

### Lessons for Effective Development Planning: Evaluation of the Pre-final Version of the Draft Malawi's Agriculture Investment Plan (NAIP2)

Nic J.J. Olivier, Sheryl L. Hendriks, Elizabeth Mkandawire,  
Nico J.J. Olivier, and Clara Williams

#### Background and Introduction

Dramatic change has been happening in Africa for at least the past decade. Agricultural transformation in Africa is leading to tangible impacts on economic growth, poverty reduction and reducing under nutrition. Much of the progress can be attributed to the revived focus on agriculture as a driver of inclusive economic growth through the Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP). The CAADP was initiated through the 2003 Maputo Declaration on Agriculture and Food Security in Africa (AU 2003), and sought to achieve Millennium Development Goal One (MDG-1) to halve the turn of the century levels of extreme poverty and hunger by 2015.

The main goal of the 2003 CAADP is to help African countries attain higher rates of inclusive economic growth through agriculture, forestry, and fisheries sector-led development that eliminates hunger, reduces poverty, food insecurity, and malnutrition, and enables the expansion of agricultural exports. Despite some progress, the growth has been unequal and not sufficient to significantly reduce food insecurity, malnutrition, and poverty. What is more, according to a review of progress (AU/NEPAD 2016), it was realized that (i) increased growth was not only dependent on the proportion of income allocated to the agricultural sector; (ii) encouraging private sector investment and growing trade called for a favorable business environment that extended beyond the powers of the ministry of agriculture, and (iii) multi-sectoral intervention and coordination were required to simultaneously remove constraints and barriers to growth and create an enabling environment for transformation.

In 2014, the 23rd AU Assembly adopted the Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods (AU 2014).

#### Key Findings

##### It is Essential that NAIPs:

- Focus on core strategic initiatives essential to achieve development outcomes;
- Present the pathways to change;
- Align and consider international, African and regional instruments and declarations;
- Acknowledge that constitutional and transversal development frameworks are foundations of all development efforts and align M&E with these;
- Establish appropriate technical and political structures; and
- Ensure that clear coordination, supervision, monitoring and evaluation, and reporting structures and frameworks are set out in a coherent and integrated manner.

##### Key Messages Regarding the Second Draft MAIP:

- An appropriate alignment with Malabo architecture is lacking;
- The draft MAIP is largely a work (performance) plan to implement the 2016 NAP, and is not a strategy focusing on agricultural transformation, food security and nutrition;
- The MAIP's conceptual framework, content, governance and implementation modalities, and monitoring and evaluation sections need significant improvement;
- Alignment with international, African and regional instruments and the Malawi constitutional and legal framework is needed;
- Benchmarks, pathways to change and appropriate indicators for monitoring and achieving progress on the Malabo commitments are missing;
- The elements on food security, nutrition and gender are inadequate to achieve the stated performance targets of the Plan; and
- The sector-coordination structure is inappropriate for a NAIP and needs to be broadened and located in the National Planning Commission.



The enhanced 2014 Malabo Declaration reaffirms the central commitments of the 2003 Maputo Declaration, but shifts away from the single-sector scope of the 2003 Maputo CAADP. This 2014 Malabo-focused CAADP approach pays attention to irrigation, mechanization and post-harvest losses and waste, while including areas of infrastructure, natural resources, land tenure, trade and nutrition elements that go beyond the mandate of the Ministry of Agriculture. Rather, the Malabo-aligned country-specific NAIPs provide a prioritized set of strategic agriculture, food security, and nutrition-centered initiatives as part of, and within the framework of, a nation's broader economic and social development agenda.

