.

While context and challenges are unique to each country, PARM has been able to overcome and gain momentum and carry activities simultaneously in nine countries. Capacity building is integral to the country process and knowledge management is linked to both country process and capacity building which generate the knowledge products. The interconnection among the three components is therefore very obvious. Capacity development should be carried out through national institutions and organizations at sub-national levels to be more efficient and effective.

IFAD was seen as the ideal organization to host PARM. Integration of PARM knowledge products into IFAD and other SC development partners at corporate level is an opportunity for PARM to leverage, to facilitate investment in ARM. PARM has a strong focus on completing the country process, knowledge management and capacity development activities; it is not evident from the PARM process how investment will be attracted for “implementation” (stage 5). KfW-NEPAD funding could help to start a few pilot projects emerging out of PARM activities.

ARM is a critical and important aspect that has been neglected and not been looked at holistically, so far, even though government and development partners have been supporting farmers. The continuation of PARM Secretariat as a knowledge management platform and knowledge broker is crucial to continue the paradigm shift of thinking holistically about ARM. PARM could look at evolving into a “CGAP” of ARM. Hence it is important that PARM should not come to an end, after “opening the eyes” and starting the paradigm shift. The business operations model that PARM should evolve into in the next two years should take into consideration a combination of some or all of the aspects mentioned in the recommendations, in order to ensure continuity and have a larger impact.

### Recommendations

#### Overall Recommendations

The recommendations are provided keeping in mind both short/mid-term and long-term aspects of PARM. It has also taken into consideration aspects that PARM should take into account – a) from the perspective of carrying out its country process; b) from the point of view of how the implementation (stage 5) will be carried out. The recommendations are inter-linked in many ways and address areas to make PARM more effective.
j) **Leveraging country offices (of SC members) support/partnership during and after the country process.** Both the SC and PARM Secretariat should strive to achieve this through messaging at a corporate level and PARM staff meeting with country offices with country representatives and relevant programme managers. This is important from two aspects:

- One of the country offices (of SC members) could **act as the “voice” for PARM in the country.** This does not mean staff paid by PARM or additional responsibility for the country office. The person from the country office (IFAD or one of the SC members) can bring the topic of ARM/PARM in appropriate forums in the country. It provides credibility and sustained interest by keep ARM/PARM in the agenda in the country. This way PARM/ARM will discussed in donor forums and sector working group meetings among others, even when PARM staff are not on mission.

- It also means that PARM/ARM will be on the agenda of **country offices (of SC members)** and thereby considered during their country planning cycles and hence likely integration of ARM for investment.

- PARM should also consider involving one of the country offices of SC members’ to co-chair PARM events in the country, along with its national partners – MOA or the specialized agency

k) **PARM should plan to be present in the country “sector structures”** in the country (e.g. donor working groups, sector working group). This is crucial to gain visibility. This is an important aspect that needs to be addressed early in the country process and should continue throughout the country process. It also adds credibility which is required to get investment and integration of ARM into development partner programmes, private sector and other investors. Being present in the “sector structures” also gives opportunity to present PARM’s work, exclusively for them and discuss their interests.

- This will lead to **better connections and “visibility” with development partners** and other investors who are key actors to invest and implement.

l) Creating **“informal” coordination mechanism in the country** along with PARM focal person within the ministry of agriculture or across ministries would help institutionalization and ownership right from the beginning. PARM should involve both the PARM and CAADP focal persons together during planning/discussions at MOA and ensure that there is a mechanism for them to have regular discussions on ARM. This also helps to move away from a single-person dependency. This should **start early in the process** and building capacity to coordinate is also crucial.

m) **Ensure private sector involvement and facilitate investment.** Leveraging the expertise and experience AC members, to start with to understand how to get private sector interested in PARM’s work at the country level. Private sector plays big role in the agriculture sector, in the entire value chain - input companies, processors, aggregators, traders, packaging, warehousing, distribution to markets (internal and international), among others.
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o Partnering with the private sector could help in leveraging resources and expertise at the country level.

n) **Partnering with local universities and national/regional institutions** is important to leverage and bring ARM knowledge and capacity from policy level to farmer level at the grassroots. This will be in addition to work through extension services through the ministries of agriculture, as appropriate. Cementing the discussions already started (with Makerere University in Uganda, AGRHYMET in Niger and UGB in Senegal) into partnerships will help PARM’s work and effectiveness in the respective countries. Similarly, PARM should identify capacity building partners in other countries.

o) **PARM should create and strengthen synergies and collaborations with other relevant knowledge platforms/initiatives and establish links.** This will increase visibility and create awareness about PARM products and portfolio of services. It will also position PARM as a knowledge broker on ARM and will also leverage PARM’s effort to become a Global Platform.

  o Work with partners and other relevant organizations to have links to PARM website. The SC and AC partners can provide a page or blurb with link to PARM website. It creates access to PARM library to wider audience;

  o PARM should connect with initiative and platforms, even if they address only components of ARM. They add value and bring synergies under PARM, as a knowledge broker and platform on ARM.

  o In addition to highlighting PARM’s effort and ARM uptake in G20 discussions, **facilitate global level discussions and/or bilateral consultations on ARM** to ensure that it is getting integrated into agricultural sector programmes of bilateral and multilateral development partners and global foundations.

p) **In countries where PARM has not been able to integrate ARM into NAIP** (due to entering a country after the plan has been finalized), **PARM should have a concrete steps defined for course of action to ensure that ARM is integrated into subsequent plan** and/or how it can fit into national annual budget in the current plan, even if it is addressing only components of ARM.

q) Where applicable, if PARM continues to recruit **part-time PARM liaison officers.** However, they should not be at the junior level (event/logistics coordinator) and should be linked (attached) to IFAD or one of the development partner’s (of SC/AC) office, depending on who provides the “voice” (see earlier recommendation).

r) In the long-term, **PARM can be mainstreamed or “integrated” into IFAD** (since it was the organization of choice to host PARM) or another multilateral organization, such as FAO. This would ensure that there is a ready uptake of PARM products into programming and its investment in the countries. There have been examples of integration of “hosted facilities” being integrated into IFAD, and still continuing.
## Annex A – List of Stakeholders Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution/position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hamp</td>
<td>Lead Technical Specialist, Inclusive Rural Finance Services, IFAD Rome / Chair, PARM Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodrigo Iglesias Daveggi</td>
<td>Intra ACP and Agribusiness Programme Manager / (PARM SC Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude Torre</td>
<td>Agriculture, Rural Development and Bio-diversity, Department of Sustainable Development (DDD), Agence Française de Développement (AFD), Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lea Teresa Stuff</td>
<td>Project Manager, Rural Development, Biodiversity, Transport, East Africa, DR Congo an African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Alber</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Loew</td>
<td>Head of Division, Governance, Food Security and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariam Sow Soumare</td>
<td>Principal Programme Officer, NEPAD, Johannesburg,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Friederichs</td>
<td>Policy Issues of Development Cooperation with Africa/Africa Union – Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), Bonn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolfo Brizzi</td>
<td>Director Policy and Technical Advisory Division, IFAD Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Anton</td>
<td>Senior Programme Manager PARM Secretariat, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massimo Giovanola</td>
<td>Technical Specialist PARM Secretariat, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karima Cherif</td>
<td>Knowledge Management Officer, PARM Secretariat, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon Williams</td>
<td>Partnership and Resource Mobilization Officer, IFAD Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vittorio Buonanno</td>
<td>Finance Officer, IFAD, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauro Martini</td>
<td>M&amp;E Officer, Financing Facility and Remittances (FFR), IFAD Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Coleman</td>
<td>Weather Risk Management Facility (WRMF), Inclusive Rural Financial Services, IFAD, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bettina Prato</td>
<td>Research Coordinator, Office of the Chief Development Strategist, IFAD (IFAD focal point on G20 partnership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbosonge Mwenechanya</td>
<td>Former COMESA / PARM focal point, Lusaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filippo Brasesco</td>
<td>Agribusiness Officer, FAO Sub-regional Office, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabio Bedini</td>
<td>WFP, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulat Demeke</td>
<td>FAO, Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohamed Beavogui</td>
<td>Africa Risk Capacity, Johannesburg,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikas Choudhary</td>
<td>Senior Economist, World Bank, Washington DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Fay</td>
<td>Director of Policy and Advocacy, Corporate Affairs, Cargill, Washington DC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethiopia (September 5 – 10, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution/position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assefa Admassie Aatile</td>
<td>Principal Researcher, EEPRI/EEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filippo Brasesco</td>
<td>Agribusiness Officer, FAO Sub-regional Office, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulac Demirag</td>
<td>Country Director and Representative, IFAD Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagayehu Bekele</td>
<td>Director - Climate and Environmental Sustainability Program, ATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laketch Mikael</td>
<td>Senior Director for Environmentally Sustainable and Inclusive Agricultural Growth. ATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewodros Demeke</td>
<td>ARM Expert, ATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zena Habtewold Biru</td>
<td>Director, Planning &amp; Programming Directorate and CAADP Focal Person, MOANR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution/position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tesfaye Megistie Dore</td>
<td>Director General – Agricultural Extension Directorate, MOANR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dejene Abesha</td>
<td>Co-Chair RED&amp;FS, MOANR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesfin Tesfaye</td>
<td>Procurement and Partnerships Officer, P4P, WFP Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuela Mashayo</td>
<td>P4P Coordinator, WFP Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Zegeye</td>
<td>Manager, General &amp; Micro Insurance Business, Nyla Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilahun Gemeda</td>
<td>Senior Programme Associate (DRM), WFP Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolday Amha</td>
<td>Executive Director AEMFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bart Minten</td>
<td>Program Leader, Ethiopia Strategy Support Program, IFPRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassen Ali</td>
<td>Assistant FAO Representative, FAO Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mengesha Aresawum</td>
<td>Agribusiness Officer, FAO Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Carrasco</td>
<td>Programme Manager, Agricultural Growth, Rural Development and Food Security Section (RD&amp;FS), EU Delegation Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshetu Mulatu</td>
<td>Operations Officer, Agricultural Growth, RD&amp;FS Section, EU Delegation Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berhanu Dufera</td>
<td>Director, Financial Cooperatives Development, Federal Cooperative Agency Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nega Wubneh</td>
<td>Country Representative, Alliance for Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) / Former PARM Focal Person in ATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abebech Assefa (by Skype)</td>
<td>Team Leader for Food Security and Agricultural Growth, Embassy of Canada, Ethiopia/ Co-chair Agricultural Task Force Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uganda (September 12 – 20, 2016)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution/position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massimo Castiello</td>
<td>Deputy Country Representative, FAO Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Kerer</td>
<td>PARM Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Mugisa</td>
<td>PARM Liaison Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Talwana</td>
<td>Associate Professor (Applied Entomology and Nematology), Makerere University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndikurryayo Richard</td>
<td>Assistant Commissioner, Agricultural Statistics, MAAIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mukama P. Charles</td>
<td>Senior Vet. Inspector &amp; Desk Officer COMESA/WTO/OIC – PARM Focal Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enoth Mbiene</td>
<td>Director, Fit Uganda Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloysius Lorkeers</td>
<td>Head of Section, EU EEAS - Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aijuka Benjamin</td>
<td>Country Program Manager, East Africa Grain Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Uwamwiza</td>
<td>Operations Adviser, Agriculture and Resilience, EU Delegation in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Sentumbwe</td>
<td>Uganda Cooperative Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silim M. Nahdy</td>
<td>Executive Director, AFAAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocatum Joseph Paul</td>
<td>Senior Cooperative Officer, Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agness Atyang</td>
<td>Consultant for (PARM) Information System Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudakwashe Jech</td>
<td>Underwriting Manager, Lions Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Makosya</td>
<td>Consortium Officer, Agro Consortium, Uganda Insurers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Masiga</td>
<td>Management Accountant, FINCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Ayero</td>
<td>Inspection Officer, Insurance Regulators Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Muhoobi</td>
<td>Principal Economist, MAAIF – CAADP Focal Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alessandro Marini</td>
<td>Country Representative, IFAD Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Ogang</td>
<td>President of Uganda National Farmers Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avu Elly Biliku</td>
<td>Principal Economist, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Oryokot</td>
<td>Senior Agriculture Specialist, World Bank Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damalie Lubwama</td>
<td>Production and Market Information Manager, Cotton Development Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Institution/position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Fowler</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Livelihoods Advisor, USAID Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon Badagawa</td>
<td>Executive Director, Private Sector Foundation, Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sembambo Muhammed</td>
<td>Senior Climate Change Officer, Ministry of Water and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joesphat Byaruhanga</td>
<td>Senior Policy Officer – Agriculture and Agribusiness, Embassy of Kingdom of Netherlands, Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddharth Krishnaswamy</td>
<td>Head of Analysis, Monitoring &amp; Evaluation (AME), WFP Uganda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Niger (September 19-23, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Team Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HC3N         | • Adamou Danguioua, DPEP & Point focal/PARM  
|              | • Arimi Mahamado, DSEC                      
|              | • Matthias Benzhaf                          |
| RECA         | • Delmas Philippe                           
|              | • Aissa Kimba                                |
| FAO          | • Hama Ibrahim, Project Coordinator – Agricultural Risk and Climate Change             |
| AREN         | • Abdou Amadou, Head of Programmes          |
| PICCT/Cab/PM | • Ag Arya Moussa, Coordinator               |
| EU – Rural Development, Food Security and Decentralization Section | • Nicoletta Avella, Head of Programmes – Rural Development and Food Security  
|              | • Assoumane Oumarou, National Expert        |
| Swiss Development Cooperation | • Boureima Adamou, Programme Manager |
| DECOR/CNRA   | • Abdou Affanou. Consultant                 |
| PARM (étude) | • Abdoulkader AFANE, Consultant             |
| World Bank   | • Ba Amadou, Team Leader – Agricultural Sector                                           |
| CNEDD        | • Kamaye Maazou, Executive Secretary        |
| GIZ/PromAP   | • Thuweba Diwani, Manager Economic Analysis  
|              | • Raymond Mehou, Manager Farmer Organizations                                            |
| HC3N         | • Matthias Benzhaf, Technical Assistant     |
| AGRHYMET     | • Atta Sanoussi, Head of Training           
|              | • Etienne Sarr, Training Coordinator        |
| General Directorate of Rural Engineering DGGR/MAGEL | • Chaibou Amadou, Director - Planning of Land and Irrigation |
| General Directorate for Plant Protection (DGPV) | • Sani Mamane Moudi, Director General – Plant Protection |
| HC3N         | • Mahaman Sani Abdou, Secretary General     
|              | • Ibrahim Lemane (DSEC)                     
|              | • Saley Mahamadou (DMRC)                    
|              | • Aboubacar Mahamadou (ATN/Nutrition)       
|              | • Banzhaf Matthias (AT)                     
|              | • Diakite Mado (AT)                         |
| IRAM (by Skype)| • Jerome Costa                            |
| World Bank – FARM-D | • Vikas Choudry |
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### Annex C - Scope of the Complementary Responsibilities of the Three Leading Institutions of African Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>General Scope of the Mandate</th>
<th>Specific Responsibilities in the Light of Malabo Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **African Union Commission - Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture** | With overall goal of catalysing and fostering integration objectives in the interest of both national and continental economic growth and inclusive development goals:  
  - Facilitate overall continental policy decision and guidance  
  - Facilitate African Union legitimacy and authority  
  - Convening and organising information support and reporting to the AU policy organs |  
  - Facilitate political validation as necessary (e.g. of the CAADP Guidelines)  
  - Convening and facilitating the continental platforms to report on CAADP at the AU  
  - Country engagement to catalyse / sustain political interest and action  
  - Advocate for Africa’s agriculture development agenda in global fora |
| **NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency (NEPAD Agency)** | With overall goal of catalysing and fostering integration objectives in the interest of both national and continental economic growth and inclusive development goals:  
  - Coordinate support to member states and regional institutions on implementation of the AU growth and development decisions and initiatives (including translating decisions for implementation; support/ facilitate support in the design, execution and evaluation of national and regional development programmes) |  
  - Technical coordinating development and use of the CAADP Guidelines  
  - Technical coordination of the design and implementation of the biennial CAADP review cycle including associated M&E; learning; Reports and Reporting  
  - Facilitate and coordinate continental knowledge and information support to regional and national programming and review exercises |
| **Regional Economic Communities (RECs)** | With overall goal of catalysing and fostering regional level integration objectives in the interest of both national and continental economic growth and inclusive development goals:  
  - Organise and facilitate inter- / multi-country engagement on regional development programmes and initiatives |  
  - Support & coordinate multi-national engagement and negotiations to develop and implement multinational agricultural development programmes and initiatives  
  - Facilitate and coordinate alignment and reporting on multi-national agriculture development programmes and initiatives to regional policy organs including Ministerial and Heads of State platforms |
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Executive Summary

Introduction
The Platform for Agricultural Risk Management (PARM), a G8-G20 initiative hosted by International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), is a multi-donor partnership co-financed by the European Commission (EC), Agence Française de Développement (AFD), the Government of Italy (DGCS), and IFAD to support government and stakeholders on Agricultural Risk Management (ARM). PARM works in strategic partnership with the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD). Since its launch in December 2013, PARM is in various stages of progress in nine countries in sub-Saharan Africa.

Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation
As envisaged in the monitoring plan, the mid-term evaluation was undertaken with an aim to provide the PARM Secretariat, the Steering Committee, and the development partners an assessment of the strengths and weakness of PARM processes – including the methodology and its application at the overall coordination and the country levels. The main objective of the evaluation was to provide an independent external view of the overall PARM process, achievements in the selected countries (Ethiopia, Niger, and Uganda), and the performance of the coordination mechanisms (from launch until August 2016). This is the summary of findings in Ethiopia.

Country Context
The agriculture sector makes a substantial contribution to the economic performance of Ethiopia (43% of GDP in 2013) and has grown at an average annual rate of 7.8 percent between 2005 and 2013. In spite of falling share of agriculture to GDP (due to growth in industry and services), it remains a strategically important sector of Ethiopian economy accounting for over 80 percent of the labour force. Agriculture contributes to over 60 percent of the export earnings of Ethiopia. A variety of risks and uncertainties disrupt agricultural production and food security in Ethiopia. The Government has demonstrated a strong commitment to agriculture and rural development through allocations of more than 10 percent of the total budget. There has been limited effort to harmonize the agricultural risk management interventions

PARM launched its activities in Ethiopia by collaborating with NEPAD, Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and other national partners and jointly convening the “Policy Forum on Integrating Agriculture and Food Risk Management and Innovative Financial Services” in Addis Ababa in November 2014.

---

1 In 2016, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany (BMZ) and KfW Development Bank joined the Steering Committee of PARM and provided USD 5 million to NEPAD to build capacity and to carry-out project emerging from PARM activities
2 World Bank 2015
3 The first actions on ARM was initiated in Ethiopia by FAO and NEPAD in 2013
**Approach and Methodology**

The evaluation used a collaborative and participatory approach. The evaluation approach was process-oriented with a view to improving efficiency and effectiveness of PARM to have a better impact. Key methods used during the evaluation included key informant interview, review of documents and semi-structured observations. A mission to Ethiopia was undertaken during September 5-10, 2016. During the mission in Ethiopia, diverse stakeholders (23), including government officials, development partners, insurance companies, research institutions and non-profit organizations were interviewed.

**Key Findings and Conclusions**

**PARM has proven to be relevant to Ethiopia** because diverse policies, strategies, institutions, programs, projects, and pilots have been implemented to address agricultural and food security risk by the Government of Ethiopia and development partners; however, there has been limited effort to harmonize the agricultural risk management interventions. **PARM has been making progress in the country process in Ethiopia, to meet the demand for ARM support from the Government of Ethiopia and also at the farmer level.** With the risk assessment study not yet published and disseminated and other studies in the conception stage, it is too early to assess how the demand is being met, but the intended efforts are moving in the right direction.

Through its RAS workshop and its successive missions **PARM has brought the issue of ARM to the forefront in Ethiopia.** The ATA, the key partner of PARM, is integrating ARM into its transformation initiatives. Although the **timing of the entry of PARM into Ethiopia was considered good, in the overall context, it was late for country planning cycle, to integrate ARM into the Second Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP II) and most likely Agriculture Sector Policy Investment Framework (PIF) II.** This would mean alternate ways for PARM to keep ARM in the national discussions.

**PARM has a strong and committed partner in ATA.** However, **PARM has to build a partnership with MOANR through CAADP focal person and/or ATA.** There is **strong interest in the Government;** however, this is **yet to be leveraged by PARM.** As ARM is a catalyst providing technical support to MOANR, it is important to create a counterpart in MOANR to ensure a “coordination mechanism” to evolve and mainstream ARM into MOANR and MOLF.

As PARM is focussed on completing the rest of the steps in the country process including capacity building and knowledge management, the focus of PARM has not yet shifted to attracting investment for ARM in the country. There is **interest among development partners and research institutions to partner with PARM. This has to be leveraged** at the earliest through continuous engagement and clear strategy to engage various stakeholders (beyond attending events and making presentations). PARM should strategically plan to **be part of the RED&FS structure to ensure “visibility” and avoid “lack of continuity” in engagement between PARM events.**

**PARM needs to have a clear understanding/strategy in the country on how ARM will attract investment in Ethiopia,** as it is neither part of GTP II nor PIF II. **PARM is a process, and it works with the government as partners to create ownership. This is likely to take time, and it depends on country context, especially with recent unrests. While it is too early in the PARM process in**
Ethiopia to talk about investments, impact, and sustainability, it is important that PARM starts planning for it immediately, given the fact that considerable time has lapsed. The current process is effective and working; however, it needs to be strengthened in order to ensure broader ownership and institutionalization, specifically within the MOANR and MOLF.

**Recommendations**

The recommendations for Ethiopia are focused on immediate steps to be carried out by PARM to raise awareness and sustain interest among diverse stakeholders (including within MOANR and development partners in the country), to ensure institutionalization of ARM and to attract investments to have an impact. The key recommendations include:

a) **Complete the steps in country process quickly and without gaps**, in Ethiopia, and present findings within the next 3-6 months. This is important to raise the level of awareness and interest in ARM with tangible products. This includes finalizing/dissemination the risk assessment study, completion of the planned studies and presenting to the stakeholders. PARM and ATA should ensure appropriate and targeted wide distribution.

b) In addition to the presentation of study findings and capacity building workshop to diverse stakeholders, PARM should coordinate (through ATA and IFAD/EU) to **present to the development partners – in the RED&FS or a specific technical committee/task force**. This should be a separate event (preferably) which means tying in with the regular meeting days of the RED&FS or specific technical committee or task force.

c) In addition to the CAADP focal person in MOANR, PARM along with ATA and in consultation with MOANR (including the CAADP local person) should **identify a specific Directorate and a person within that Directorate as a counterpart to ATA**, so that ARM could be mainstreamed (for example Extension Directorate, to begin with). This person could be later become for example an “ARM unit” with people from other Directorates joining in. This is important because MOANR is the implementing institution and not ATA (which provides technical support).

d) Cement discussions with Extension Directorate and move forward in collaboration with ATA if the focus is to build capacities through the extension services mechanism. In order to meet the demand for ARM support from the farmers/smallholders **PARM has to be institutionalized into the Extension system if farmers have to benefit**. This would also mean the development of curricula in collaboration with a university in Ethiopia or a national institution. ATA is a support and technical arm of ministries of agriculture. Ultimately, the owner of ARM has to be MOANR and MOLF.

e) **Reach out to development partners in Ethiopia** in order to raise the awareness of PARM/ARM and also to facilitate mainstreaming of ARM in their investment/attracting investment for PARM products. This could be done through all or a combination of the following:
   - Targeted and multiple presentations to the development partners (only), as mentioned in the earlier recommendation – by PARM and ATA;
   - Develop a plan and strategy to highlight the added value of PARM/ARM to agricultural programming; and,
o Have a voice (‘champion’) in the country through either EU/IFAD or others, along with ATA, in the development partners’ community. This way PARM is on the agenda even between missions and after PARM.

f) If PARM has to make inroads and make ARM sustainable impact in Ethiopia, it has to **create synergies with existing initiatives in the country**. It is important that PARM finds synergies preferably in all the four national programmes. Given the context and how the agriculture sector programming is done in Ethiopia, this is critical.

g) **Ensure distribution of PARM products** (including newsletters) to a broader range of stakeholders in the country – e-copies/hard copies as applicable and relevant.

h) **Prepare a plan with an indicative timeframe of activities to be completed in consultations with ATA**, not only for completion of PARM process but also for sustainability, well before completion of country process and steps (and exit of PARM). It is important there is a shared understanding between PARM and its country partner on how ARM will be mainstreamed (as it is currently not part of GTP II and PIF II).

i) **Before exit ensure that ARM has attracted at least one or two investment** (including leveraging through the KfW-NEPAD funding). PARM could also target development partners who are entering into a new cycle of plan/strategy/programming.
1.0 Introduction

Government policies and interventions of development partners address risks in agriculture either implicitly or explicitly; nevertheless, these vary widely between countries. In the past decades, several institutions\(^4\) have placed significant emphasis on Agricultural Risk Management (ARM). However, lack of capacity, inadequate knowledge transfer among countries, and low uptake of innovation remain as constraints in agricultural risk management.

In this context, the Platform on Agricultural Risk Management (PARM), an outcome of G8 and G20 discussions,\(^5\) was launched in December 2013 to support the development of a holistic approach to risk management in agriculture. The PARM is a new partnership between development partners and developing countries to ensure risk management as an integral part of policy planning and implementation in the agricultural sector. PARM, a four-year multi-donor initiative, is co-financed by the European Commission (EC), the French Development Agency (AFD), the Government of Italy (DGCS), and IFAD, established with a budget of USD 7,775,000 (EUR 5,980,789).\(^6\) The PARM Secretariat, hosted by IFAD, manages and coordinates PARM. The PARM is governed by a Steering Committee (SC) and an Advisory Committee (AC) and managed by the Secretariat.

The initial geographical focus of PARM has been in eight countries\(^7\) in the sub-Saharan Africa, with Uganda, Niger, and Ethiopia starting activities of the PARM process first. Two additional countries, Gambia and Zambia, have also expressed interest in PARM.

The monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan of PARM, approved by the fifth PARM Steering Committee (SC) in July 2015, envisages a mid-term and a final evaluation. As part of the mid-term evaluation three countries (Ethiopia, Niger, and Uganda) were included for in-depth review. This report presents country-level findings for Ethiopia.

Purpose and Objective of the Mid-term Evaluation

The overall purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to provide the PARM Secretariat, the Steering Committee, and the development partners an assessment of the strengths and weakness of PARM processes – including the methodology and its application at the overall coordination and at the country level. The findings of this evaluation are expected to contribute to improved efficiency of PARM and facilitate acceleration of the PARM process.

\(^{1}\) Including the World Bank, the European Union (EU), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), the World Food Programme (WFP), and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

\(^{2}\) June 2011 - G20 meeting of Agriculture Ministers in Paris’ November 2011 - G20 leaders Cannes Declaration; May 2012 – G8 Factsheet on Action on Food Security; and June 2012 - G20 Los Cabos Declaration

\(^{3}\) In 2016, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany (BMZ) and KfW Development Bank joined the Steering Committee of PARM and provided USD 5 million to NEPAD to build capacity and to carry-out project emerging from PARM activities

\(^{4}\) Niger, Ethiopia, Uganda, Mozambique, Senegal, Cape Verde, Cameroon, and Liberia
The main objective of the evaluation is to provide an independent external view of the overall PARM process, achievements in the three selected countries, and the performance of the coordination mechanisms. This mid-term evaluation aims to:

a) Assess the performance of the overall PARM programme coordination; and,

b) Assess the country level activities, and provide suggestions for improvement.

In order to complete the overall analysis of PARM, the evaluation assessed the process and the approach in place in three countries, including Ethiopia, to facilitate the integration of ARM assessment and tools into the national strategies, represented by the agricultural investment and development plans. The evaluation examined the strengths and weaknesses at the country level.

This report specifically focusses on the assessment of activities at the country level in Ethiopia including the country processes, and partnerships, coordination. The report also addresses the strengths and weakness of PARM at country level (in Ethiopia) and provides suggestions for improvement.

2.0 Country PARM Context – Ethiopia

The agriculture sector makes a substantial contribution to the economic performance of Ethiopia (43% of GDP in 2013) and has grown at an average annual rate of 7.8 percent between 2005 and 2013. In spite of falling share of agriculture to GDP (due to growth in industry and services), it remains a strategically important sector of Ethiopian economy accounting for over 80 percent of the labour force. Ethiopian agriculture is typically characterized as subsistence, low-input/low-output, and rain-fed farming. According to FAO, the main food crops are maize, teff, wheat, sorghum, roots, pulses, and barley; whereas, major agricultural exports include coffee, sesame, pulses and oilseeds in addition to livestock products. Agriculture contributes to more than 60 percent of the export earnings of Ethiopia.

The agriculture sector has performed strongly over the last decade, but there is still substantial potential to improve productivity and production. The Government has demonstrated a strong commitment to agriculture and rural development through allocations of more than 10 percent of the total budget (exceeding the CAADP commitment). The sector structures play a vital role in coordination and implementation programmes and policies in agriculture in Ethiopia.

Within the CAADP Framework, agriculture and food insecurity risk management (AFIRM) has been identified as a critical area for intervention in the next ten years. Diverse policies, strategies, institutions, programs, projects and pilots have been implemented to address agricultural and

---

8 World Bank 2015
9 FAO Ethiopia Country Office 2014
11 FDRE (2010) Ethiopia’s Agriculture Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF) 2010-2020
food security risk by the Government of Ethiopia and development partners; however, there has been limited effort to harmonize the agricultural risk management interventions. A variety of risks and uncertainties disrupt agricultural production and food security in Ethiopia.

It is in this context, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) initiated steps with Government of Ethiopia, in 2013. PARM launched its activities in Ethiopia by collaborating with New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), FAO and African Rural and Agricultural Credit Association (AFRACA), and by jointly convening the “Policy Forum on Integrating Agriculture and Food Risk Management and Innovative Financial Services”\textsuperscript{13} in Addis Ababa in November 2014. The Forum was also supported by the Agricultural Transformation Agency (ATA) and the then Ministry of Agriculture.\textsuperscript{14} In this Forum, a study on ARM co-funded by FAO and PARM Secretariat was presented.

Ethiopia was one of the first countries supported by the Platform for Agricultural Risk Management (PARM), where State Ministry of Agriculture stated its intention to integrate ARM tools into existing national policy and investment plan. Since the launch of PARM, both the ATA and the Government of Ethiopia (including Ministry of Agriculture) went through a restructuring.

3.0 Approach and Methodology

The evaluation used a collaborative and participatory approach. The evaluation approach was process-oriented with the intention to improving efficiency and effectiveness of PARM to have a better impact. Overall, the approach examined the strengths and weaknesses of PARM process in Ethiopia, in addition to assessing the country process with a view to making a recommendation to facilitate acceleration of the PARM process in the country including partnership, coordination, and integration of ARM into national strategies and investment plans. The approach looked at the PARM process at country level separately for each phase – a) the first phase from setting-up to risk assessment; and, b) the second phase including tools assessment, follow-up, and implementation.

Key questions addressed as part of this mid-term evaluation were:

1. To what extent has PARM been able to meet the demand for ARM support from Government and smallholders in Ethiopia? What have been the challenges and how can they be overcome?
2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the PARM process in the target countries (Ethiopia)?

\textsuperscript{13}The first actions on ARM was initiated in Ethiopia by FAO and NEPAD in 2013
\textsuperscript{14}The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MOARD) was split into Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources (MOANR) and Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries (MOLF) in 2015 as part of restructuring
3. To what extent has PARM been effective in facilitating the integration of ARM into the national strategies and investment plans in Ethiopia? What are the key lessons? What have been the challenges?
4. To what extent has PARM enhanced awareness and built capacities of national stakeholders (government, farm organizations, smallholders, etc.) to manage agricultural risks?
5. To what extent have national stakeholders and partners been involved in the PARM process in Ethiopia?
6. Is the portfolio of services provided by PARM and its business model appropriate to respond to PARM’s goals and objectives? How could they be improved?

Key methods used during the evaluation included key informant interview, review of documents and semi-structured observations.

As part of the evaluation, in addition to interviews with Steering Committee and Advisory Committee members, a field mission to Ethiopia was undertaken during September 5 -10, 2016. During the mission in Ethiopia, diverse stakeholders (23), including government officials, development partners, insurance companies, research institutions, non-profit organizations/associations were interviewed (Annex A). Furthermore, the evaluation also reviewed both relevant corporate documents and country documents of PARM, in addition to national documents and relevant literature (Annex B).

4.0 Findings

The results presented in this section are primarily based on discussions with diverse stakeholders present in and outside Uganda and review of documents, in addition to observations made during the field mission. The findings are presented to address the key evaluation questions.

1. To what extent has PARM been able to meet the demand for ARM support from Government and smallholders in Ethiopia? What have been the challenges and how can they be overcome?

Since the launch in November 2014 in Ethiopia, PARM has been making progress in its process to meet the demand for ARM support from Government of Ethiopia. Although it is too early to assess how PARM has been able to meet the demand for ARM support at smallholder level in Ethiopia, the intended efforts of PARM are likely to meet the demand at the farmer level. It is important to note that components of ARM were looked at in “bits and pieces” (e.g. DRM, insurance, climate change, etc.) and in isolation and not as a whole, before PARM was launched in Ethiopia.

Development and growth of agriculture sector in Ethiopia has been threatened by its vulnerability of smallholders to various risks compounded by considerations of shocks and disasters. This has undermined the long-term development investment considerations. The Government of Ethiopia has developed large national (flagship) programmes - Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP),
Agricultural Growth Programme (AGP), Sustainable Land Management Programme (SLMP) and Pastoral Resilience Programme - managed by its Ministries leading the sector, to address/manage risks in the sector. However, there has been a lack of comprehensive analysis and policy on ARM.

There is no mechanism to manage agricultural risks holistically in Ethiopia. Development partners who make significant investments in the national programmes are also looking at how to deal with shocks among other agricultural risks. There is a demand from the government to address the need to mainstream ARM in agricultural risk programmes.

The “Policy Forum” (mentioned earlier) was initiated to contribute to ARM in Ethiopia. The event enabled PARM to launch and establish a partnership and a “Country Steering Committee” (discussed later). With the State Minister for Agriculture showing interest, and with no organization leading managing/discussing agricultural risk in Ethiopia, the ATA (which is the technical arm of the Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources - MOANR) became a focal organization for PARM in Ethiopia (see box).

PARM has brought the issue of ARM to the forefront in Ethiopia. During discussions with stakeholders, it was noted that before PARM, even the ATA which has been driving the transformation agenda in the country had not thought with that “lens.” PARM has highlighted the importance of a holistic approach in ARM with relevant policy decision makers in Ethiopia, in the sector.

Ethiopia does not have a strong platform on ARM. In order to meet the demand for ARM support Government, PARM undertook a Risk Assessment Study (RAS) starting from May 2015.\(^{15}\) The initial findings were presented for validation by national stakeholders in December 2015; the study report has not been finalized yet, at the time of this evaluation.\(^{16}\) During the evaluation mission (September 2016), it was noted that the ATA has taken the initiative and appointed a staff in August 2016 (with its resources) to review the RAS, conduct further analysis and fix the gaps – this reflects ownership and commitment of the ATA (PARM’s focal organization) and the importance of ARM to Ethiopia.

It was reported, that had RAS been completed earlier in 2015, there was an opportunity to integrate ARM into Growth Transformation Plan II (GTP II). However, PARM’s focal organization and many others still view PARM as a timely and helpful initiative in bringing ARM to the forefront, in Ethiopia. PARM’s advocacy and work have led to ATA looking at ARM in the broader framework now.

\(^{15}\) The study was undertaken of Natural Resources Institute (NRI), University of Greenwich – a member of Agrinatura

\(^{16}\) The evaluation noted that PARM Secretariat and ATA differed in their opinion on how ready the RAS was for finalization.
The evaluation noted from discussions that with the delay in finalization of RAS, the ATA proposed to PARM to get started with other activities in the process so that it can be taken to the government and development partners to sustain the initial interest and demonstrate added value and comparative advantage. This has led to PARM and ATA initiating activities to conduct feasibility studies/development of tools. Discussions with stakeholders also revealed that as part of PARM, different concept notes are being prepared on various issues. These included:

- Insurance linking to PSNP (rural finance department of ATA – looking for funding);¹⁷
- Impact on market prices due to humanitarian programmes in Ethiopia; and,
- Integrating ARM into agricultural extension as means to build capacity in the extension services and thereby the farmers. The evaluation noted that there is already an Agricultural Extension Strategy document in MOANR – waiting to be approved.

Stakeholders were unanimous in their view that it is important that agricultural risk and its management have to be mainstreamed and it should not be a separate programme.