Since the 2003 Maputo Declaration, the execution of CAADP's evidence-based planning and implementation focus has brought technical credibility to African development processes, both at the continental and country level, instilling greater confidence from public, private and international investors and leading to more targeted actions. The CAADP process involves: (i) stock taking of the current policies and programmes in the country; and (ii) an analysis of the trends with regard to development; whilst (iii) identifying future growth opportunities that will help the country achieve both the CAADP and the nationally defined targets, and then determining the basket of interventions to achieve these. In this way, the second generation (2014+) Malabo-aligned NAIPs provide the vehicle to link national development frameworks to multi-sectoral action to:

- i. Further the commitment to the CAADP process;
- ii. Increase investment finance in agriculture, forestry and fisheries;
- iii. End hunger, improve food security and reduce malnutrition;
- iv. Eradicate poverty through agriculture;
- v. Increase intra-African trade in agriculture commodities and services;
- vi. Improve resilience to climate variability; and
- vii. Enforce mutual accountability for actions and results.

## The Purpose of This Analysis

The Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Food Security Policy (FSP) seeks to conduct food security policy analysis and provide support to government policy and related reforms. This includes identifying a range of possible improvements with regard to agriculture, food security, and nutrition policies as well as to the design of the CAADP NAIPs. This support is intended to increase the probability that countries will be in a position to deliver fully on (i) the food security and nutrition (FSN)-related commitments flowing from the 2014 AU Malabo Declarations<sup>1</sup> and the Sustainable Development Goals (hereinafter SDGs), and (ii)

<sup>1</sup> This includes the Malabo Declaration on Nutrition Security for Inclusive Economic Growth and Sustainable Development. <http://www.g20ys.org/upload/auto/f20d5372b44d38f099213d39bad3d251f90369dc.pdf>

key FSN-related international, African, regional and Malawi domestic policy and statutory obligations and commitments.

Within this context, the authors have developed: (i) a methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of development planning in terms of the alignment and linkages of (a) international, African and regional commitments and (b) national transversal development imperatives (including, but not limited to, the country-specific constitution, vision, medium term growth and development strategy, and cross-cutting intergovernmental, financial and development legislation); (ii) a second methodology for assessing the quality of the NAIPs in attaining the Malabo and SDG2 targets related to food security and nutrition; and (iii) a third methodology for assessing the gender equality components against commitments.

It is against this framework that the 30th September 2017 second draft of the Malawi National Agriculture Investment Plan—the Prioritized and Coordinated Agricultural Transformation Plan for Malawi: 2017/18—2022/23 was reviewed (MoAIWS 2017). This policy brief reports on the findings of the review in order to provide (i) focused inputs into the finalization of the Malawi National Agriculture Investment Plan (hereinafter referred to as the MAIP), (ii) insight and lessons for other countries engaged in the design of their second CAADP NAIPs, and (iii) a framework for the application of the above-mentioned evaluation methodology in Malawi and other countries in Africa. The policy brief is set out in four sections covering four areas: (i) the conceptual framework, (ii) content and programmatic areas, (iii) governance and implementation modalities, and (iv) monitoring and evaluation elements. Please note that references in square parentheses [ ] refer to the paragraph number in the draft MAIP version dated 30<sup>th</sup> September 2017.

## Overview of the MAIP

The 2017/18 – 2022/23 MAIP is the implementation plan for the 2016 Malawi National Agricultural Policy (NAP) (MoAIWD 2017). It replaces the 2010 - 2014 Malawi Agriculture Sector Wide Approach (ASWAp) for the period 2011/12 – 2106/17 that constituted the Malawi-specific CAADP investment plan for the 2003 Maputo phase of CAADP. The Malawi ASWAp focused on three main elements: (i) technical support, (ii) capacity building and human resources development, and (iii) planning of agricultural programmes as well as their monitoring and evaluation.

The main thrust of the MAIP is defined [48] as ‘to stimulate broad-based agricultural-led growth, with specific measures to maximize the synergies with food and nutrition security, poverty reduction and overall economic growth’. It seeks to achieve broad-based and resilient agricultural growth, improved well-being and livelihoods of Malawians, and

improved food and nutrition security (Table 3.1 – [47]), determined by seven development objectives or key performance areas (MAIP Annex 2). The MAIP consists of four programmes:

- Program A. Policies, Institutions. and Coordination for Results;
- Program B. Resilient Livelihoods and Production Systems;
- Program C. Production and Productivity for Growth; and
- Program D. Markets, Value Addition, Trade. and Finance for Transformation.

The four programmes consist of 16 Intervention Areas (IAs) that include more than 100 activities:

- IA1: Policy, Program and Stakeholder Coordination and M&E;
- IA2: Strengthening Farmer Organizations;
- IA3: Public Agricultural Services Delivery;
- IA4: Diverse, Nutritious Foods Available and Consumed;
- IA5: Food Safety and Quality Standards;
- IA6: Empowerment and Tenure Security;
- IA7: Disaster Risk Management Systems;
- IA8: Pest and Disease Management;
- IA9: Agricultural Innovation System;s
- IA10: Access to Inputs;
- IA11: Sustainable Natural Resource Management;
- IA12: Sustainable Irrigation Development;
- IA13: Mechanization;
- IA14: Agricultural Markets and Trade;
- IA15: Inclusive Private Investments in Agri-business; and
- IA16: Access to a Broader Range of Agri-Financial Services Enhanced.

### Assessment of the Conceptual Framework

The MAIP presents an administrative strategy for implementation of the 2016 NAP rather than presenting an executive strategy for executing the 2017-2022 Malawi Growth and Development Strategy III (hereinafter MGDS III) elements related to the Malabo commitments. Both the political and technical coordination is missing, leaving the MAIP as a simple implementation plan of a myriad of agriculture sector projects and donor funded initiatives, rather than presenting a comprehensive plan of action with a prioritized set of actions that will simultaneously achieve the national development objectives, the Malabo commitments and other binding obligations and non-binding commitments. The MAIP is essentially an implementation plan for the NAP. From p 32 ([85]) onwards, the MAIP document focusses primarily on matters that are usually contained in an annual work plan (performance plan) – and not in a five year strategic plan (which, in essence, NAIPs are supposed to be).

Despite the stated thrust of the plan aligning with the Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods, the MAIP is not aligned with international, African, regional and Malawi national priorities and commitments. In addition, it lacks a sound theory of change that should set out the current context, its problems, and the pathways to the changes necessary to achieve these commitments. While a ‘theory of change’ is presented in MAIP’s Annex 1, this is misnamed and also does not indicate how the proposed programmes and investment areas will lead to impact.

The binding obligations of key UN and African Union treaties and protocols are not discussed, such as the:

- UN 1948 Universal Declaration on Human Rights;
- UN 1966 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;
- UN 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women;
- UN 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child;
- AU 1981 African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights;
- AU 1990 African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child; and
- AU 2003 Protocol to the ACHPR on the Rights of Women in Africa.

These relate to various rights to development, human rights, food, water, and sanitation, as well as the special rights of women, children, and detained persons. In addition, the legally non-binding but strong commitments following from declarations such as the SDGs are not mentioned or discussed in detail. Only one of two relevant 2014 Malabo Declarations are referred to. Other key international and African non-binding declarations creating commitments that are not discussed include, but are not limited to:

- WHO 2014 Comprehensive Implementation Plan on Maternal, Infant and Young Child Nutrition;
- WHO 2012 Global Nutrition Goals;
- FAO WHO 2014 Rome Declaration on Nutrition and the Framework for Action;
- UN GA 2015 Resolution – The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development;
- UN 2016 UN Decade of Action on Nutrition 2016-2025 – Work Programme;
- AU 2015 Africa Regional Nutrition Strategy 2015-2025;
- AU 2014 Agenda 2063;
- AU 2015 Agenda 2063 – First Ten Years Implementation Plan 2014-2023;
- AU 2015 NEPAD CAADP Results Framework 2015-2025; and
- AU 2016 NEPAD CAADP Implementation Guidelines under the Malabo Declaration.

In a similar vein, there is no detailed discussion of the existence or not of provisions relating to hunger, food and

nutrition in regional (COMESA and SADC) instruments and the Republic of Malawi (Constitution) Act 20 of 1994 (as amended), nor of similar provisions in other Malawi legislation.