For PARM to effectively to move forward to meet the demand from the Government, there is a need have an institutional arrangement in MOANR, beyond the CAADP focal point. While ATA is a key organization in Ethiopia, in the agricultural sector, to partner with, the evaluation noted that the ATA acts as a catalyst in the country, supporting the government in the transformation and solving bottlenecks. It provides the linkage and coordination with stakeholders. Discussions revealed that it is the Government (and the ministries) that carry out the implementation. Therefore, it is important to have an institutional arrangement within MOANR, as a counterpart to ATA.

Given the fact that PARM has already established a relationship with policy makers in the Ministry and there is strong interest in the Government, PARM has the opportunity to have discussions at a high level along with the ATA to create a “unit” or “case team” within MOANR. The evaluation noted from discussions that this type of arrangement (model) is not new in Ethiopia and there have been examples of similar structures in the Ministry.¹⁸

The CAADP focal person in Ethiopia is a Director of Planning and Programming Directorate (PPD) in MOANR. This is a positive situation for PARM. Nevertheless, to meet the demand for ARM in the Government and at the farmer level, ARM has to be mainstreamed in the Government, and this has not been laid out clearly – in terms of structure and/or strategy.¹⁹ In the words of a stakeholder, there is no definite “point of departure” For example – a) if ARM has to be under Extension – then it requires an overall framework to guide it; and, b) if we are looking at input supply risks – then input Directorate should also be involved. The important point to note, as remarked by stakeholders was for PARM to move quickly to meet the demand, without delaying further.

¹⁷ There is a rural finance – voucher system already developed
¹⁸ For gender there is a directorate, climate is under a CRG unit and there is nutrition unit under the extension directorate
¹⁹ This was seen as one of the weakness of the RAS in Ethiopia by the focal organization. This is also a lesson to be taken into account for RAS in other countries.
The RAS (when finalized and published) is likely to be a useful product for development partners to mainstream ARM in large and small projects. However, this remains an untapped potential for PARM. A good recent example is how IFAD Ethiopia used the draft RAS in the development of its COSOP20 and its large irrigation project (PASDIP21) in Ethiopia.

2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the PARM process in Ethiopia?

PARM, through the ATA, is leading agricultural risk management in Ethiopia. Most other initiatives are related to micro-insurance or index insurance which were found to be a pilot level project. PARM is holistic. It is also not an individual program; however, it has to be mainstreamed. PARM is cross-cutting.

The overall strengths are inherent to PARM. As reflected in discussions and review of documents, PARM is well structured and not a bureaucratic process. The PARM process brings together a variety of stakeholders. PARM has proved to be flexible. Stakeholders viewed that agriculture risk is viewed in a broader perspective and holistic manner by PARM.

Strengths of PARM, specific to Ethiopia include:

- The timing of entry of PARM into the country was considered right by various stakeholders, including the ATA;
- PARM has a very appropriate and good partner who is influential in the government and is well respected with good working relationship with development partners in the country;
- The uniqueness of PARM in Ethiopia is that it has brought the issue of ARM to the forefront in Ethiopia. Before PARM, even the ATA did not contemplate on ARM holistically. Now the ATA is also advocating for ARM (although a long way to go, it is taking appropriate steps);
- PARM has developed useful tools (as perceived by the stakeholders, based on initial workshop and website visit) and,
- The link to IFAD country office was considered good by stakeholders.

In many ways, the weaknesses noted during the evaluation for PARM in Ethiopia are all inter-related and are compounded by the fact that PARM is small. As highlighted during discussions with stakeholders, these weaknesses should be considered areas to improve. These include:

- Despite six PARM missions to Ethiopia, there is a perceived notion among stakeholders that there is “lack of continuous engagement” in the country. This is also due to the big time lap between the two PARM events, so far (in fact only one event after the launch). This, leads to the notion of PARM going “off the radar” between events/missions as informed by many stakeholders. This is also more of an inherent operational model issue for PARM which has also been compounded by other factors (internal and external).
• PARM does not have finished products and/or tools yet, in Ethiopia (although a work in progress) to take to the Government and/or the development partners to showcase/demonstrate, and discuss the added value of PARM/ARM;

• Another key weakness highlighted (which is also linked to other areas to improve) is the absence of a “local presence” in Ethiopia. This meant missing out on country forums and sector institutional structures. The appointment of a PARM liaison officer for Ethiopia recently (on a part-time basis) is a positive step, in the short-term; however, unlike in Uganda, this person is more of an event organizer/coordinator at a junior level. As viewed by many stakeholders, this is unlikely to build credibility or visibility for PARM or fulfill the gap of lack of continuous engagement (this does not mean that PARM should hire a senior level in-country local person);

• PARM’s lack of “visibility” is also compounded by other weaknesses. “Visibility” (awareness) is not evident in Ethiopia, specifically among many development partners. Even if an individual knows PARM, it does not mean that it is known organization-wide or known by a person who is structurally important in decision-making. It must also be noted that building visibility takes time (for a new initiative such as PARM), especially when resources are limited;

• Linked to visibility is the lack of PARM/ARM agenda in the Rural Economic Development and Food Security (RED&FS) sector working group structure and discussions;

• Beyond ATA, currently, PARM is only a “discussion and of interest” topic of the MOANR.\textsuperscript{22} The main link in MOANR is the CAADP focal person who is in the PPD, which is important; however, PPD does not have a mandate on ARM. Currently, the way MOANR is organized, no one has a mandate for ARM and rural finance per se.

Discussions on how they can be overcome are presented subsequently in this report and recommendations.

3. To what extent has PARM been effective in facilitating the integration of ARM into the national strategies and investment plans in Ethiopia? What are the key lessons? What have been the challenges?

PARM has been effective in facilitating the integration of ARM into the national strategies and investment plans; however, this is still a work in progress due to various reasons, in Ethiopia. Discussions with key stakeholders revealed that since PARM’s timing of completing RAS was behind the country planning cycle, it has not been able to incorporate ARM into the Second Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP II\textsuperscript{23}).

Currently, Ethiopia’s Agriculture Sector Policy Investment Framework II (PIF II) for 2016-2020 is being prepared. It was noted that the PARM focal person from the ATA and the CAADP focal

\textsuperscript{22} There is keen interest shown by State Minister and also by the Director General of Extension Services in MOANR
\textsuperscript{23} The Second Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP II), National Planning Commission, Ethiopia, September 2015
person are both involved in the task force developing the PIF II. This might be a good opportunity for ARM to be integrated into the PIF II; however, PARM needs to bring this into the discussions through the ATA. The PIF II being planned is likely to reflect GTP II. GTP II did not explicitly incorporate ARM because the ARM discussion came later; nevertheless, there is an opportunity to link ARM through – productivity and farm risks. This has to be taken up by PARM through ATA.

Although ARM is not specifically mentioned in national policies it is covered in many ways – e.g. land management, cooperatives, PSNP, market prices, capacity building, etc. Discussions with stakeholders revealed that there is a possibility that Climate Resilient Green Economy (CRGE) will be mainstreamed in PIF II; this will mean climate issues and financial risks are likely to be included. However, it is not explicitly evident if this will be due to the efforts of PARM. The challenge in mainstreaming is managing expectations and interests of different stakeholders (managing, coordinating, each one’s interest, etc.)

Currently, in Ethiopia, ARM is integrated into the ATA. It has been mainstreamed, and ARM is being considered as the fifth cross-cutting areas in addition to climate, nutrition, gender, inclusiveness (youth, FA, pastoralists) and biodiversity. This (consideration as a cross-cutting theme) is a positive step, as ATA is currently organized structurally by key issues – production and productivity; environmentally sustainable and inclusive growth; agribusiness and markets and enhanced implementation capacity; and, agriculture commercialization cluster initiative. Each of these four areas is managed by a Senior Director who reports to the Chief Executive Officer. Although PARM/ARM is “housed” under the environmentally sustainable and inclusive growth area, the importance mainstreaming within ATA is a key aspect for PARM to be a success in Ethiopia. The evaluation noted from the discussions that before restructuring ATA’s work was divided into three pillars – systems, value chain and cross-cutting. PARM, when it was launched in Ethiopia, was under Systems pillar because of rural finance. It was reported that ARM at that time was not fully integrated; it was more of an add-on. So the progress of ARM within ATA to be integrated fully is a positive direction.

PARM has been working on climate information system in Ethiopia. ATA has developed an Interactive Voice Response System (IVRS) which has been adopted by MOA and is being mainstreamed as a national program (not linked to PARM activities).

Key lessons from Ethiopia include:

- It is important to have a good partner (such as ATA);
- Top level commitment to ARM (the issue) is very crucial in Ethiopia. In spite of restructuring in the Government and the ATA and turnover of the key official handling PARM in the ATA, ARM/PARM is being still on the agenda/a topic of discussion;
- Government’s interest and support is required to mainstream ARM into MOANR – for example in extension services;

---

24 The evaluation noted that GTP I was developed by the Government and PIF I was developed by development partners. Hence there was some misalignment. In the case of GTP II and PIF II there have been more consultations between Government and development partners.
• Institutionalization within MOANR is important. While the ATA is a key agency in the sector, it is not an implementer of programmes and so it is important to have a strong counterpart in MOANR (besides the CAADP focal person) to facilitate mainstreaming within the ministry;

• For ARM to be effectively mainstreamed in Ethiopia, it is important for ARM to be integrated into the national programmes in the sector in Ethiopia (currently not done/explored); this also means PARM/ARM being present in RED&FS which supports and coordinates PIF implementation;

• Creating appropriate institutional arrangements early in the PARM process (than late in the process) will ensure better ownership and coordination mechanism (country steering committee may not be the solution as evident from Ethiopia and as remarked by stakeholders);

• Being on time to coincide with country planning cycle is essential for integration of ARM into national strategies and investment plans; Missing the cycle time could mean finding alternative process for integration, which may take more time; and,

• It is important for PARM to be current and to be quick in planning actions. Ethiopia is a dynamic environment, and hence it was important not to base findings from a workshop two years ago.

There are several initiatives related to ARM in Ethiopia. These include insurance schemes of banks and insurance companies, specifically weather index insurance (which are more at a pilot stage for several years), Ethiopia Commodity Exchange (ECX), disaster risk management of the Government of Ethiopia, and bilateral development partners’ projects on weather risk insurance and climate information. It is important for PARM to involve development partners and look at synergies of various initiatives addressing aspects of agricultural risks, in order to have a holistic impact in the country.

In addition to the focus on integrating ARM into national strategies and investment plans, it is also important for PARM to be integrated into the “sector structures” – RED&FS – this is an area to improve, mentioned earlier. It is important to understand broadly how RED&FS is structured and its importance in the sector (see box on page 11). In Ethiopia, the implementation of PIF (the country’s NAIP) is supported through the RED&FS.

---

25 Irish Aid and USAID
The Rural Economic Development and Food Security (RED&FS) Sector Working Group

The Rural Economic Development and Food Security (RED&FS) Sector Working Group was established in 2008 to provide a platform for the Government of Ethiopia (GoE), represented by the then Ministry of Agriculture with its major multi and bi-lateral development partners (DPs). The RED&FS is governed by an Executive Committee (EX-COM) composed of the State Ministers and Heads of development partners. The EX-COM is Chaired by the two Ministers (Agriculture and Livestock) and co-Chaired by two development partners on a rotation basis - at the time of this report, the World Bank and the EU were the co-Chairs.

At the time of establishment, the RED&FS mirrored the institutional structure of the then Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MOARD) and consisted of three Technical Committees (TC) corresponding to the three State Ministries: Agricultural Growth, Sustainable Land Management, and Disaster Risk Management (DRM) and Food Security (FS). Following the Government restructuring in Fall 2015, the Ministry was split into two – Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources (MOANR) and Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries (MOLF). After a series of discussion within the EX-COM, it has been agreed that the RED&FS be expanded to include two technical committees from the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries.

Furthermore, the restructuring led to the separation of DRM from Food security. The former renamed as National DRM Coordination Commission is currently situated under the Prime Minister’s Office. The latter placed under a new State Ministry for Rural Job Opportunities Creation and Food Security. Accordingly, the RED&FS now has five technical committees. Each TC has a number of taskforces (see Figure below).

Each Technical Committee (TC) is chaired by the relevant State Minister and co-Chaired by two DPs on a rotation basis. Members are directors (from the ministries) responsible for implementing the major projects in the sectors also known as flagship projects (e.g. AGP, PSNP, and SLMP) and development partners supporting same. For example, the Agriculture Growth TC is co-Chaired by Canada and Italy.

Each Technical Committee has special interest Taskforces (TF). The membership is open to development partners, NGOs and the private sector. Each TF is chaired by a government department or agency on a permanent basis and development partners on a rotation basis. For example, the Private Sector Development Taskforce is situated within the Agriculture Growth TC and presently chaired by ATA and co-Chaired by USAID.
Linked to the lessons, some challenges include:

- Not being integrated, explicitly, into GTF II and PIF II would mean there is no national policy or strategy document on ARM. This would mean more efforts to integrate into various programming independently to keep ARM on the agenda and in the discussions;

- Ethiopia is a dynamic environment, and hence it is important for PARM to move quickly when the findings are ready, and the demand is there. It needs to be quick in planning actions based on findings and moving forward; otherwise, PARM could lose its position/importance to others (e.g. FARM-D or others).\(^\text{26}\)

- PARM has to ensure that the owner of ARM is MOANR and MOLF, with the support from ATA, which is support/technical, specialized organization. For example, if ARM has to be mainstreamed into Extension Service there has to be framework and guidelines; and,

- To be on the agenda of RED&FS on a continuous basis and to attract investments/mainstreaming into programmes, PARM has to demonstrate its added value - due to its concepts and tools. Time would be big constraint for PARM. IFAD Ethiopia could be a good test case, as it has incorporated PARM concepts in its COSOP and PASDIP.

4. To what extent has PARM enhanced awareness and built capacities of national stakeholders (government, farm organizations, smallholders, etc.) to manage agricultural risks in Ethiopia?

At the time of the mid-term evaluation, it could be said that PARM has been creating awareness on ARM. There has been a considerable level of interest from the State Minister and few top policy decision-making officials in MOANR. The increased understanding at ATA has been reflected in its mainstreaming ARM in its agenda. Since the launch of PARM, there have been two events including the risk assessment validation workshop organized in Ethiopia. The workshops have been attended by diverse stakeholders from various organizations.

Furthermore, PARM Secretariat staff have undertaken six missions to Ethiopia either in conjunction with PARM events or separately. This also led to increased awareness on ARM and had built capacities in the country. However, it is too early to comment on knowledge management and capacity development at the country level, especially because RAS has not been finalized and distributed. PARM along with ATA is exploring how capacity building can be done through extension services. Stakeholders found PARM tools to be interesting at a conceptual and policy

\(^\text{26}\) World Bank, in the past was interested in ARM in Ethiopia but moved away due to various reasons, including the fact there was no owner for ARM. However, discussions in Ethiopia reveal there could be renewed interest now at the WB country level.
level; however, this needs to be taken down to the farmer level.

The Government has shown interest to integrate ARM into extension service (as indicated during discussions with MOANR and ATA); however, this has to be leveraged by PARM, sooner than later; this is currently at an early discussions and concept note stage. Integrating ARM into the extension services\(^{27}\) is crucial to building ARM capacities within MOANR and also among farmers. At the same time, PARM needs to ensure that ARM is mainstreamed into MOANR beyond extension; for example, to address input supply risks, the input Directorate of the MOANR have to be involved and stay engaged. These discussions are still at very early stage.

PARM workshop reports have been distributed to partners; some through ATA and rest from PARM directly. In order to create greater awareness, it is important for PARM to complete RAS and make the report available for wider relevant stakeholders, at the earliest (as it has been almost two years since PARM was launched in Ethiopia).

Lack of “local presence” has hindered “visibility” and awareness of PARM among many national stakeholders, especially the development partners. This has also affected PARM in “not being present” in the discussions of RED&FS\(^{28}\) structure and mechanisms and thereby low awareness of PARM. All the actors in the agriculture sector participate and are present at some level in the RED&FS structure (see discussions earlier and box in page 11).

It should be noted while individuals who have attended PARM workshops are likely to have increased awareness about ARM; it would be too early to conclude that the knowledge and capacities have been transferred to others or institutionalized in their respective organizations.

Furthermore, ATA reported that the experience from regional events organized by PARM - two experience sharing workshops – has helped national stakeholders in Ethiopia gain knowledge and learn about ARM/PARM from other countries. PARM has also been good at linking to events with CAADP/NEPAD event – so there is PARM side event with a panel in the main event. This was seen as a good practice, and the national stakeholders reported to have benefitted from it.

5. To what extent have national stakeholders and partners been involved in the PARM process in Ethiopia?

In Ethiopia, PARM is working with ATA, the key agency transforming agriculture sector. ATA is an appropriate partner, and its engagement in the PARM process has been a positive aspect.

At the time of the ATA, becoming a focal organization, ARM was not an integrated into its transformation work. It was not a focus of ATA’s work, then. ARM was more of an add-on at that point. When ATA was re-organized by issues, production, commercialization, environmental sustainability and inclusive growth, and finance, PARM ended with environmental sustainability and inclusive growth because of it also addressing climate risks. The ATA is now approaching

\(^{27}\) There are 65,000 extension (development) agents. There are structures at various levels – regional, zonal and woreda level. In each kebele there are 3 to 5 extension agents

\(^{28}\) Established in April 2008, RED&FS is the government-donor coordination platform for agriculture, natural resources management and food security in Ethiopia (http://www.moa-redfs.gov.et/) - see also page 11 box
ARM as a way of mainstreaming it or making it a cross-cutting issue in all programs. Two years ago ARM was new, but now ARM is viewed as an important aspect of agricultural transformation, by the ATA. The commitment of ATA is also reflected by the fact that ARM is under the auspices of a Senior Director and her team. A new person has been recruited at mid-level to focus on ARM (at ATA’s cost) – who is mandated with a first task of conducting further analyses and filling the gaps in the draft RAS so that it can be finalized and published for use by stakeholders in Ethiopia.

The “Country Steering Committee” that was created, never got into action (met) together in Ethiopia However, the key organizations, who were supposed to have been members of the Committee, have been involved in PARM in varying degrees, bilaterally. While it is important to have coordinating or “case” unit, regarding country coordination and monitoring mechanism, it need not be necessarily a “Steering Committee.”

If the key owner of ARM has to be MOANR or MOLF, there should be coordinating counterpart or mechanism in the ministries, as ATA is only a catalyst. PARM has not moved in this direction yet to solidify partnership and create mechanisms within MOANR, beyond ATA. Once the counterparts are decided, then ATA could work with and through them in the ministries. Currently, the only established main link in MOANR structure is the CAADP person (through PARM’s partnership with NEPAD), besides the interest of the State Minister.29

Beyond ATA, the partnerships at the country level are still a work in progress. It is more at the level of discussions and prospecting stage. IFAD Ethiopia’s connection to PARM tools in preparing COSOP30 was reported to be informal and coincidence. However, this highlights the opportunities for PARM in Ethiopia and elsewhere.

It is important for PARM to leverage connections at SC/AC to get their respective country offices partners involved at the country level. Discussions at the country office level revealed that there is keen interest, as managers in the country offices see the synergies. The involvement of most development partners has largely been limited attending PARM events in Ethiopia. The involvement of development partners has been hindered by the absence of PARM in RED&FS structure. All the development partners investing in the sector are present in RED&FS. Some of the development partners in Ethiopia, who are linked to PARM at the corporate level (SC/AC), chair various committees or task forces in the RED&FS structure (e.g. EU, Italy and FAO) in Ethiopia (see the box on page 11). PARM has not attracted the interest or been able to forge partnerships at the country level. ARM is relevant to all the big four national programs (PSNP, AGP, SLMP, and Pastoral Resilience) and all development partners investing in these programmes are present in the structure. Each of these flagship programmes also has a separate donor coordination group (this is different from the RED &FS structure. As mentioned earlier, RED&FS supports PIF implementation. Additionally, the RED&FS has a Secretariat which has two coordinators – one from MOANR and the other from the World Bank. These again provide another link to MOANR, if PARM were present in RED&FS.

29 As mentioned earlier in the report, the CAADP focal person and ATA Senior Director (PARM focal person) are working together as part of the taskforce developing the PIF II. This is of high relevance to PARM, but not due to PARM.
30 Country Strategic Opportunities Programme
Involvement of and partnership with research organizations (including IFPRI and ILRI), and universities, who have been very active in the sector in Ethiopia, has not also evolved beyond attendance and/or presentation at PARM events.

Potential key partners in the country include – micro-finance institutions, insurance companies, MOANR and MOLF, among others. Representatives from many of these organizations are involved to the extent of attending PARM events and/or presenting their risk management experiences during the events. However, there are no specific roles for these stakeholders partners. Other likely partners include – meteorological actors, cooperative unions and also private sector organizations (e.g. malt growers linked to breweries, seed producers, etc.).

An important aspect to sustain the interest of in-country partners (current and potential) in PARM is the continuous engagement. PARM also needs to progress quickly without significant time lag in order to attract partners and partnerships and their involvement. Discussions with RED&FS indicated that there was keen interest and they were involved initially when PARM was launched; however, with delays no evident progress, it lost interest, and PARM lost an opportunity to be in RED&FS and consequently the “visibility” and development partner involvement. This is an important lesson for PARM.

There is potential for IFAD Ethiopia to take a more active role in PARM advocacy. It could provide technical support, etc. IFAD could potentially invest/finance a project, based on a request from the Government if there is a feasible opportunity emerging from the PARM studies. There is also interest from EU Delegation to Ethiopia in terms of its programming in agricultural growth, rural development and food security.

There is also the potential for PARM to leverage FAO and WFP partnership and their experience in the country in the sector, including their influence on the RED&FS structure. At the country level, FAO Ethiopia is known to have better information on food security at federal and regional level than most development partners in the country. Partnership with FAO could benefit PARM in leveraging MOANR connections and relationships of FAO.31 Both PARM and FAO can benefit from sharing experience and information. WFP has also been involved in the implementation of insurance programmes for crops and livestock in Ethiopia, in addition to its major role in food security. It is important to connect with top country officials of FAO and WFP (or other development partners) to get the buy-in to ensure successful partnerships.

6. **Is the portfolio of services provided by PARM and its business model appropriate to respond to PARM’s goals and objectives? How could they be improved?**

There is no doubt among stakeholders about the appropriateness and relevance of the portfolio of service provided by PARM in Ethiopia, which includes policy support for ARM, development of systems and tools and capacity development of stakeholders. Nevertheless, it is too early to appreciate the complete impact of the various services, as it is still a work in progress in Ethiopia, with RAS not yet published. Additionally, it was not explicitly evident how PARM’ process and its

---

31 In general FAO at the country level have a close working relationship in Ministry of Agriculture (including livestock and fisheries)
business operations model will lead to investment in the country (the implementation stage of the PARM process) if ARM is not integrated into GIF II and PIF II.

At present, the business model does not explicitly ensure “visibility” and partnership with investors (including development partners). It is not clear from the model how it will be institutionalized beyond ATA or how PARM products and tools will attract investments beyond government from development partners and the private sector. The model does not have an alternate plan as PARM process has missed the country planning cycle and ARM have not been integrated into national/sectoral strategy documents – as in the case of Ethiopia where it was late for GTP II and PIF II.

The inherent weakness of PARM’s operational model, among others, is that it does not provide continuity in the country between PARM events/missions. There are structure and mechanisms and forums in the country in the agriculture sector, where PARM is not “visible” and/or not present. As remarked on several occasions, PARM is good and important conceptually; however, being “part-time” has not created the momentum. It was a unanimous voice across stakeholders (irrespective how involved they have been in PARM activities) that presence on the ground was considered to be important to have the momentum in Ethiopia. This does not necessarily mean posting PARM staff in the country full time.

The business process is focussed on conducting the assessment, feasibility studies, development of tools and developing capacities and knowledge. However, institutional mechanisms and structures are not put in place simultaneously to ensure smooth operations continuity of ARM agenda in the country. It is a well-known fact that putting mechanism in place and making it functional, especially when involving government stakeholders, takes time. As per the PARM process, institutional arrangements is towards the end of its process; this should start early in the process and simultaneously with studies.

Stakeholders viewed that while having a part-time person would help better coordination in the country in the short-term, the recent decision to appoint a junior level person for event/logistic coordination does not address the issues. One of the key highlights of the PARM process is that its contacts in Ethiopia are policy decision-makers – Senior Director (at ATA) or Director (PPD – CAADP person). This is important; if there is buy-in at a higher level, it becomes easier to get people engaged in the organization/institution. However, sustaining the interest with tangible and continuous progress is important.

With Ethiopia being home to key international and regional institutions, including the African Union and United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA), not having the strong local presence also means missing out key regional events which are relevant to PARM and the countries in the region, including Ethiopia. For example, the recent Inter-governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) event in Djibouti to sign the regional agricultural investment plan (RAIP) and the African Green Revolution Forum in Nairobi, which brought together heads of state, farmer organizations, finance and investment leads, private sector business managing commodity value chains and development partners, among others.

An aspect that PARM could look into as part of its business operations or model is to leverage the relationship with country offices of SC members. Involvement of at least one of the SC/AC
members’ country office to act as “voice” for PARM in the country will give a boost for PARM/ARM in the country, regarding “visibility” and being on the agenda for discussions in the sector. This could be IFAD, EU and/or FAO. This would facilitate keeping the PARM/ARM agenda during meetings in the country. The country offices will not be taking any additional burden of oversight or carrying out PARM activities but keeping PARM on the agenda during discussions in the country. This will in many ways help to address the situation of lack of “visibility” and also provide to some extent continuity in the country. It also gives credibility. This mechanism can also ensure continuity of ARM discussions and/or facilitate investment, after PARM exits (completes its process).

5.0 Conclusions

PARM has proven to be relevant to Ethiopia because diverse policies, strategies, institutions, programs, projects, and pilots have been implemented to address agricultural and food security risk by the Government of Ethiopia and development partners; however, there has been limited effort to harmonize the agricultural risk management interventions. PARM has been making progress in the country process in Ethiopia, to meet the demand for ARM support from the Government of Ethiopia and also at the farmer level. With the risk assessment study not yet published and disseminated and other studies in the conception stage, it is too early to assess how the demand is being met, but the intended efforts are moving in the right direction.

Through its RAS workshop and its successive missions PARM has brought the issue of ARM to the forefront in Ethiopia. The ATA, the key partner of PARM, is integrating ARM into its transformation initiatives. Although the timing of the entry of PARM into Ethiopia was considered good, in the overall context, it was late for country planning cycle, to integrate ARM into GTP II and most likely PIF II. This would mean alternate ways for PARM to keep ARM in the national discussions.

PARM has a strong and committed partner in ATA. However, PARM has to build a partnership with MOANR through CAADP focal person and/or ATA. There is a strong interest in the Government; however, this is yet to be leveraged by PARM. As ARM is a catalyst providing technical support to MOANR, it is important to create a counterpart in MOANR to ensure a “coordination mechanism” to evolve and mainstream ARM into MOANR and MOLF.

As PARM is focussed on completing the rest of the steps in the country process including capacity building and knowledge management, the focus of PARM has not yet shifted to attracting investment for ARM in the country. There is interest among development partners and research institutions to partner with PARM. This has to be leveraged at the earliest through continuous engagement and clear strategy to engage various stakeholders (beyond attending events and making presentations). PARM should strategically plan to be part of the RED&FS structure to ensure visibility and avoid “lack of continuity” in engagement between PARM events.

PARM needs to have a clear strategy on how ARM will attract investment in Ethiopia if it is neither part of GTP II nor PIF II. PARM is a process, and it works with the government as partners to
create ownership. This is likely to take time, and it depends on country context, especially with recent unrests. While it is too early in the PARM process in Ethiopia to talk about investments, impact, and sustainability, it is important that PARM starts planning for it immediately, given the fact that considerable time has lapsed. The current process is effective and working; however, it needs to be strengthened in order to ensure broader ownership and institutionalization, specifically within the MOANR and MOLF.

6.0 Recommendations

The recommendations for Ethiopia are focused on immediate steps to be carried out by PARM to raise awareness and interest among diverse stakeholders (including within MOANR and development partners in the country), ensure institutionalization of ARM and attract investments to have an impact. The key recommendations include:

a) **Complete the steps in country process quickly and without gaps**, in Ethiopia, and present findings within the next 3-6 months. This is important to raise the level of awareness and interest in ARM with tangible products. This includes finalizing/dissemination the risk assessment study, completion of the planned studies and presenting to the stakeholders. PARM and ATA should ensure appropriate and targeted wide distribution.

b) In addition to the presentation of study findings and capacity building workshop to diverse stakeholders, PARM should coordinate (through ATA and IFAD/EU) to **present to the development partners – in the RED&FS or specific technical committee/task force**. This should be a separate event (preferably) which means tying in with the regular meeting days of the RED&FS or specific technical committee or task force.

c) In addition to the CAADP focal person in MOANR, PARM along with ATA and in consultation with MOANR (including the CAADP local person) should **identify a specific Directorate and a person within that Directorate as a counterpart to ATA**, so that ARM could be mainstreamed (for example Extension Directorate, to begin with). This person could be later become for example an “ARM unit” with people from other Directorates joining in. This is important because MOANR is the implementing institution and not ATA (which provides technical support).

d) Cement discussions with Extension Directorate and move forward in collaboration with ATA if the focus is to build capacities through the extension services mechanism. In order to meet the demand for ARM support from the farmers/smallholders **PARM has to be institutionalized into the Extension system if farmers have to benefit**. This would also mean the development of curricula in collaboration with a university in Ethiopia or a national institution. ATA is a support and technical arm of ministries of agriculture. Ultimately the owner of ARM has to be MOANR and MOLF.
e) **Reach out to development partners in Ethiopia** in order to raise the awareness of PARM/ARM and also to facilitate mainstreaming of ARM in their investment/attract investments for PARM products. This could be done through all or a combination of the following:

- Targeted and multiple presentations to the development partners (only), as mentioned in the earlier recommendation – by PARM and ATA;
- Develop a plan and strategy to highlight the added value of PARM/ARM to agricultural programming; and,
- Have a voice ("champion") in the country through either EU/IFAD or others, along with ATA, in the development partners’ community. This way PARM is on the agenda even between missions and after PARM.

f) If PARM has to make in roads and make ARM sustainable impact in Ethiopia, it has to **create synergies with existing initiatives in the country**. It is important that PARM finds synergies preferably in all the four national programmes. Given the context and how the agriculture sector programming is done in Ethiopia, this is critical.

g) **Ensure distribution of PARM products** (including new letters) to a broader range of stakeholders in the country – e-copies/hard copies as applicable and relevant.

h) **Prepare a plan with an indicative timeframe of activities to be completed in consultations with ATA**, not only for completion of PARM process but also for sustainability, well before completion of country process and steps (and exit of PARM). It is important there is a shared understanding between PARM and its country partner on how ARM will be mainstreamed (as it is currently not part of GTP II and PIF II).

i) **Before exit ensure that ARM has attracted at least one or two investment** (including leveraging through the KfW-NEPAD funding). PARM could also target development partners who are entering into a new cycle of plan/strategy/programming.
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## Annex A – List of Stakeholders Interviewed in Ethiopia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution/position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Assefa Admassie Atilie</td>
<td>Principal Researcher, EEPRI/EEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filippo Brasasco</td>
<td>Agribusiness Officer, FAO Sub-regional Office, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulac Demirag</td>
<td>Country Director and Representative, IFAD Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagyehu Bekele</td>
<td>Director - Climate and Environmental Sustainability Program, ATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laketch Mikael</td>
<td>Senior Director for Environmentally Sustainable and Inclusive Agricultural Growth, ATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewodros Demeke</td>
<td>ARM Expert, ATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zena Habtewold Biru</td>
<td>Director, Planning &amp; Programming Directorate and CAADP Focal Person, MOANR</td>
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Note: In addition to the above corporate documents were reviewed with regard to the overall PARM mid-term evaluation. They are listed in overall coordination report which is part of this evaluation.
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Executive Summary

Introduction
The Platform for Agricultural Risk Management (PARM), a G8-G20 initiative hosted by International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), is a multi-donor partnership co-financed by the European Commission (EC), Agence Française de Développement (AFD), the Government of Italy (DGCS), and IFAD to support government and stakeholders on Agricultural Risk Management (ARM). PARM works in strategic partnership with the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD). Since its launch in December 2013, PARM is in various stages of progress in eight countries in sub-Saharan Africa.

Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation
As envisaged in the monitoring plan, the mid-term evaluation was undertaken with a purpose to provide the PARM Secretariat, the Steering Committee, and the development partners an assessment of the strengths and weakness of PARM processes – including the methodology and its application at overall coordination and at country levels. The main objective of the evaluation was to provide an independent external view of the overall PARM process, achievements in the selected countries (Ethiopia, Niger, and Uganda), and the performance of the coordination mechanisms. This is the summary of findings in Niger.

Country Context
Niger has a long history of agriculture risk assessment, involving a number of institutions and programmes. Central in this is a comprehensive agriculture risk assessment conducted by the World Bank in 2013, followed up with a risk assessment strategy and a suite of new and large projects. The Government of Niger has several committees, and institutions focused upon food security and climate risk, including under the President the Haut Commissariat à la mise en œuvre de l’Initiative 3N «les Nigériens Nourrissent les Nigériens» (HC3N) created in September 2011, specialized units under line ministries.

By the time PARM entered, key studies undertaken include FAO’s 2008 Review of Risk Management Tools and Policies in Niger’s Rural Sector and the World Bank’s 2013 Agricultural Sector Risk Assessment in Niger: Moving from Crisis Response to Long-term Risk Management. PARM’s Niger Risk Assessment was conducted at the request of the Government to fill the gaps in the World Bank’s assessment on but a study of three specific variables that stakeholders need to understand in order to manage risks: financial access, market access, and information.

---

1 In 2016, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany (BMZ) and KfW Development Bank joined the Steering Committee of PARM and provided USD 5 million to NEPAD
Approach and Methodology
The evaluation used a collaborative and participatory approach. The evaluation approach was process-oriented with a view to improve efficiency and effectiveness of PARM to have better impact. Key methods used during the evaluation included key informant interview, review of documents and semi-structured observations. A mission to Niger was undertaken during September 19-26, 2016. During the mission in Niger diverse stakeholders (30), including government officials, development partners, research institutions and non-profit organizations were interviewed.

Key Findings and Conclusions
The main dimension of agriculture risk in Niger is drought. Drought is well understood, is integrated into national strategies and investment plans, and is being addressed by several large existing initiatives. Other dimensions of agriculture risk are being addressed to varying degrees, but not holistically. The main challenge of PARM in Niger, therefore, was to situate itself in relation to other initiatives so that it could add value.

Niger was from the outset going to be a challenging country for PARM engagement, because of the scale and maturity of existing agriculture risk management initiatives in country. Although HC3N is the right national partner agency, it is a fact that PARM is only one among a large number of related initiatives in Niger, and it is likely that PARM may not be high on the priority with a small budget.

The reason PARM has had challenge to keep the momentum in Niger seems to be a combination of several factors: (a) an assigned subject for the Niger Risk Assessment that is helpful but not essential to the main policy and planning processes under way; (b) the turnover of key Niger stakeholders; (c) PARM business model premised upon occasional engagement in a situation where continuous engagement is necessary to keep processes moving.

Looking ahead, there is still demand in Niger that can be met by PARM: specifically for capacity development and knowledge management (with relevant information in French and national languages - and of a type and delivery mechanism that can be accessed by intermediary organizations in the regions). With regard to studies and assessments, there might be some useful new follow-up actions coming from the existing Niger Risk Assessment (depending upon the evaluation and decisions of HC3N), there will almost certainly be a need for further studies and assessments in areas of risk that have not yet been fully explored and there seems to be a general deficit in holistic risk analysis as the existing institutions, projects and initiatives are highly fragmented.

Recommendations
The recommendations are provided with an aim to guide PARM to have an impact in Niger. However, these also depend on the length of time and resources that PARM would like to commit in Niger and the demand from the country. The recommendations include:

a) Finalize and distribute the PARM studies in Niger without any further delay to diverse relevant stakeholder including development partners.
b) **Move forward on capacity development** by working through AGRHYMET and HC3N to develop Niger-adjusted ARM training programmes to be rolled out to key agencies in Niamey and especially in the regions (possibly with two channels: integrating ARM into the formal curriculum of regional universities, and in-service training in regional locations preferably in conjunction with PASEC.

c) **Conduct focussed studies, to fill gaps in risk assessment or development of tools**, based on demand and requirements.

d) **Leverage connections through the PARM Steering Committee** members to their respective country offices, in addition to local partnerships in the country to look at possibility to integrate it into their respective country strategy/plans/programmes.

e) Explore opportunities and have discussions to see if the country offices of one of the development partners in the Steering Committee could be a "spokesperson" for PARM in country “forums”. This will give PARM a boost to re-start and will also ensure some continuity in the country (between PARM missions/events).
1.0 Introduction

The Platform for Agriculture Risk Management (PARM) is an initiative of the G8-G20 specifically with focused global attention on food security and Africa. PARM is a four-year multi-donor partnership co-financed by the European Commission (EC), Agence Française de Développement (AFD), the Government of Italy (DGCS), and International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). PARM has a strategic partnership with the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD).