The references [34] to Grow Africa and the New Alliance in the policy overview neglect to differentiate between, on the one hand, international, African and regional binding obligations and voluntary commitments, and on the other hand, voluntary international and African programmes (such as Grow Africa and the New Alliance).

Achievement of the transversal goals is not included in or a key focus of the MAIP. While the MAIP lists various policies related to the programmes set out, the policy context is inadequately described, missing a number of key elements related to the alignment of the MAIP (see also MAIP's Annex 6) with international, African, regional (in the case of Malawi, both COMESA and SADC) and Malawi national commitments and policies (including a number of recently revised policies and others under revision). One key element of development planning relates to the alignment of sector and inter-sectoral policies and programmes with the overall (transversal) country development framework. In Malawi, this is represented by the MGDS [28]. In places, the MAIP refers to the 2012 MGDS II, which has expired. The MGDS III is currently under final consultation and its priority investment areas have not yet been finalized. This presents a policy sequencing problem.

Some of the key Malawi transversal policies and statutory elements missing from the conceptual framework include: reference to the 2015 Gender Policy, the 2006 Food Security Policy, and the 2017 draft Food Security Bill. No specific reference is made to the Malawi Division of Revenue Act (or equivalent). Other references are outdated and do not reflect recent revisions of policies such as the 2016 draft Multi-sectoral Nutrition Policy. Annex 6 (page 180) refers to the Joint Sector Plan. This is not mentioned earlier and it is not clear what this Plan is about.

The MAIP overview of sector-specific policies is incomplete, neglecting, for example, policies related to the environment, disaster management and water and sanitation, to name but a few. The Fisheries Policy is listed in the MAIP's Annex 6, but does not feature as a key part of the domestic policy framework, leading to this sub-sector being neglected as an essential part of livelihoods, food security, and nutrition in Malawi. The review of the MAIP seems to indicate that no policy on agribusiness exists, yet this is essential for the implementation of many of the MAIP programmes, as well as for achieving the agricultural transformational agenda of Malabo.

The impact indicators and various targets are not aligned with the Malabo commitments. The impact indicator for food security used on page 14 (Table 3.1 [47]) is the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES). This is the only direct

indicator of food insecurity included in the 2015 SDGs, but the indicator for food security in the MAIP Annex 2 is food deficit. Annex 2 provides the baseline that is missing in Table 3.1. Other essential food security indicators (at national, household, and individual levels) are not included despite food security being a key performance area of the MAIP.

Only stunting rates for children are included for nutrition indicators; however, this is only one measure of malnutrition. Both the 2014 Malabo commitments and the 2016 CAADP Results Framework include wasting and underweight, as well as the Minimum Adequate Diet for Infants and the Women's Dietary Diversity Score as indicators and targets, based on the 2012 Global Nutrition Targets. The FIES is only one composite indicator of food security.

The roles and functions of stakeholders are not defined, except for sectoral functions. This also applies to parastatals, boards and trusts [37], in respect of which the list provided in the 2017 MAIP is incomplete. For example, the roles and functions of the Office of the President and Cabinet (OPC) and the National Planning Commission (NPC) are missing from the MAIP. We discuss this omission in further detail in the section on governance and implementation modalities (see below). The review (FAO 2016) of the 2010 - 2014 ASWAp strongly recommended locating the coordination and monitoring functions of the next ASWAp (i.e., the MAIP) in the NPC.

The role of civil society in implementation and monitoring of implementation is not provided. A typology and description of the farming sector is not provided. It would be helpful to know the average farm size for each of the three categories of farmers, how many farmers are subsistence level, how many medium size farms are there and what their potential to drive transformation of the agricultural sector is. No concrete information is provided whether cooperatives are operational and effective. In addition, the MAIP does not contain any specific information as regards to Malawi's agricultural land capability classification.

The MAIP ignores the role of universities in research, development, and capacity building in Malawi. Only one university is mentioned and its role is limited to postgraduate research projects. This is a gross misrepresentation that undervalues the current—and potential—role of universities in the sector, notwithstanding the Malabo targets associated with agriculture research and development targets, budgets, and extension training and support.

## Assessment of the Content and Programmatic Areas

A reading of the 16 planned Intervention Areas (IAs – see above), indicates a dire lack of prioritization and strategic planning. Where the MAIP indicates that a specific group or

commodity will be the priority, it qualifies this by stating that the other groups and commodities will also receive attention and will not be neglected. In this way, the MAIP seeks to serve everyone, thereby spreading limited human and capital resources too thinly over too many commodities. The programmatic elements of the plan are weak and lack detail and specificity. For example, what appropriate technologies will be promoted [77]?

As indicated above, from p 32 ([85]) onwards, the MAIP document focusses primarily on matters that are usually contained in an annual work plan (performance plan) – and not in a five year strategic plan (which in essence NAIPs are supposed to be). The MAIP does not make it clear how the 46 Intermediate Objectives (IOs – see above)—many of which have multiple programmes—relate to the 16 Intervention Areas (IAs – see above), the delivery of the four programmes (Programs A-D – see above) and how they will lead to impact.

The selection of the 16 Interventions Areas (IAs) is not evidence-based. While the identification of priority value chains is based on empirical modelling, the selection of commodities does not consider the technical realities of Malawi. In addition, vulnerable groups are not identified, leading to a glaring lack of strategic targeting.

Despite an existing well-aligned policy framework for nutrition, the programmes fall short of delivering on the Malabo and SDG2 commitments. A draft National Multi-sectoral Nutrition Policy and a Nutrition Strategy Plan have been reviewed and costed and aligned to the SDGs. These replace the National Nutrition Policy and Strategic Plan (2007-2011) version. The 2009 Infant and Young Child Nutrition Strategy, the 2010 Nutrition Education and Communication Strategy and a National School Health and Nutrition Policy (drafted 2013) are not considered.

Nutrition-sensitive agriculture and food systems do not feature in the document. The programmes seek to improve food insecurity and malnutrition more indirectly. Despite the tragically high levels of stunting and child malnutrition, no direct efforts are made to address this in this Plan. There are no references to improving food consumption through for example fortification of foods and biofortified commodities except for nutrition of orange-flesh sweet potato (mentioned on p. 19 ([58]) and in Annex 7 of the MAIP).

From among the over 100 activities, food security, and nutrition-related elements include:

- An overall increase in production with horticultural crops as one priority;
- Linking smallholders to food purchase for institutional programmes especially school food programmes;
- Nutrition education, sensitization, and campaigns to disseminate information;
- School food programmes;

- Homestead gardens;
- Improving food safety, food safety legislation and control as well as improving knowledge of food safety issues;
- Rehabilitation and maintenance of strategic grain reserves and warehouses for disaster mitigation; and
- Increasing the area under irrigation although no mention is made of what crops will be irrigated.

The content section lacks provision of the policy and regulatory (legal) elements essential to execute the MAIP. For example, there is no explicit mention of the enactment of legislation necessary to facilitate the direct provision of food for school food programmes [89]. Who will purchase this food? The provision of these legislative measures are neither costed nor budgeted for. There is duplication of functions and mandate creep with various Ministries without recognition of both the existing policy and regulatory frameworks and the functional domains allocated to each Ministry. An example relates to nutrition education that is within the mandate of the Ministry of Health and covered by the Nutrition Education and Communication Strategy.

The document begins with an erroneous statement ([1]) that Malawi has large tracts of underutilized land. If there is underutilized land, what quality is this land, what is it suitable for, and whose care is it under (commercial, smallholder, or (communal) subsistence farmers)? The selection of livestock—especially beef and dairy—as a strategic priority commodity was based on modelling results that demand for livestock products (meat and milk) is growing and that livestock could lead to economic growth ([58]). This is inherently flawed in the context of Malawi—a small country, half of which is covered by water and where farm plot sizes will certainly neither support nor sustain large livestock rearing or provide the feed supplies necessary for this kind of farming.