Its overall aim is to make risk management an integral part of policy planning and implementation in the agricultural sector. Its specific objective is to strengthen agricultural risk management (ARM) in selected developing countries, in a holistic manner, and on a demand-driven basis. PARM does this through three main channels: a process of analysis and policy dialogue called the "PARM Process", Capacity Development in the target countries, and a Knowledge Management platform. PARM is hosted by IFAD in Rome, where a small Secretariat was established in late 2014.

At planning meetings in 2013, it was decided to focus first on three countries where there was already some heightened awareness of agriculture risk: Uganda, Ethiopia, and Niger. Subsequently, it was scaled-up to five more countries in sub-Saharan Africa. Activities began in 2014, and the first wave of risk assessments and capacity development workshops were completed in 2015. In July 2015, the PARM Steering Committee approved the PARM Logical Framework and Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, and in accordance with that M&E Plan, this review was commissioned to take stock of PARM’s progress at the mid-point in its four-year timeframe.

As part of the mid-term evaluation three countries (Ethiopia Niger, and Uganda) were included for in-depth review. This report presents findings for Niger at country level.

Purpose and Objective of the Mid-term Evaluation

The overall purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to provide the PARM Secretariat, the Steering Committee, and the development partners an assessment of the strengths and weakness of PARM processes – including the methodology and its application at overall coordination and at country levels. The findings of this evaluation are expected to contribute to improved efficiency of PARM and facilitate acceleration of the PARM process.

The main objective of the evaluation is to provide an independent external view of the overall PARM process, achievements in the three selected countries, and the performance of the coordination mechanisms. This mid-term evaluation aims to:

---

1 G8 in May 2011 in Deauville; G20 Agriculture Ministers in June 2011 in Paris; G20 in November 2011 in Cannes
2 In 2016, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany (BMZ) and KfW Development Bank joined the Steering Committee of PARM and provided USD 5 million to NEPAD to build capacity and to carry-out project emerging from PARM activities.
a) Assess the performance of the overall PARM programme coordination; and,
b) Assess the country level activities, and provide suggestions for improvement.

In order to complete the overall analysis of PARM, the evaluation assessed the process and the approach in place in three countries, including Niger, to facilitate the integration of ARM assessment and tools into the national strategies, represented by the agricultural investment and development plans. The evaluation examined the strengths and weaknesses at country level.

This report specifically focuses on the assessment of activities at the country level in Ethiopia including the country processes, and partnerships, coordination. The report also addresses the strengths and weakness of PARM at country level (in Niger) and provides suggestions for improvement.

2.0 Country PARM Context – Niger

Niger’s agriculture sector is extremely volatile due to high exposure to risk and frequent shocks. This has led to a lot of work on risk management, mostly centered on drought risk in the Sahel by established institutions such as Niger’s foremost university Abdou Moumouni University, the Regional Centre for Agronomy, Hydrology and Meteorology (AGRHYMET - a specialized agency headquartered in Niamey of the Comité permanent Inter-Etats de Lutte contre la Sécheresse dans le Sahel (CILSS)), and the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT - a member of the Consultative Group for International Agriculture Research-CGIAR, which has one of three West Africa regional hubs in Niamey).

The Government of Niger has several committees and institutions focused on food security and climate risk, including under the President the Haut Commissariat à la mise en œuvre de l’Initiative 3N «les Nigériens Nourrissent les Nigériens» (HC3N) created in September 2011, specialized units under the line ministries including for example the Centre National de Lutte Anti Acridienne specifically focused on periodic locust invasions and, under the Prime Minister, the Dispositif National de Prévention et de Gestion des Catastrophes et Crises Alimentaires with operational cells for Food Crisis and Disaster Management, Humanitarian Response, Early Warning and Disaster Prevention, and Social Safety Nets.


---


---
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It was in this context that PARM/NEPAD team made its initial visit to Niger in June 2014 to attend a workshop to validate the World Bank’s proposed Agriculture Risk Management (ARM) action plan, the Plan d’Action pour la Gestion des Risques Agricoles (PAGRA)\textsuperscript{8}.

During the second mission in December 2014, PARM/NEPAD were asked by the Government’s designated agency Haut Commissariat à la mise en œuvre de l’Initiative 3N «les Nigériens Nourrissent les Nigériens (HC3N) to focus on three specific aspects of agriculture risk that had not been fully elaborated in the World Bank’s 2013 study: namely (a) access by smallholders to agriculture microfinance and to credit based on warehouse receipts (“credit warrantage” or “credit stockage”), (b) access by smallholders to national and regional markets taking into consideration market policies of neighbouring countries, and (c) information systems allowing smallholders to access information on risks, market prices and financial service providers.

PARM conducted the studies through Institut de Recherches et d’Applications des Méthodes de développement (IRAM) and national workshop was conducted in December 2015 to present the findings. At the end of the session, the feedback was provided to PARM\textsuperscript{9} that the assessment needed more information on the status and role of non-state actors in the three designated focus areas of the study (finance, market access, and information), and PARM was asked to add this further dimension to the study.

Following the workshop, IRAM was retained to carry out a second phase of field work to address the identified gaps from the initial draft, and this took place in February 2016. From March to July there was a process of drafting and review between IRAM and PARM, and a final version of the report was provided to HC3N on 23 August 2016.\textsuperscript{10} At the time of the evaluation, the final report had not yet been circulated within HC3N for review, comment and/or next steps.

### 3.0 Approach and Methodology

The evaluation used a collaborative and participatory approach. The evaluation approach was process-oriented with a view to improving efficiency and effectiveness of PARM to have better impact. Overall, the approach examined the strengths and weaknesses of PARM process in Niger, in addition to assessing the country process with a view to making recommendation to facilitate acceleration of the PARM process in the country including partnership, coordination and integration of ARM into national strategies and investment plans. The approach looked at the PARM process at country level separately for each phase – a) the first phase from setting-up to risk assessment; and, b) the second phase including tools assessment, follow-up, and implementation

Key questions addressed as part of this mid-term evaluation were:

\textsuperscript{8} [http://www.agriskmanagementforum.org/content/agricultural-sector-risk-assessment-niger](http://www.agriskmanagementforum.org/content/agricultural-sector-risk-assessment-niger)
\textsuperscript{9} Information provided by HC3N but not validated with the PARM Secretariat
\textsuperscript{10} Information provided by HC3N but not validated with the PARM Secretariat
1. To what extent has PARM been able to meet the demand for ARM support from Government and smallholders in Niger? What have been the challenges and how can they be overcome?

2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the PARM process in the target countries (Niger)?

3. To what extent has PARM been effective in facilitating the integration of ARM into the national strategies and investment plans? What are the key lessons? What have been the challenges?

4. To what extent has PARM been effective in facilitating the integration of ARM into the national strategies and investment plans? What are the key lessons? What have been the challenges?

5. To what extent have national stakeholders and partners been involved in the PARM process in each country?

6. Is the portfolio of services provided by PARM and its business model appropriate to respond to PARM’s goals and objectives? How could they be improved?

Key methods used during the evaluation included key informant interview, review of documents and semi-structured observations.

As part of the evaluation, in addition to interviews with Steering Committee and Advisory Committee members, a field mission to Niger was undertaken during September 19-23, 2016. During the mission in Niger, diverse stakeholders (30), including government officials, development partners, universities, non-profit organizations and commodity/farmers’ organizations were (Annex A). Furthermore, the evaluation also reviewed both relevant corporate documents and country documents of PARM, in addition to national documents and relevant literature.

4.0 Findings

1. To what extent has PARM been able to meet the demand for ARM support from Government and smallholders in Niger? What have been the challenges and how can they be overcome?

PARM’s three activity areas (knowledge management, capacity development, and PARM country process) are at different stages in Niger in order to holistically remark how PARM has been able to meet the demand for ARM support from Government in Niger.

The fact that PARM/NEPAD were asked by the Government’s designated agency HC3N to focus on three specific aspects of agriculture risk which required further research to complement and add value to the World Bank’s 2013 study, and PARM undertaking studies to only address those aspects (and not a full risk assessment) is evidence of PARM was meeting the specific demand for ARM support from the government.
However, it is too early to assess the utility of these studies completed by PARM\textsuperscript{11} as the final reports of these studies have only been submitted in August 2016. Based on the feedback from the workshop in December 2015, further data collection and analysis was done in 2016 to meet the demand of stakeholders and the government. It is possible that the emphasis in \textit{Projet d'Appui à l'Agriculture Sensible aux Risques Climatiques} (PASEC) on scaling up agriculture production has guided PARM to work on issues (credit, market, information) that are useful for making informed risk decisions. The recommendations from these studies have to be taken up HC3N and the country to be implemented. Implementation of recommendations will depend on political interest, integration into other initiatives or form the basis for further research.

Regarding knowledge management, many Niamey-based stakeholders are not aware of PARM, the Niger Risk Assessment, PARM’s webinars and outreach activities, or PARM’s library of newsletters, reports, and country studies. However, there are other organizations such as National Network of Agricultural Chambers of Niger (RECA)\textsuperscript{12} that regularly receives the PARM newsletters and is particularly interested in information exchange with other drought-affected PARM countries notably Ethiopia. The main constraint in connecting PARM knowledge management with Nigerien stakeholders is the language (preference for French). In this context, AGRHYMET (which has bilingual capacity and a strong network throughout West Africa) might prove to be a strategic partner for PARM’s Knowledge Management in Niger and the francophone countries in Africa.

Regarding capacity development, based on interviews and review of documents, it is evident that there is a large unmet demand for awareness creation and training on ARM, in French, at all levels ranging from inclusion of ARM in the agriculture faculty curricula of Niger’s national and especially regional universities, to in-service training for key officials, non-state service providers and farmer’s organizations in both Niamey and in the regions. The new structures being put in place by PASEC and other new programmes will include “maisons du paysan” – one-stop rural service and product distribution centres in every commune, and which hold promise as vehicles for dissemination of Niger-adapted ARM training in the future. It is not evident that PARM is currently addressing this demand – but this is a potential area for PARM focus in future.

2. **What are the strengths and weaknesses of the PARM process in Niger?**

Key strengths of PARM, identified by stakeholders in Niger, during the evaluation include:

- PARM has partnered with an appropriate counterpart institution, HC3N;
- The flexibility of PARM to adapt its model in the context of prior work by the World Bank and to focus on specific issues that had not been fully addressed by the Bank; and,
- The capacity-building seminar primarily targeted stakeholders outside Niamey.

The stakeholders in Niger also pointed out weaknesses of PARM. These include:

\textsuperscript{11} Undertaken by IRAM
\textsuperscript{12} Réseau National des Chambres d’Agriculture du Niger
• The inherent weakness in the Secretariat-based study/seminar/country mission model of PARM is that the annual or periodic events are too infrequent to build up interest and momentum in country;\(^{13}\)

• The fact that the workshop was not immediately followed by a final report. Additionally, there were also no working groups leading to an action plan after the workshop which led to the PARM process coming to a stand-still;

• In the specific case of Niger, the time lag following the workshop was too long, the momentum was lost, other initiatives and workshops have filled the space, and now most stakeholders met during the evaluation had only a distant recollection of the PARM workshop in 2015; and,

• PARM is currently not the Government of Niger’s or at least not HC3N’s priority. It is not that PARM is not valuable, but rather that, as a small, distant and peripatetic initiative, it understandably gets crowded out by the larger, more immediate and more present pressures of new large projects of World Bank and Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) following its risk assessment and its subsequent action plan - PAGRA.

The evaluation also noted during discussions that these weaknesses were also compounded by the turnover of several key actors involved in PARM’s Niger Risk Assessment (during the 21 months from the start until completion). This included: the turnover in the IRAM technical team, change of High Commissioner of the HC3N, and turnover of the PARM focal person in HC3N. While turnover is inevitable, the extent in PARM’s case was unfortunate that it affected continuity, leading to the fact that PARM’s Niger Risk Assessment may not have an “owner” or “champion”.

3. To what extent has PARM been effective in facilitating the integration of ARM into the national strategies and investment plans of Niger? What are key lessons? What were the challenges?

Some aspects of ARM, and in particular the number one identified risk in Niger which is drought, are well integrated into the national strategies and investment plans of Niger. This has been the case for several planning cycles although using a shifting vocabulary from “vulnerability analysis” to “resilience” then “agriculture risk” and more recently “climate smart agriculture”. As one stakeholder observed, “the analysis can vary but the solutions are always the same”.

Nevertheless, there are possible weaknesses in the current ARM structures in Niger. Furthermore, even though ARM is referenced in Government policies (notably the *Synthèse Plan D'action 2016-2020 de l'Initiative 3N* as well as drafts for the 2016-2020 planning and investment cycle), it is not broadly understood and internalized into plans or implemented. The gap between policy and practice cannot be easily bridged in a short period of time through studies and workshops.

\(^{13}\) Initial mission in June 2014, then one in December 2014 (launch) and another in 2015 (workshop)
Regarding the national strategies and investment plans of Niger, there is evidence in the draft documents for the Government’s 2016-2020 planning cycle that Agriculture Risk Analysis has been taken into account by international agencies and by the Government; however, they may not be directly attributable to PARM. The main work on risk analysis and strategic integration has been led by the World Bank and incorporated by the 2013 Risk Assessment Study (of World Bank), the 2014 PAGRA, and the design work in 2015 for the two World Bank flagship projects PASEC and the Regional Sahel Pastoralism Support Project (PRAPS). Interestingly, (with PARM asked to take a closer look at finance and market information), at exactly the same time as IRAM (Institut de Recherches et d’Applications des Méthodes de Développement) was working on the PARM study, the Bank had consultants working in parallel on the same questions, resulting in three technical studies to support the design of PASEC: the Rapport de l’étude sur l’amélioration de l’accès des producteurs aux informations climatiques et agro-climatiques done (November 2015), the Étude sur l’accès des agriculteurs à l’information (November 2015), and the Cahier des Charges de l’Opérateur Financier (April 2016).14

As noted during the evaluation, while World Bank work on subsequent studies has been completed, PARM’s work has still not been distributed or published. It is likely, that the work may miss the 2016-2020 planning cycle and the importance of PARM’s contribution to the design of these large World Bank programmes. From various discussions it is evident that for PARM to be effective and to get leverage for its modest resources, it needs to identify and become part of the primary existing process – which in the case of Niger was the World Bank-led process.

4. To what extent has PARM enhanced awareness and built capacities of national stakeholders (government, farm organizations, smallholders, etc.) to manage agricultural risks in Niger?

HC3N (PARM’s focal organization) is positive that the PARM’s national workshop and the two phases of the Niger Risk Assessment have indirectly influenced policy and programming processes by contributing to increased awareness about ARM, by bringing together people who might not have been collaborating previously, and by keeping these issues of finance, markets and information on the agenda of HC3N and other stakeholders during this formative period.

PARM has conducted one capacity development event in Niger in December 2015.15 Participation by 42 targeted diverse key mid-level officials from inside and outside the capital was considered a positive thing. The event was considered a success. While it could be said that it raised some awareness about ARM/PARM, it is difficult (and too early) to say that capacities of national stakeholders have been strengthened with only one seminar.

As mentioned earlier, there is a significant unmet demand for awareness-raising and training on ARM at all levels, in French. Local stakeholders including AGRHYMET16 have been interested in

---

14 These studies are not published and not publicly available.
16 Centre Régional pour l’Agronomie, l’Hydrologie et le Météorologie
the technical content of the PARM seminar and felt that it could be adapted and replicated/scaled-up to a wider audience in Niger. It is important that PARM takes steps to move forward, beyond initial discussions, in collaborating with AGRHYMET or others for capacity building in Niger.

5. **To what extent have national stakeholders been involved in the PARM process in Niger?**

HC3N is the key partner for PARM in the country. However, the turnover of personnel at the Director level and the focal person level has hindered the engagement to some extent, although the HC3N is in principle involved and committed.

AGRHYMET, which has a strong network throughout West Africa and bilingual capacity has been actively involved in the only capacity development seminar conducted and is quite interested to be involved further. However, this is yet to be leveraged by PARM.

The Capacity Development seminar, the Niger Risk Assessment analysis (two phases) and the Niger Risk Assessment Study workshop have included a broad range of stakeholders including all the key policy decision-makers. This does not necessarily mean stakeholder involvement or partner engagement. In many cases, it was one official or at most two from an institution or office who attended: and without an immediate follow-up to consolidate next steps or a mechanism to replicate and disseminate the learning within the participating organizations or throughout the country, it is not evident that the participation has had led to any institutionalization, beyond the personal learning of the participating individual. Furthermore, the person who attended might have been the person who was available, and not necessarily the person who was structurally most important – or again, the functions of staff might have changed since the workshop.

Lack of a “Country Steering Committee”, turnover of PARM focal person in HC3N, and time lag in PARM process between PARM events has made it difficult for stakeholders to remain engaged.

This time delay (lack of continuity) in the process also led to a lack of awareness among development partners also, partly due to the fact that the most major development partners met had not attended the PARM events, or there has been a turnover of the person who attended. The key development partners in the country are in general unaware of PARM including the European Union, a key donor to Niger and also to PARM. This is an important gap in a country like Niger which is largely dependent on development partner funding for programming in the sector.

6. **In Niger, are the portfolio of services provided by PARM and its business model appropriate to respond to PARM’s goals and objectives? How could they be improved?**

In spite of having a stronger partner at the national level, Niger has not been an easy operation for PARM. This was partly compounded by the turnover of personnel (relevant to PARM) at various levels and the World Bank’s risk assessment study, its subsequent plan of action, and large project financing, which preceded the PARM entry into the country. More than the question of the appropriateness of portfolio of services or the business model, it may be the question of whether it was the right time for PARM to go into Niger.
Similar to the studies done by PARM to complement the World Bank study, there is likely to be a need for smaller, quicker and more focused studies that fill immediate analytical gaps faced by HC3N and the sector.

The knowledge management aspect of PARM has potential in Niger because there is a gap in knowledge exchange between country experiences (especially research and tools in French, and knowledge that touches the other aspects of agriculture risk beyond drought). Furthermore, there is a critical gap in the dissemination of knowledge in-country, in the regions, beyond Niamey. Even though this knowledge gap is going to be partly addressed by PASEC and its strategic relationship with RECA, PASEC even with the MCC top-up is only covering 62 of Niger’s 265 communes, and it is likely to have risk biases aligned with the project objectives of production and climate change adaptation. A knowledge component associated with PASEC and covering agriculture risks more holistically might be valuable.