There is no mention of fish as a strategic commodity, despite fish's unprecedented efficiency in converting feed into protein, the fact that fish features prominently in the Malawian diet and livelihoods, and that fish is an excellent source of nourishment for children. A few programmes related to fish are buried in the long list of projects including catchment management and landing facilities. There is no thought given to the most constraining elements related to fish—namely breeding and hatcheries. Water quality is not addressed at all nor is the impact of irrigation expansion and other agricultural activities that affect environmental and water quality and the potential impact of these on sustainable fisheries and livelihoods. No agribusiness development is targeted at this sector.

Little effort is made to define the existing land rights or to refer in detail to 2006 Malawi National Land Act. No consideration is given to the impact that the 2016 Malawi Land Act will have on agriculture in Malawi.

While Intervention Area 6 (IA 6) focusses on women's empowerment and land tenure, the actions and activities listed are not sufficient to meet international commitments and obligations such as the 1995 UN Beijing Platform for Action and the AU 2003 Protocol to the ACHPR (African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights) on the Rights of Women in Africa. In Malawi, women constitute 70% of the agriculture labour force (GoM 2017). The ever-increasing workload of women places strain on agricultural productivity and consequently food security and nutrition. Increasing the number of women with registered access to land and providing training programmes is indeed essential [38], however, it does not address the socially embedded inequalities that prevent women from fully exercising their rights. Training programmes are not sufficient to challenge household gender relations that limit women's decision-making and control over income and resources. Inequalities that prevent women from practicing the useful skills they acquire during training need to be addressed.

It is unclear as to how Program A (Policies, Institutions, and Coordination for Results [63]) will be translated into action. Careful consideration is necessary to envisage and plan how existing legislation will be coordinated through overarching frameworks aligned with the MGDS III and the Malabo commitments.

Extension service functions and services appear in multiple places in the document (e.g., [86, 87, 91, 94, 97, and 109]). This makes coordination extremely difficult and efficiency unlikely, with a stretched extension service expected to deliver across multiple programmes (especially in the decentralized district model) without coordinated effort, focus, and strategic prioritization of clients, commodities, and services. Moreover, the extension service is currently under review and reform has been proposed. The MAIP acknowledges that "the public extension system needs to be upgraded to play its role... Extension infrastructure is in poor condition and staffing levels and retention rates are low—vacancy rates for front-line staff stand as high as 60%, with poor working conditions leading to low retention rates" [88].

### Governance and Implementation Modalities

The coordination of the MAIP is primarily left at the level of the MoIAWD. No detailed inter-sectoral coordination is set out in the MAIP. In addition, implementation, oversight and monitoring and evaluation functions are assigned to MoIAWD. The MoIAWD cannot both implement and evaluate (judge) the performance of the plan; neither can it manage other sectors. This falls outside of its mandate, but falls within the mandate of the NPC.

It is not possible for MoIAWD to be responsible for policy oversight for policies in the domain of other Ministries ([73], see Table 4.1), while the MoIAWD also cannot be the

coordination structure for other Ministries. A number of functions contained in the MAIP fall outside of the MoIAWD mandate. The Troika coordination structure exists only within the MoIAWD. This cannot be.

A well organized overall coordination and oversight structure is missing. The structure set out in Figure 6.1 ([181]) is entirely inappropriate for a transversal plan aligned with Malabo. The Agriculture Sector Working Group and its equivalents in other Ministries (such as DoNUTS in MoH) need to be aligned and coordinated within the high level coordination structure at the level of the Office of the President and Cabinet (OPC) or the NPC.