The PARM service that seems to be most appropriate in Niger is capacity development. The initial workshop was appreciated, there is a clear need especially for training on how to analyse risks beyond drought and integrate risk factors holistically into business planning, and on the part of the stakeholders, there is a definite interest in doing more at both the national level and in the regions. One identified gap at the local level is the capacity of communes to develop risk-aware commune development plans.

As highlighted earlier, the lack of continuous engagement limits the effectiveness of PARM’s work on risk analysis and the potential for deeper country-level engagement in knowledge management and capacity development. This suggests that the general business model of periodic support from Rome is not sufficient in the Niger context of larger existing initiatives and rapid change. Something more continuous locally is needed, either a strategic partnership with an institution like AGRHYMET or RECA, or a guaranteed larger share of the time and attention of a national counterpart in HC3N, or a dedicated ARM national technical adviser or a “spokesperson” for PARM from a development partner – or some combination of the three.17

5.0 Conclusions

The main dimension of agriculture risk in Niger is drought. Drought is well understood, is integrated into national strategies and investment plans, and is being addressed by several large existing initiatives. Other dimensions of agriculture risk are being addressed to varying degrees, but not holistically. The main challenge of PARM in Niger, therefore, was to situate itself in relation to other initiatives so that it could add value.

17 In the Niger context, where line Ministries like Agriculture or Livestock have executing responsibility and HC3N has the policy, planning and coordination responsibility, the anchor point would need to be at the strategic level of HC3N if it is in Government.
Niger was from the outset going to be a challenging country for PARM engagement, because of the scale and maturity of existing agriculture risk management initiatives in the country. Although HC3N is the right national partner agency, it is a fact that PARM is only one among a large number of related initiatives in Niger, and it is likely that PARM may not be high on the priority with a small budget.

The reason PARM has had the challenge to keep the momentum in Niger seems to be a combination of several factors: (a) an assigned subject for the Niger Risk Assessment that is helpful but not essential to the main policy and planning processes under way; (b) the turnover of key Niger stakeholders; (c) PARM business model premised upon occasional engagement in a situation where continuous engagement is necessary to keep processes moving.

Looking forward, there is still demand in Niger that can be met by PARM specifically for capacity development and knowledge management (with relevant information in French and national languages - and of a type and delivery mechanism that can be accessed by intermediary organizations in the regions). With regard to studies and assessments, there might be some useful new follow-up actions coming from the existing Niger Risk Assessment (depending upon the evaluation and decisions of HC3N), there will almost certainly be a need for further studies and assessments in areas of risk that have not yet been fully explored and there seems to be a general deficit in holistic risk analysis as the existing institutions, projects and initiatives are highly fragmented.

6.0 Recommendations

The recommendations are provided with an aim to guide PARM to have an impact in Niger. However, these also depend on the length of time and resources that PARM would like to commit in Niger and the demand from the country. The recommendations include:

f) **Finalize and distribute the PARM studies in Niger without any further delay** to diverse relevant stakeholder including development partners.

h) **Conduct focussed studies, to fill gaps in risk assessment or development of tools**, based on demand and requirements.

i) **Leverage connections through the PARM Steering Committee** members to their respective country offices, in addition to local partnerships in the country, to look at the possibility to integrate it into their respective country strategy/plans/programmes.
j) Explore opportunities and have discussions to see if the country offices of one of the development partners in the Steering Committee could be a “spokesperson” for PARM in country “forums”. This will give PARM a boost to re-start and will also ensure some continuity in the country (between PARM missions/events).
## Annex A – List of Stakeholders Interview in Niger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HC3N                          | • Dr Adamou Danguioua, DPEP & Point focal/PARM  
  • Mr Arimi Mahamado, DSEC  
  • Mr Matthias Benzhaf        |
| RECA                          | • Mr Delmas Philippe                              
  • Mme Aissa Kimba             |
| FAO                           | • Mr Hama Ibrahim, Project Coordinator – Agricultural Risk and Climate Change |
| AREN                          | • Mr Abdou Amadou, Head of Programmes             |
| PICCT/Cab/PM                  | • Dr Ag Arya Moussa, Coordinator                  |
| EU – Rural Development, Food Security and Decentralization Section | • Mme Nicoletta Avella, Head of Programmes – Rural Development and Food Security  
  • Mr Assoumame Oumarou, National Expert |
| Swiss Development Cooperation | • Mr Boureima Adamou, Programme Manager           |
| DECOR/CNRA                    | • Mr Abdou Affanu. Consultant                     |
| PARM (étude)                  | • Mr Abdoukader AFANE, Consultant                 |
| World Bank                    | • Mr Ba Amadou, Team Leader – Agricultural Sector |
| CNEDD                         | • Dr Kamaye Maazou, Executive Secretary           |
| GIZ/PromAP                    | • Dr Thuweba Diwani, Manager Economic Analysis    
  • Mr Raymond Mehou, Manager Farmer Organizations |
| HC3N                          | • Mr Matthias Benzhaf, Technical Assistant        |
| AGRHYMET                      | • Pr. Atta Sanoussi, Head of Training             
  • Mr Etienne Sarr, Training Coordinator         |
| General Directorate of Rural Engineering DGGR/MAGEL | • Mr Chaibou Amadou, Director - Planning of Land and Irrigation |
| General Directorate for Plant Protection (DGPV) | • Mr Sani Mamane Moudi, Director General – Plant Protection |
| HC3N                          | • Mr Mahaman Sani Abdou, Secretary General        
  • Mr Ibrahim Lemane (DSEC)  
  • Mr Saley Mahamadou (DMRC)  
  • Dr Aboubacar Mahamadou (ATN/Nutrition)  
  • Mr Banzhaf Matthias (AT)  
  • Mme Diakite Mado (AT)     |
| IRAM (by Skype)               | • Mr. Jerome Costa                                |
| World Bank – FARM-D           | • Mr. Vikas Choudry                              |
Annex B – List of Documents Reviewed

- Adama, Faye et al.; Rapport provisoire de la Mission d’Etude des Mécanismes de Financement de l’i3N et des conditions de mise en place du Fonds d’Investissement à la Sécurité Alimentaire et Nutritionnelle (FISAN); February 2014
- Akue, Vincent; Rapport Final (Étude finances) PASEC; April 2016
- Balla, Abdourahamane; Proposition d’une stratégie nationale de réduction des risques de catastrophes au Niger (SNRRC); April 2013
- Daouda, Mamadou; Rapport de l'étude sur « l’amélioration de l’accès des producteurs aux informations climatiques et agro-climatiques »; November 2015
- HC3N; Priorités Résilience du Pays - PRP (AGIR/NGER); May 2015
- HC3N; Synthèse Plan d’action 2016-2020 de l’Initiative 3N; April 2016
- Magha, Mohamadou; Analyse contextuelle et description du projet PASEC; November 2015
- Ministère de l’Environnement, de la Salubrité Urbaine et du Développement Durable; Cadre Stratégique de Gestion Durable des Terres (CS-GDT) au Niger et son Plan d’Investissement 2015-2029; November 2014
- PARM; Rapport de fin mission conjointe NEPAD - Plateforme de la Gestion des risques agricoles (PARM/IFAD); December 2014,
- PARM; Back to Office Report Mission to Niger; December 2014
- PARM; Mission Aide Memoire; December 2015
- PARM; Back to Office Report Mission to Niger; December 2015
- UNDP; Méthodologie de ciblage à l’échelle communale au Niger : Rapport de l’Etude; March 2013
- World Bank; Évaluation des risques du secteur agricole au Niger : De la Réaction Aux Crises à La Gestion des Risques à Long Terme; January 2013
- World Bank/HC3N; Plan d’action pour la gestion des risques agricoles au Niger (PAGRA) 2014-2023; 2013
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Executive Summary

Introduction
The Platform for Agricultural Risk Management (PARM), a G8-G20 initiative hosted by International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), is a multi-donor partnership co-financed by the European Commission (EC), Agence Française de Développement (AFD), the Government of Italy (DGCS), and IFAD to support government and stakeholders on Agricultural Risk Management (ARM). PARM works in strategic partnership with The New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD). Since its launch in December 2013, PARM is in various stages of progress in eight countries in sub-Saharan Africa.

Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation
As envisaged in the monitoring plan a mid-term evaluation was undertaken with an intent to provide the PARM Secretariat, the Steering Committee, and the development partners an assessment of the strengths and weakness of PARM processes – including the methodology and its application at overall coordination and the country levels. The main objective of the evaluation was to provide an independent external view of the overall PARM process, achievements in the selected countries (Ethiopia, Niger, and Uganda), and the performance of the coordination mechanisms. This is the summary of findings in Uganda.

Country Context
Uganda’s population of over 35 million people has about 70 percent dependent on agriculture for their livelihoods. Agriculture also contributes to more than 20 percent of the country’s GDP (22.2% in 2013/2014 and 22.5% in 2012/2013). The sector is the backbone of the economic development of the country, and hence risks in the sector will have a direct impact on the livelihood of several people and the economy. The growth in the sector is affected by weather hazard economic downturns, limited availability of improved inputs, lack of investment in infrastructure and other factors.

Uganda is one country that has advanced the most in the PARM country process, aided by the initial activities and discussion about ARM by NEPAD and Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in Uganda with Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF).

Approach and Methodology
The evaluation used a collaborative and participatory approach. The evaluation approach was process-oriented with a view to improving efficiency and effectiveness of PARM to have better impact. Key methods used during the evaluation included key informant interview, review of documents and semi-structured observations. A mission to Uganda was undertaken during

1 In 2016, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany (BMZ) and KfW Development Bank joined the Steering Committee of PARM and provided USD 5 million to NEPAD to build capacity and to carry-out project emerging from PARM activities.
September 12-20, 2016. During the mission in Uganda, diverse stakeholders (31), including government officials, development partners, universities, non-profit organizations and commodity/farmers’ organizations were interviewed

**Key Findings and Conclusions**

The concept of PARM is relevant, the PARM process is structured and effective, but attracting investment for implementation phase has not been the focus of PARM as at the time of mid-term evaluation (as PARM is focused on achieving its intended results (the steps) and moving forward simultaneously in nine countries). PARM has been able to meet the demand for ARM support from the Government and has been successful in integrating ARM into the Agriculture Sector Strategic Plan for the next five years. However, it is too early to expect PARM to meet the demand for ARM support from smallholders (at the time of this mid-term evaluation), PARM has been working on putting the building blocks in place to provide capacity building through the extension service system of MAAIF.

PARM has increased the awareness of ARM through its successive and successful events organized in Uganda. This has led to a contribution to moving the discussions in the sector from a “production” lens to “productivity.” The risk assessment study has enabled Uganda to identify and prioritize their top five risks in the sector that need to be addressed.

PARM has contributed increased understanding and capacities of diverse stakeholders (about 300) who have attended PARM events, specifically in the government and its agencies at various levels, to manage agricultural risks in Uganda. This included policy makers and technical staff of MAAIF and representatives from local government, research institutions and farmer organizations, among others, in addition to selected farmers. Nevertheless, it is too early to expect these individual capacities being transferred or institutionalized in their respective organizations. PARM’s effort to integrate ARM into extension service is a positive step in meeting the demand for ARM tools and capacity development at the farmer level.

PARM has established a strong partnership with MAAIF, through CAADP. Within MAAIF, in the last one year, it has evolved with more people being involved – PARM focal person, CAADP focal person, and the Statistics Division. Including people from Crop Directorate and Extension Directorate will also benefit PARM/ARM discussion in mainstreaming ARM into MAAIF and creating a “coordination mechanism” within MAAIF. The partnership with Makerere University has been notable for their contribution to the Risk Assessment Study and also in their interest and discussions to develop curricula for ARM training for extension services and the university students. Partnership with development partners in the country is an area that PARM has to improve.

Uptake of PARM tools and attracting of investment is an area where PARM needs to improve, in order to have a stronger impact in the country and overall, regarding its added value. The current process is effective and working; however, it needs to be strengthened in terms of a collaborative approach in the country to ensure broader ownership and institutionalization. Increasing “visibility” and ensuring continuity (in between PARM events) in the country is critical for PARM’s success. PARM is a process, and it works with the government as partners to ensure integration and to create ownership. This is likely to take time, hence starting some of the
activities such as institutional arrangements early in the process and in parallel to the studies will help PARM having greater impact and outcomes when it completes its activities.

**Recommendations**

The recommendations provided are focused on what should be done by PARM to institutionalize ARM and attract investment to have an impact. At the same time, these recommendations also are likely to guide PARM to plan the exit strategy in Uganda. The key recommendations include:

a) **Creating a coordination mechanism (e.g. an ARM “working group”) initially within MAAIF.** This could include PARM focal person, CAADP focal person, and a representative each from the Statistical Division, Extension Directorate and Pest and Diseases Directorate, which can meet on a monthly basis to discuss ARM coordination in MAAIF and in the country. This will ensure the ownership and institutionalization within MAAIF. These arrangements and mechanisms will help improve coordination of ARM activities not only at the national level but also at the sub-national government level and can serve as a link between the national and local levels of government.

b) **Integrate ARM into extension service activities (of MAAIF) to reach farmers.** ARM is already included in the extension policy. However, it is important to get ARM integrated into the extension strategy, ensure the development of curriculum for the training and the roll-out the training.
   - **At the same time,** PARM should move forward quickly in developing curricula for training the trainers and for farmers/extension agents by collaborating with Makerere University and MAAIF.
   - **The activities and discussions to integrate of ARM** into extension services and to develop curricula should happen simultaneously. It will be ideal that PARM, MAAIF, and Makerere discuss together with PARM playing a facilitator role.

c) **Reach out to development partners in Uganda** starting with country offices of SC/AC members to **integrate ARM into their investments.** This is important to answer the question of what next after PARM process.
   - **Presentations** (more than one) **in the development partners’ monthly meetings,** in the coming months, will likely to create more awareness and may open opportunities for PARM uptake/ARM mainstreaming in their investment.
   - **Leveraging KfW-NEPAD funding** may be another option.

d) **Have a clear a timeline and plan of activities to be completed before the country process comes to an end in Uganda.** With limited resources and more countries to work with, PARM should plan timelines for the exit in Uganda, if it has completed its planned process and activities. This plan should be developed and shared with MAAIF, and there should be a clear understanding between PARM and MAAIF.

e) **Coordination mechanism at the national level across ministries** is required if national budget sharing has to be ensured to address ARM holistically (as ARM is beyond MAAIF). PARM has to be cautious in calling it “National Steering Committee” as it would trigger a request for a budget. However, this may take a long time and may not be within the control of PARM, at this stage when it is towards the end of the country process. However, since it is
integrated within ASSP, it may evolve as a natural process, if MAAIF “coordination mechanism” works efficiently.
1.0 Introduction

Government policies and interventions of development partners address risks in agriculture either implicitly or explicitly; nevertheless, these vary widely between countries. In the past decades, several institutions\(^2\) have placed significant emphasis on Agricultural Risk Management (ARM). However, lack of capacity, inadequate knowledge transfer among countries, and low uptake of innovation still remain as constraints in agricultural risk management.

In this context, the Platform on Agricultural Risk Management (PARM), an outcome of G8 and G20 discussions,\(^3\) was launched in December 2013 to support the development of a holistic approach to risk management in agriculture. The PARM is a new partnership between development partners and developing countries to ensure risk management as an integral part of policy planning and implementation in the agricultural sector. PARM, a four-year multi-donor initiative, is co-financed by the European Commission (EC), Agence Française de Développement (AFD), the Government of Italy (DGCS), and IFAD, established with a budget of USD 7,775,000 (EUR 5,980,789).\(^4\) The PARM Secretariat, hosted by IFAD, manages and coordinates PARM. The PARM is governed by a Steering Committee (SC) and an Advisory Committee (AC) and managed by the Secretariat. PARM works in strategic partnership with The New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD).

The initial geographical focus of PARM is in eight countries\(^5\) in the sub-Saharan Africa, with Uganda, Niger, and Ethiopia starting activities of the PARM process first. Two additional countries, Gambia and Zambia, have also expressed interest in PARM.

The monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan of PARM, approved by the fifth PARM Steering Committee (SC) in July 2015, envisages a mid-term and a final evaluation. As part of the mid-term evaluation three countries (Ethiopia Niger, and Uganda) were included for in-depth review. This report presents country-level findings for Uganda.

Purpose and Objective of the Mid-term Evaluation

The overall purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to provide the PARM Secretariat, the Steering Committee, and the development partners an assessment of the strengths and weakness of PARM processes – including the methodology and its application at overall coordination and country levels. The findings of this evaluation are expected to contribute to improved efficiency of PARM and facilitate acceleration of the PARM process.

\(^2\) Including the World Bank, the European Union (EU), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), the World Food Programme (WFP), and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

\(^3\) June 2011 - G20 meeting of Agriculture Ministers in Paris’ November 2011 - G20 leaders Cannes Declaration; May 2012 – G8 Factsheet on Action on Food Security; and June 2012 - G20 Los Cabos Declaration

\(^4\) In 2016, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany (BMZ) and KfW Development Bank joined the Steering Committee of PARM and provided USD 5 million to NEPAD to build capacity and to carry-out project emerging from PARM activities

\(^5\) Niger, Ethiopia, Uganda, Mozambique, Senegal, Cape Verde, Cameroon, and Liberia
The main objective of the evaluation is to provide an independent external view of the overall PARM process, achievements in the three selected countries, and the performance of the coordination mechanisms. This mid-term evaluation aims to:

a) Assess the performance of the overall PARM programme coordination; and,

b) Assess the country level activities, and provide suggestions for improvement.

In order to complete the overall analysis of PARM, the evaluation assessed the process and the approach in place in the three countries, including Uganda, to facilitate the integration of ARM assessment and tools into the national strategies, represented by the agricultural investment and development plans. The evaluation examined the strengths and weaknesses at the country level.

This report specifically focusses on the assessment of activities at the country level in Uganda including the country processes, and partnerships, coordination. The report also addresses the strengths and weakness of PARM at country level (in Uganda) and provides suggestions for improvement.

2.0 Country PARM Context – Uganda

Uganda’s population of over 35 million people has about 70 percent dependent on agriculture for their livelihoods. Agriculture also contributes to more than 20 percent of the country’s GDP (22.2% in 2013/2014 and 22.5% in 2012/2013). The sector is the backbone of the economic development of the country, and hence risks in the sector will have a direct impact on the livelihood of several people and the economy.

The major cash crops are coffee, tea, cotton, tobacco, and cocoa. Other cash crops include sugar, cut-flowers, fruits and vegetables. Uganda grows 16 major food crops with includes cereals (maize, sorghum, rice), root crops (cassava, sweet potatoes, Irish potatoes), pulses (beans, cowpeas, field peas, pigeon peas) and oilseeds (groundnuts, soya beans, sesame), banana and plantains. Since 2005, Uganda also has shown a steady increase in the number of livestock and poultry.