It follows that a higher level transversal (across sectors) agency is necessary for coordination across and between sectors, as well as for the monitoring and evaluation of progress. There are various statutory structures possible for this function, but as indicated above, the Malawi NPC mandate matches these functions. The MoIAWD should be a leading implementing agent, whilst the NPC should take on the functions of coordinating, monitoring and evaluating, and reporting on the MAIP and reporting on the Malabo and SDG commitments. To perform these functions, the NPC needs a ring-fenced budget. No budget is allocated to the NPC (or other higher-level agency for that matter) for this overall coordination, monitoring and evaluation, and reporting goal.

No funding is allocated to the strategic coordination of and reporting on the MAIP [129]. The budget for Program A reduces over time [58]. However, the reasons for this reduction are not provided. This is contrary to expectations, as coordination, monitoring and evaluation, and reporting needs would usually increase over the duration of a programme. A number of tables in the budget are not aligned, e.g., Tables 4.1 ([73]) and 5.2 ([123]).

A concerning statement is made on page 62 ([139]) that while the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) is the Malawian government's financial planning tool, the annual allocations are not always consistent with the MTEF, thus increasing instability and affecting the predictability of funding. This constitutes a major risk for the implementation of this highly (overly) ambitious MAIP.

The cost of implementation is extremely high, with 62% of the funding going to MoIAWD, 12% to the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development (MoLGRD), 3% to the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Tourism (MoITT), and 1% or less going to the other sectors, including the Ministry of Health (MoH) (Table 5.7 [131]). This reiterates that the MAIP is not a comprehensive agriculture and food security plan, but a sector-focused work (performance) plan that is not aligned at the political or technical level with the Malabo or SDG2 commitments. While the figures in Tables 5.8 ([132]) and 5.9 ([134]) contain a mathematical error and the budgets do not add up, it is

expected that 68% (US\$2.2 Billion) of the budget will come from Development Partners (DPs). It should be noted that Malawi is no longer classified as a USAID Feed the Future country.

The performance of the sector in the former ASWAp has not been satisfactory (FAO 2016). Annex 3 lists a myriad of small, medium, and larger projects funded by the DPs. No strategic coordination and assimilation plan is presented for these projects and programmes and no indication is given as to how these will contribute to the achievement of the 2017 MAIP targets.

### Assessment of the Monitoring and Evaluation Elements

The MAIP reports that progress will be measured against a consensus baseline ([84]). Yet, baseline data for most indicators is not provided and a significant proportion of targets are marked as yet ‘to be determined’. Many of these indicators (such as Indicator B1 – Annex 2) are available, for example in the Demographic Household Survey or the recent CAADP Biennial Review report. Many targets record ‘improvement’ as the target. How will this be measured? Most reported targets are outputs (see Chapter 7 of the MAIP), rather than outcomes. No link of outcomes to achieving the impacts is presented.

In addition, the MAIP does not set out a concrete plan to achieve this.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

The above review indicates that the MAIP is largely a work (performance) plan spread over five years focusing on the implementation of the 2016 NAP. Matters identified in the review of the former Malawi ASWAp are not sufficiently incorporated in the draft MAIP, nor is there an appropriate alignment with the prescribed Malabo architecture for the content and formulation of the second generation NAIPs. The four areas discussed in this policy brief (conceptual framework, content, governance and implementation modalities, and monitoring and evaluation) need enhancement in order to meet the requirements as set out in the peremptory AU documentation. In addition, a discussion of, and alignment with, (i) binding obligations created by international, African and regional instruments and the Malawi constitutional and legal framework, and (ii) commitments flowing from international, African and regional agreements are required in order to clarify the benchmark against which an appropriate comprehensive NAIP and its implementation should be measured.

The programmes need significant trimming and focus with a clear, evidence-based plan charted out to drive agricultural growth that will reduce poverty, food insecurity, and

This is not indicative of a strong planning modality and commitment to serious mutual accountability for delivery and impact (Table 3.1 – [47ff]). Moreover, the targets muddle the commitments of various international declarations and in particular ignore nutrition outcomes and impacts that are core to the Malabo commitments (through the Biennial Review) and the CAADP Results Framework. In addition, many indicators do not specify medium-term targets to achieve the Malabo 2025 target. For example, the current rate of stunting (no dates and data sources are provided as with numerous indicator tables) is reportedly 37%. The target for the MAIP (a 5-year plan) is 29%, but the Malabo target is 10% by 2025 (whilst the 2012 global nutrition target for stunting is to reduce stunting by 40% by 2025).