The yields remain low as indicated by yield gaps. Uganda’s agriculture is small-scale farming; only four percent of the farms are five hectares or more. Only 16 percent of farmers belong to farmer groups, and extension staff visits only 20 percent of the farmers, according to Uganda Census for Agriculture. Only nine percent have access to agricultural credit. Agriculture in Uganda is rain-fed. Even of the potential land for irrigation, only about seven percent is currently under formal irrigation. The agricultural risks faced by Uganda are diverse.

The New Partnership for Africa Development (NEPAD) began discussions on ARM in Uganda towards the end of 2012 with technical support from Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO) as part of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programmes.
(CAADP) process. Within the CAADP Framework, agriculture and food insecurity risk management (AFIRM\(^6\)) has been identified as a critical area for intervention in the next 10 years. The initial ARM process initiated by NEPAD and FAO, led to the creation of a National Steering Committee (NSC) and development of an “ambitious” programme plan, pre-PARM. However, with planning and activities not being aligned to the Government’s funding cycle, the momentum and interest were waning. So, the entry of PARM at this point, in 2014, was very timely and appropriate; this re-started the ARM agenda in Uganda.

The interest from the Government of Uganda also helped moving the ARM agenda in the country. As remarked by one stakeholder “ARM is homegrown in Uganda”

Uganda is one country that has advanced the most in the PARM country process. The success and progress of PARM country process has been achieved in spite of elections in the country, staff turnover and change of CAADP and PARM/ARM focal person in the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF).\(^7\)

### 3.0 Approach and Methodology

The evaluation used a collaborative and participatory approach. The evaluation approach was process-oriented with a view to improving efficiency and effectiveness of PARM to have a better impact. Overall, the approach examined the strengths and weaknesses of PARM process in Uganda, in addition to assessing the country process with a view to making a recommendation to facilitate acceleration of the PARM process in the country including partnership, coordination and integration of ARM into national strategies and investment plans. The approach looked at the PARM process at country level separately for each phase – a) the first phase from setting-up to risk assessment; and, b) the second phase including tools assessment, follow-up, and implementation.

Key questions addressed as part of this mid-term evaluation were:

1. To what extent has PARM been able to meet the demand for ARM support from Government and smallholders in Uganda? What have been the challenges and how can they be overcome?
2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the PARM process in the target countries (Uganda)?
3. To what extent has PARM been effective in facilitating the integration of ARM into the national strategies and investment plans? What are the key lessons? What have been the challenges?


\(^7\) Until mid-2015, the PARM and CAADP focal person was the same individual – a Programme Officer – Technical Services of the former Plan for Modernization of Agriculture (PMA) Secretariat under MAAIF.
4. To what extent has PARM enhanced awareness and built capacities of national stakeholders (government, farm organizations, smallholders, etc.) to manage agricultural risks?

5. To what extent have national stakeholders and partners been involved in the PARM process in each country?

6. Is the portfolio of services provided by PARM and its business model appropriate to respond to PARM’s goals and objectives? How could they be improved?

Key methods used during the evaluation included key informant interview, review of documents and semi-structured observations.

As part of the evaluation, in addition to interviews with Steering Committee and Advisory Committee members, a field mission to Uganda was undertaken during September 12-20, 2016. During the mission in Uganda, diverse stakeholders (31), including government officials, development partners, universities, non-profit organizations and commodity/farmers’ organizations were interviewed (Annex A). Furthermore, the evaluation also reviewed both relevant corporate documents and country documents of PARM, in addition to national documents and relevant literature (Annex B).

4.0 Findings

The findings presented in this section are primarily based on discussions with diverse stakeholders present in and outside Uganda and review of documents, in addition to observations made during field mission. The findings are presented to address the key evaluation questions.

1. To what extent has PARM been able to meet the demand for ARM support from Government and smallholders in Uganda? What have been the challenges and how can they be overcome?

PARM has been able to meet the demand for ARM support from Government of Uganda, since the latter half of 2014. While it is too early to expect PARM to meet the demand for ARM support from smallholders (at the time of this mid-term evaluation), PARM has been working on putting the building blocks in place to provide capacity building through the extension service system of MAAIF.

As mentioned earlier, the ARM process started in Uganda with NEPAD and FAO spearheading the activities along with MAAIF, in 2012. This subsequently led to the creation of a National Steering Committee and development of an “ambitious” programme plan, pre-PARM. However, with planning and activities not aligned to funding, the momentum and interest waned. So the entry of PARM at this point in 2014 was very timely and appropriate. This re-started the ARM agenda in the country. This has led to ARM being discussed in the agriculture sector planning process and incorporated into the draft Agriculture Sector Strategy Plan 2015/16-2019/2020 (ASSP).
The Government of Uganda (GoU), specifically MAAIF, has been receptive and has shown interest; however, this has to be capitalized further. Since PARM’s launch in Uganda, in addition to the incorporation of ARM into the draft ASSP, ARM has also been included in the Extension Policy developed by the Directorate of Extensions Services - a recently created Directorate in MAAIF. The Strategy for Agricultural Extension was reported to be a draft stage, at the time of this evaluation. It is important that ARM is incorporated into this strategy also, to ensure implementation.

At the same time, PARM has been in discussions with Makarere University in Kampala to develop a short-term training module for extension workers and other MAAIF staff. The development of training module will complement and add value to the Extension Strategy when developed and help in creating awareness and capacities on ARM at the farmer level. So PARM has not only been making efforts to create a demand but through the ARM module for extension services (to be developed), it is also addressing the supply side.

PARM has created the awareness that ARM is very relevant to various ministries, beyond MAAIF, as agricultural risks are encountered along the value chain. However, this multi-sectoral approach – including land, water, finance, and trade, among others to have serious consideration, ARM discussions has to be taken up also at the national development planning processes. In Uganda, the Second National Development Plan 2015/16 – 2019/20 (NDP-II)\(^8\) does not explicitly mention about agricultural risk management; however, it mentions about climate changes investment to reduce post-harvest losses, improving infrastructure for agricultural value chain among others. It was noted that this preceded PARM and its studies; nevertheless, there is an opportunity to link to draft ASSP and leverage investments to meet demands.

By mandate, PARM is a facilitator and not a service provider. While PARM has been successful in having ARM integrated into the draft ASSP, the biggest challenge will be getting the investment for the plan. Given the fact that the first plan (pre-PARM) was able to mobilize only about 30% of the required investment\(^9\), this will be the main challenge for ARM to be holistic and integrated.

MAAIF alone cannot implement the plan. The investment for the plan has to not only come from MAAIF budget but also from other relevant ministries – for example, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MFPED), Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) and Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives (MTIC). This means that all relevant ministries should also provide a budget line for ARM. Until this is done it will remain the responsibility of only MAAIF, and so it is likely that ARM may not be addressed in its entirety. All ministries have to be involved so that they can discuss the budget, break it down and share it. However, this is a process and highly likely to take a longer period than the duration of PARM activities life in Uganda.

For this to happen there need to be a coordination mechanism. While the “country steering committee”\(^10\) brings several of these stakeholders, there is a need for a better structure and working arrangement to ensure that the coordination works effectively at the national level, even after the exit of PARM. The mechanism should also facilitate an enabling environment wherein the

---

\(^8\) Published in June 2015

\(^9\) This is based on discussions with relevant stakeholders. No document to the evaluator to confirm this.

\(^10\) Mentioned as country steering committee (formed when PARM was launched) to differentiate it from the National Steering Committee before PARM. There is still some confusion on the Steering Committee among stakeholders.
private sector is welcomed to play a role. The challenge seen in the last two years of PARM has been the irregular meetings and attendance of the “country steering committee.” The evaluation noted that “country steering committee” may not be an ideal mechanism for coordination, given the fact that even the Steering Committee for Plan for Modernization of Agriculture (PMA) in Uganda had similar issues.  

The ultimate success and value addition of PARM will be based on how the studies, capacity development, and knowledge management activities in Uganda have translated into uptake and/or integration of PARM tools and products into investments. This is also the challenge of the new draft ASSP which has integrated ARM; however, it has not been clear about how to operationalize or what investments are required and from whom. It was reported that this was being currently reviewed by the CAADP focal person and others on what resources are available and what will be required as an investment.

2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the PARM process in Uganda?

PARM’s inherent strengths also benefitted Uganda. PARM has been able to bring diverse stakeholders to discuss agricultural risk with well-founded evidence. PARM has been able to provide an understanding of what the important losses are and highlight the value of the losses. PARM has looked at risks with an investment perspective – cost-benefit and return on investment. PARM has been able to bring a commercial aspect to the discussions. It also approached ARM in a holistic manner.

Strengths of PARM specific to Uganda (not listed in any specific order) include:

- PARM has been able to carry out several successive and successful activities. Many of the activities were being done for the “first time” in PARM’s life, and the lessons from Uganda were taken to other countries;
- PARM is “housed” in MAAIF, which is the most relevant ministry; however, there are some components that have to be addressed by other Ministries and agencies (e.g. water, trade, information, etc.) in the government structure;
- As informed by several stakeholders, PARM has contributed to the discussions to move away from “production” to “productivity” in Uganda;
- PARM process has been on time to have ARM integrated into the draft Agriculture Sector Strategy Plan 2015/16-2019/2020 (ASSP);
- PARM’s work in Uganda has also led to ARM being integrated into the Extension Policy;  

---

11 Evaluation of the Plan for the Modernisation of the Agriculture (in Uganda) – September 2005
http://www.opml.co.uk/sites/default/files/PMA%20evaluation%20final%20report_0.pdf - Only 20% of the Steering Committee members attended 70% or more the 17 Steering Committee meetings held. On many occasions junior officials (below project coordinator level) were sent by organization. This does not take into account person turnovers.
12 The top 5 risks and losses due to it has been estimated by the Risk Assessment Study (RAS)
13 It was published in June 2016. However, it is yet to be approved.
14 Based on information from discussions with MAAIF and other stakeholders
• The risk assessment study and the feasibility studies are creating awareness and focus in MAAIF and among other stakeholders, on risks that are of top priority – pest and diseases, post-harvest losses and price risks; and,

• The Risk Assessment Report of Uganda has been used as a reference in other countries (e.g. in Ethiopia).

The weaknesses noted during discussions in the course of this evaluation should be considered more as areas of improvement for PARM in Uganda. These include:

• PARM has not been “visible” among some categories of relevant stakeholders – specifically the development partners, civil society organizations, and private sector (e.g. the input industry);

• With coordination managed from Rome, many stakeholders (including MAAIF) see PARM activities as “ad hoc” as they are not aware of what will be next and when despite the fact that PARM has organized the most number of events in Uganda (and PARM has progressed well in achieving intended results); this does not mean posting a staff in the country;

• PARM has been integrated into the draft ASSP but has not been fully integrated into the governance structure and implementation systems of MAAIF. This has led to low visibility even within MAAIF – partially because there could be a perception of PARM as a project that completes a set of activities (studies/workshops);

• Currently, PARM is “housed” and confined mostly in the Planning Department of MAAIF, although it should be part of the entire Ministry and mainstreamed. There have been some recent efforts to involve more people in ARM discussions within MAAIF.

• Capacity building efforts, although has developed capacities of individuals on ARM, it does not necessarily mean that it has been institutionalized;

• With Uganda advanced in the PARM process, it was not evident what investments would be made and from where the investment will come from (government, development partners, private sector, etc.) – this is required for the implementation (5th step); and,

• The plan of how long PARM would continue to carry out activities in Uganda and what it plans to accomplish in that period was not clear among stakeholders, including CAADP focal person and PARM focal person in MAAIF.

Discussions on how they can be overcome are presented subsequently in this report and recommendations.

15 The PARM focal person, the CAADP focal person and the Statistical Unit are all under the Planning and Development Department of MAAIF (see Figure 1, page 9). This does not mean they have a working interaction within the Ministry on regular basis or on ARM. This culture and mechanism has to be built in order to mainstream and institutionalize ARM.
3. To what extent has PARM been effective in facilitating the integration of ARM into the national strategies and investment plans in Uganda? What are the key lessons? What have been the challenges?

The PARM has been successful in Uganda to mainstream ARM in the planning process of the agricultural sector. In the process of developing the draft ASSP, which is the new agricultural sector investment plan, ARM\textsuperscript{16} was taken care of in all the components/themes. As the draft ASSP will be implemented not only by the agriculture sector, but also it is expected that all other relevant Ministries and Departments (e.g. MWE, MTIC, MFPED, etc.) will subsequently be able to incorporate ARM in their respective programmes that are designed to contribute to the draft ASSP. As mentioned earlier, PARM has also contributed to ARM being implemented in the new Extension Policy and in the process of being included in the draft Extension Strategy.

It is important that PARM also facilitates to further raise the importance of ARM by working on incorporating it into the National Development Plan to avoid ARM being looked at as a sector-specific issue, as ARM involves trade, processing, and packaging, logistics, finance among other which are aspects related to different ministries. As mentioned earlier, although NDP-II does not explicitly mention ARM; it details about the need for investments in reducing post-harvest losses, climate change impact, among others.

Key lessons from Uganda with reference to integration of ARM include:

- Government interest and understanding of ARM is key – able to integrate ARM into draft ASSP which is linked to NDP-II;
- For ARM to be effectively mainstreamed into the national strategies, the Planning Department of the MAAIF has to lead the process;
- Close interaction between the PARM focal person and the CAADP focal person is important. In the past (when PARM was launched in Uganda) it was one and the same person, but currently, it is under two different desks in the Planning Department, MAAIF;\textsuperscript{17}
- Institutionalization is vital. Involving more than one person in planning and carrying out PARM related activities is important. Otherwise, when the person leaves the capacity and knowledge is lost until an appropriate alternate is found. This is likely to slow down the process;
- Being on time with government planning cycle is crucial to have ARM integrated;
- Approval of draft documents (e.g. draft ASSP) takes time. Decision on investment will take longer time; and,
- In addition to the focus on integrating PARM into national strategies and investment plans, it is also important for PARM to be integrated into the MAAIF structures, an area to improve; this has been mentioned earlier also. However, it is important to understand broadly how MAAIF is structured (see Figure 1).

\textsuperscript{16} Page 46 of draft ASSP

\textsuperscript{17} In many ways it is good for PARM/ARM as more people are involved.
MAAIF has four directorates – Crop Directorate, Animal Directorate, Fisheries Directorate and the newly created Extension Directorate. Each Directorate has three departments, and under each department, there are many divisions. A Director heads each Directorate. In addition to this, there are three stand-alone Departments including Planning and Development and, Administration and Finance Department. These stand-alone Departments that support all four Directorates are headed by a Commissioner. The Planning and Development Department has four divisions, each led by an Assistant Commissioner; these include Statistics Division; Planning Division; M&E Division; and, Policy Analysis Division. While ARM was introduced into the Statistics Division after the draft ASSP, so that ARM has a “home” in the MAAIF structure, the PARM focal person and CAADP focal person (who were already nominated by MAAIF) are in the Planning Division. The Figure 1 indicates where the PARM and CAADP focal persons are in the MAAIF structure and why integration and mainstreaming into the MAAIF structure is critical for a greater PARM impact and ARM sustainability in Uganda. ARM is having a “home” in Statistics Division, is a positive sign of commitment from the Government.

Figure 1: MAAIF Structure and PARM/ARM

These institutional arrangements and mechanisms would help improve coordination of ARM activities not only at the national level but also at the sub-national level and can serve as a link between the national and local levels of government.

Linked to the lessons, some challenges for ARM, include:

18 The Division is headed by Assistant Commissioner. This will also help PARM to get into higher level of discussions in the MAAIF structure.
Translation of the draft ASSP into actionable points in the form of programmes is the next step and because it involves stakeholders outside the agriculture sector. This may take a long process as it involves discussion and allocation of budget;

Furthermore, some parts of the draft ASSP may not be effectively translated into appropriate programmes depending on the priorities of the Ministry or Agency that is relevant for a specific component considering that some of the components lie outside the agriculture sector; and,

Financial resources are always a constraining factor. Even with the draft ASSP in place and with specific programmes developed, implementation of the programmes may not be achieved as desired due to limited funding (as mentioned earlier the last Plan was able to get only 30% of the budgeted amount for investment).

4. To what extent has PARM enhanced awareness and built capacities of national stakeholders (government, farm organizations, smallholders, etc.) to manage agricultural risks in Uganda?

PARM has contributed to improved awareness, increased understanding and capacities of national stakeholders (specifically in the government at various levels) to manage agricultural risks in Uganda. This included policy makers, technical staff of MAAIF, local governments, research institutions, farmer organizations and selected farmers, among others. A combined total of about 300 participants have attended various PARM workshops/events, in the last two years, in Uganda.19

Since the last quarter of 2014, PARM has been very active in Uganda with several activities enhancing awareness and building capacities of stakeholders (government officials, representatives of smallholders) to manage agricultural risks. These include Risk Assessment Study (RAS) and identification of key high-risk areas, validation workshop of the RAS, capacity development seminar on ARM for MAAIF staff from Entebbe and local government representatives from six district, information session on ARM20, capacity building training on ARM for 45 farmers and local MAAIF staff in Eastern Uganda, the workshop on information systems for ARM, and the workshop on feasibility study on plant pest and diseases control (see box).

In all these workshops, PARM Secretariat staff and/or the international consultant have been involved in planning and facilitation the sessions. Furthermore, PARM Secretariat has undertaken

19 This is likely to include some participants who have attended multiple workshops or information sessions – double counted.
20 On the 6th Africa Day for Food and Nutrition Safety (ADFNS)
a total of four missions to Uganda (see box) separately or in conjunction with PARM events to meet key national stakeholders and potential partners. It is evident that these efforts have also enhanced the awareness and/or increased capacities and understanding. Additionally, the dedicated international PARM consultant for Uganda has also undertaken several missions which has contributed to awareness creation about PARM/ARM and also developed capacities among national stakeholders, including PARM focal point and/or CAADP focal person in MAAIF.

### Uganda Missions by PARM Secretariat

- May 25-27, 2016
- October 26-30, 2015
- June 24 – July 9, 2015
- December 8-13, 2014

PARM has initiated discussions with Makerere University to develop short-term training modules for extension workers and other staff of MAAIF and other Ministries. Makerere University has also shown a keen interest in developing ARM component to be included in an existing course and/or as a stand-alone course at Bachelor and Master level degrees in agriculture and has discussed this with PARM.

PARM’s effort and plan to integrate ARM component into extension service is a positive step towards building long-term capacities at various levels of MAAIF, in addition to the smallholders.

Nevertheless, it should be noted in spite of strong and successful start in Uganda; it is a long road ahead to see the impact of ARM integration. While PARM’s holistic approach and its effort to increase awareness about ARM have been appreciated, it was surprising note that in general there is limited in-depth awareness about PARM, its mandate, activities and expected outcomes, among some stakeholders, specifically development partners. This is also partially attributed to the turnover of staff in organizations and also attendance of stakeholders in only some of the PARM events.

Dissemination of reports of studies carried out as well as all other activities in the country have been a vehicle to cause better visibility and a better appreciation of PARM among the key stakeholders and partners. However, there is scope to improve the dissemination of PARM products to a wider audience and by various ICT vehicles. Many (specifically development partners) were keen to know more about PARM and showed interest, as it was relevant to their programming in the agriculture sector. It should be noted while individuals who have attended workshops have increased awareness and/or developed capacities on ARM; however, it is too early to expect that the knowledge and capacities have been transferred to others or institutionalized in their respective organizations. It is also likely, as noted during a discussion with a stakeholder that attending PARM event(s) could be “conceptually stimulating” but does not go beyond the person to be institutionalized into programming or investment in the organization.

PARM has already conducted a pilot capacity building and ARM awareness creation workshop at the grassroots level (which included farmers). This has been in addition to its discussions with Makerere University to increase capacities at the farmer level and also with future agriculture professionals (post-graduate and under-graduate student of agriculture). PARM should also note that it can only facilitate capacity building and provide modules and curricula but cannot carry out all capacity building activities by itself with its limited human and financial resources. In this

---
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regard, the partnership with Makerere University is crucial. It also ensures local capacities and sustainability for better impact.

5. To what extent have national stakeholders and partners been involved in the PARM process in Uganda?

At the national level, PARM through CAADP has established a strong partnership with MAAIF. The current three links for PARM in Uganda are in MAAIF are the CAADP focal person, the PARM focal person and the Statistical Unit. MAAIF is actively involved in PARM process in Uganda, Recently the Crop Directorate of MAAIF has been involved in the just completed workshop in September 2016. The discussions with Extension Directorate, MAAIF is also a positive step by PARM, going forward in building capacities of farmers through the extension agents.

Participation in PARM events by national stakeholders does not necessarily lead to partnership or involvement. Even those who attended the event have not attended all PARM events. Partnership development has therefore been forged with very few agencies, beyond MAAIF, such as Makerere University (although not formalized). Development partners have not been effectively engaged in the PARM activities, which has deprived PARM of opportunities to ensure that ARM is mainstreamed in the agenda (country plan/strategy/programming) of the different development partners.21

Uganda is one country that had a “Country/National Steering Committee,” which had met a few times, albeit changing representatives of the organizations. It was also noted that it met only when PARM Secretariat staff were on a mission in the country.

Makerere University22 has been actively involved since the beginning of the PARM process in Uganda. It is important that this partnership is made formal with a memorandum of agreement for curriculum development and delivery of training. It is important tie-up key partnerships in order to avoid delay/gaps in moving forward and/or loss of interest. If the plan is to mainstream and create awareness and build capacity through the extension system, it is important for PARM to develop a short course of one or two-week duration to create awareness in collaboration with MAAIF and Makerere University and ensure that they carry out the capacity building.

The involvement of development partners has been largely limited to the attendance at PARM events. PARM presented once in the “donor forum”; however, this has not had any impact in the development partner community in Uganda. This was clearly reflected during discussions with development partners.

Development partner engagement is crucial in Uganda to ensure ARM is being mainstreamed in their investments and programming in the agriculture sector. For example, EU is going into the next cycle of 2017-2021 (EDF11); World Bank is planning to invest USD 150 million for Agricultural Cluster Development in Uganda; the Ministry of Netherlands have continued to invest in various targeted value chains for several years; and USAID among others development partners prepare their multi-year country strategy/plans (including investment in agriculture sector). All

---

21 Development partners have 3 or 5-year cycles of strategy/programming at country level
22 It is the oldest university in East Africa.
these reflect the untapped potential for leveraging investment for PARM/ARM in Uganda; yet, work in this direction was not clearly evident.

There is scope to improve the involvement of national stakeholders and development partners in PARM process in Uganda. This was partially affected because of limited exposure/presence of PARM in meetings within the country sector institutional structures/mechanisms. For example:

- In Uganda, there is a Sector Working Group with Permanent Secretary as Chair. It meets two to four times a year. As per discussions with stakeholders, ARM has not been a discussion point in this forum, yet; and,

- There is an Agricultural Development Partners Group in Uganda – currently, co-chaired by FAO and JICA. It meets last week of every month. Although PARM has presented once in this forum, it will be a good for PARM to renew contact to present and update the group to bring PARM/ARM to “the top of the mind” item. Involving MAAIF (the focal person or a senior official from MAAIF) to make the presentation will reflect ownership and commitment from the Government (from a long-term development and sustainability perspective). It is important that the government official presents a clear message to the development partners23 – “that ARM is a priority, what do they want to do, where they are and what is required from the development partners.”

Discussions reveal there is interest in ARM among various development partners. For example, IFAD Uganda reported that it would be interested to finance the strengthening of extension services on ARM if there is a request from MAAIF. However, to ensure this, the curriculum and modules have to be developed, either with financial support from PARM or other sources. Discussion with EU country delegation in Uganda indicated that it would be interested to explore how ARM can be integrated into its agriculture and resilience programming. These are a few examples of how development partners’ involvement could be leveraged and maximized to ensure greater impact of PARM.

The involvement of private sector, with the exception of one or two insurance companies, has not been encouraging. This is an area for PARM to improve. The private sector participation in PARM events has been mostly limited to “pseudo-private sector” organizations/institutions. This could be seen from the absence of input companies in the recent findings workshop24 of pest and diseases risks in Kampala. Again the partnership with insurance companies is also not evident. In July 2016, the Government of Uganda committed USD 1.5 million to the Agro Consortium of the Uganda Insurers Association to subsidize the premiums paid by smallholders and other farmers. This amount was reported to be for the first year and is expected to double (to USD 3 million) for the subsequent years, if there is demand.25

---

23 PARM has to guide and collaborate in preparing the presentation
24 September 2016.
25 The amount will subsidize 50% of the premium for smallholder farmers and 30% of the premium for others. A smallholder is defined as one having less than 5 acres, 1-30 cattle, 1-50 pigs, less than 2000 poultry or less than 20 million USH (USD 6,000) in a season.
PARM should ensure how national stakeholders (specifically within MAAIF and if relevant other ministries) can be involved on a regular basis in planning, implementation of studies and events, without slowing the process and transferring funds to organize events. This may be too late now for Uganda, but it is a lesson to consider in other countries, to increase engagement of national partners beyond sending meeting invites and chairing the meetings. It is important that this coordination mechanism is started early in the PARM process, as this takes a longer time (to make it a practice). In the case of Uganda, this could have been the PARM focal person and CAADP person along with Statistics Unit person and/or an official from a relevant Directorate (e.g. Crop or Extension). This will also facilitate meetings on ARM/PARM in MAAIF and the country when PARM staff and/or consultant are not on a mission in Uganda. It also creates ownership and enables sustainability, in addition to better impact.

6. Is the portfolio of services provided by PARM and its business model appropriate to respond to PARM’s goals and objectives? How could they be improved?

The portfolio of services, which include policy support for ARM; development of systems and tools; and, capacity development of stakeholders are appropriate to respond to the goals and objectives of PARM. It is too early to expect a demand for ARM tools as a result of PARM activities in Uganda, as only a few farmers have been trained and provision of training through the extension service providers is a work in progress (discussion stage) at the time of this mid-term evaluation. Similarly, it is too early to comment about the uptake of PARM products for mainstreaming and/or investment, as PARM is yet to complete its fourth stage.

The recent decision to appoint a senior former MAAIF person as PARM liaison officer (local consultant position) is a positive step, in the short-term. This will definitely facilitate coordination of PARM activities; however, with PARM at an “advanced” stage in the process, it has to decide on how long it wants to stay in Uganda and what it would like to achieve and how it can get value from the PARM liaison officer to institutionalize within MAAIF, creating a “beyond planning department” working unit on ARM (with no PARM funding) to ensure that there is a mechanism for dialogue and action within MAAIF, and ensuring that assessment and feasibility studies lead to investment. This is a step (“institutional arrangement”) that should come early in the PARM process and not towards the end – another lesson for other PARM countries because creating the institutional arrangement and making it work effectively takes time.

It has to be noted that Uganda was the first country where all the steps of PARM process were “piloted” and “tested.” Methodology and tools were developed for the first time. Several of the activities provided learning for other countries. Areas of improvement for PARM’s portfolio of services suggested are likely more useful to other countries than for Uganda. These include:

- Better coordination of PARM activities with involvement of national partners;
- Clear definition of key stakeholders with roles communicated;

26 It is not a sustainable solution. While this might help in the short-term it neither helps to build ownership in MAAIF nor help in mainstreaming ARM into country processes and structures during and after PARM exits – e.g. coordination mechanism within MAAIF, presence in country “sector structures” etc.
Key national partners beyond MAAIF (or MOA) should be identified early in the process with assigned clear roles (beyond presentation and/or facilitation in workshops/chairing events);

The systems and tools developed for ARM should be harmonized with government policies and programmes; and,

Now that the risks have been identified and prioritized, the ARM tools and initiatives should be costed to guide funds mobilization.

Another aspect that PARM could look into as part of its business operations is the leveraging of relationship with the country offices of SC members. Involvement of one of the SC or AC members’ country office to act as “voice” for PARM in the country will give a boost for PARM/ARM in the country, in terms of “visibility” and being on the agenda. This could be IFAD, EU or FAO country offices. This would facilitate keeping the PARM/ARM agenda during meetings in the country. The country offices are not taking any additional burden of oversight or carrying out PARM activities but keeping the PARM in the picture. This will in many ways help to address the situation of lack of “visibility” and also provide continuity in the country. Although PARM is towards the end of its country process in Uganda, this could be part of the mechanism to put in place to continue ARM discussions and/or facilitate investment, after PARM exits (completes its process).

### 5.0 Conclusions

The concept of PARM is relevant, the PARM process is structured and effective, but attracting investment for implementation phase has not been the focus of PARM as at the time of mid-term evaluation (as PARM is focused on achieving its intended results (the steps) and moving forward simultaneously in nine countries). PARM has been able to meet the demand for ARM support from the Government and has been successful in integrating ARM into the Agriculture Sector Strategic Plan for the next five years. However, it is too early to expect PARM to meet the demand for ARM support from smallholders (at the time of this mid-term evaluation), PARM has been working on putting the building blocks in place to provide capacity building through the extension service system of MAAIF.

PARM has increased the awareness of ARM through its successive and successful events organized in Uganda. This has led to a contribution to moving the discussions in the sector from a “production” lens to “productivity.” The risk assessment study has enabled Uganda to identify and prioritize their top five risks in the sector that need to be addressed.

PARM has contributed increased understanding and capacities of diverse stakeholders (about 300) who have attended PARM events, specifically in the government and its agencies at various levels, to manage agricultural risks in Uganda. This included policy makers and technical staff of MAAIF and representatives from local government, research institutions and farmer organizations, among others, in addition to selected farmers. Nevertheless, it is too early to expect these individual capacities being transferred or institutionalized in their respective organizations.
PARM’s effort to integrate ARM into extension service is a positive step in meeting the demand for ARM tools and capacity development at the farmer level.

PARM has established a strong partnership with MAAIF, through CAADP. Within MAAIF, in the last one year, it has evolved with more people being involved – PARM focal person, CAADP focal person, and the Statistics Division. Including people from Crop Directorate and Extension Directorate will also benefit PARM/ARM discussion in mainstreaming ARM into MAAIF and creating a “coordination mechanism” within MAAIF. The partnership with Makerere University has been notable for their contribution to the Risk Assessment Study and also in their interest and discussions to develop curricula for ARM training for extension services and for the university students. Partnership with development partners in the country is an area that PARM has to improve.

Uptake of PARM tools and attracting of investment is an area where PARM needs to improve, in order to have a stronger impact in the country and overall, regarding its added value. The current process is effective and working; however, it needs to be strengthened in terms of a collaborative approach in the country to ensure broader ownership and institutionalization. Increasing “visibility” and ensuring continuity (in between PARM events) in the country is critical for PARM’s success. PARM is a process, and it works with the government as partners to ensure integration and to create ownership. This is likely to take time, hence starting some of the activities such as institutional arrangements early in the process and in parallel to the studies will help PARM having greater impact and outcomes when it completes its activities.

### 6.0 Recommendations

The recommendations provided are focussed on what should be done by PARM to institutionalize ARM and attract investment to have an impact. At the same time, these recommendations also are likely to guide PARM to plan the exit strategy in Uganda. The key recommendations include:

a) **Creating a coordination mechanism (e.g. an ARM “working group”) initially within MAAIF.** This could include PARM focal person, CAADP focal person, and a representative each from the Statistical Department, Extension Directorate and Pest and Diseases Directorate, which can meet on a monthly basis to discuss ARM coordination in MAAIF and in the country. This will ensure the ownership and institutionalization within MAAIF. These arrangements and mechanisms will help improve coordination of ARM activities not only at the national level but also at the sub-national government level and can serve as a link between the national and local levels of government.

b) **Integrate ARM into extension service activities (of MAAIF) to reach farmers.** ARM is already included in the extension policy. However, it is important to get ARM integrated into the extension strategy, ensure the development of curriculum for the training and the roll-out the training.
- At the same time, PARM should move forward quickly in developing curricula for training the trainers and for farmers/extension agents by collaborating with Makerere University and MAAIF.

- The activities and discussions to integrate of ARM into extension services and to develop curricula should happen simultaneously. It will be ideal that PARM, MAAIF, and Makerere discuss together with PARM playing a facilitator role.

c) **Reach out to development partners in Uganda** starting with country offices of SC/AC members to integrate ARM into their investments. This is important to answer the question of what next after PARM process.

  - **Presentations** (more than one) in the development partners' monthly meetings, in the coming months, will likely to create more awareness and may open opportunities for PARM uptake/ARM mainstreaming in their investment.

  - **Leveraging KfW-NEPAD funding** may be another option.

d) **Have a clear a timeline and plan of activities to be completed before the country process comes to an end in Uganda.** With limited resources and more countries to work with, PARM should plan timelines for the exit in Uganda, if it has completed its planned process and activities. This plan should be developed and shared with MAAIF, and there should be a clear understanding between PARM and MAAIF.

e) **Coordination mechanism at the national level across ministries** is required if national budget sharing has to be ensured to address ARM holistically (as ARM is beyond MAAIF). PARM has to be cautious in calling it “National Steering Committee” as it would trigger a request for a budget. However, this may take a long time and may not be within the control of PARM, at this stage when it is towards the end of the country process. However, since it is integrated within ASSP, it may evolve as a natural process, if MAAIF “coordination mechanism” works efficiently.
### Annex A - List of Stakeholders Interviewed in Uganda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution/position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massimo Castiello</td>
<td>Deputy Country Representative, FAO Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Kerer</td>
<td>PARM Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Mugisa</td>
<td>PARM Liaison Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Talwana</td>
<td>Associate Professor (Applied Entomology and Nematology), Makerere University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Ndikuryayo</td>
<td>Assistant Commissioner, Agricultural Statistics, MAAIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles P. Mukama</td>
<td>Senior Vet. Inspector &amp; Desk Officer COMESA/WTO/OIC – PARM Focal Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Hakuza</td>
<td>EWS and FS Desk Officer and Senior Economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enoth Mbeine</td>
<td>Director, Fit Uganda Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloysius Lorkeers</td>
<td>Head of Section, EU EEAS - Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Aijuka</td>
<td>Country Program Manager, East Africa Grain Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Uwamwiza</td>
<td>Operations Adviser, Agriculture and Resilience, EU Delegation in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Sentumbwe</td>
<td>Uganda Cooperative Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silim M. Nahdy</td>
<td>Executive Director, AFAAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Paul Ocatum</td>
<td>Senior Cooperative Officer, Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agness Atyang</td>
<td>Consultant for (PARM) Information System Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeche Kudakwashe</td>
<td>Underwriting Manager, Lions Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Makosya</td>
<td>Consortium Officer, Agro Consortium, Uganda Insurers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Masiga</td>
<td>Management Accountant, FINCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Ayero</td>
<td>Inspection Officer, Insurance Regulators Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Muhoozi</td>
<td>Principal Economist, MAAIF – CAADP Focal Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alessandro Marini</td>
<td>Country Representative, IFAD Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Ogang</td>
<td>President of Uganda National Farmers Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avu Elly Biliku</td>
<td>Principal Economist, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Oryokot</td>
<td>Senior Agriculture Specialist, World Bank Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damalie Lubwama</td>
<td>Production and Market Information Manager, Cotton Development Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Fowler</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Livelihoods Advisor, USAID Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon Badagawa</td>
<td>Executive Director, Private Sector Foundation, Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed Sembambo</td>
<td>Senior Climate Change Officer, Ministry of Water and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joesphat Byaruhanga</td>
<td>Senior Policy Officer – Agriculture and Agribusiness, Embassy of Kingdom of Netherlands, Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddharth Krishnaswamy</td>
<td>Head of Analysis, Monitoring &amp; Evaluation (AME), WFP Uganda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex B – List of Documents Reviewed – Specific to Uganda

- PARM Implementation Strategy Uganda 2016
- Invitation for Information System Workshop – Kampala, Uganda, May 26, 2016
- BTOR – Mission to Uganda, June 24 to July 9, 2015
- BTOR – Mission to Kampala and Mbale, Uganda, December 5-12, 2015
- Agenda for PARM Seminar on Agricultural Risk Management for Farmers’ Organization, December 2015
- Uganda Agricultural Risk Assessment Study – Executive Summary, October 2015
- PARM ADFSN Events – Concept Note and Agenda, Uganda, October 2015
- Uganda Agricultural Risk Assessment Study Validation Workshop – Volume II Main Presentations, July 2015
- Knowledge Management and Communication – Field Mission Plan, Uganda, July 4-9, 2015
- Draft Note for the National ARM Steering Committee/Platform on the Outcome of Agricultural Risk Assessment Study Validation Workshop, Kampala June 29-30, 2015
- Road Map Uganda, NSC, December 2014
- BTOR – PARM Country Visit to Uganda, December 8-13, 2014
- MAAIF (2009), CAADP Stock-taking, Brochure 1-6, October 2009.
- Note on Kungula Agriculture Insurance Products, Uganda

Note: In addition to the above corporate documents were reviewed with regard to the overall PARM mid-term evaluation. They are listed in overall coordination report which is part of this evaluation