It is unclear how the investment effectiveness [57] relates to the stated outcomes and impacts. It is essential that countries are able to set interim targets and show clear pathways to impact in their programme selection and design. The evidence (analysis) in the MAIP is missing to convince the reader that the targets are achievable if the MAIP is implemented. For example, the MAIP states that evidence exists that child stunting can be reduced [55], but this evidence is neither referenced nor presented. In

malnutrition at a rate adequate to meet Malabo and SDG commitments. These need to go beyond agriculture programmes to include strategic food system and nutrition sensitive components to ensure that food security is improved and malnutrition rates drastically reduced.

The institutional architecture needs review and revision to ensure that institutional mandates are appropriate and that coordination structures are appropriate for comprehensive programmes that align with the MGD III once it has been finalized. The coordination structure needs to be broadened beyond the MoAIWD to provide a multi-sectoral oversight structure that integrates the various stakeholders and drives mutual accountability to delivery on a focused programme. This oversight role should be assigned to the NPC.

The monitoring and evaluation benchmarks and targets need to be aligned with MGDS III, Malabo and the SDGs and the framework for these completed in full to establish the baseline and facilitate effective monitoring and evaluation of progress. This mandate has to be located at the higher level than MoAIWD. This role should be assigned to the NPC.

### References

AU (African Union). 2003. Maputo Declaration on Agriculture and Food Security in Africa (Assembly/AU/Decl. 7(II)). Addis Ababa: AU.

AU (African Union). 2014. Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods. Addis Ababa : AU.

[http://pages.au.int/sites/default/files/Malabo%20Declaration%202014\\_11%2026-.pdf](http://pages.au.int/sites/default/files/Malabo%20Declaration%202014_11%2026-.pdf).

FAO (Food and Agriculture Organisation). 2016. Review of Achievements and Implementation: Draft Final Report. The Agriculture Sector Wide Approach (ASWAp) Malawi's Prioritised and Harmonised Agricultural Development Agenda: 2010-2014. Rome: FAO.

GoM (Government of Malawi). 2017. The Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) III: Building a Productive, Competitive and Resilient Nation. Draft document, 23rd June 2017. Lilongwe: GoM.

MoAIWD (Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development). 2017. National Agricultural Investment Plan (NAIP) Prioritized and Coordinated Agricultural Transformation Plan for Malawi: 2017/18-2022/23. Second Draft Report, 30th September, 2017. Lilongwe: MoAIWD.

### About the authors

Nic J.J. Olivier is Research Associate of the Institute for Food, Nutrition, and Well-being (IFNuW) at the University of Pretoria and Extraordinary Professor at North West University. E-mail: [oliviern@mweb.co.za](mailto:oliviern@mweb.co.za).

Sheryl L. Hendriks is Director of IFNuW and Professor in the Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development, University of Pretoria. E-mail: [Sheryl.hendriks@up.ac.za](mailto:Sheryl.hendriks@up.ac.za).

Elizabeth Mkandawire is a Research Assistant and PhD candidate in the Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development, University of Pretoria. Email: [elimka23@gmail.com](mailto:elimka23@gmail.com).

Nico J.J. Olivier is a Research Associate of IFNuW, University of Pretoria. Email: [njjolivier@gmail.com](mailto:njjolivier@gmail.com).

Clara Williams is a Research Associate of IFNuW and an Extraordinary Lecturer at the Faculty of Law, University of Pretoria. Email: [clara.williams001@gmail.com](mailto:clara.williams001@gmail.com).

This study was made possible through the Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Food Security Policy.

*This research is made possible by the generous support of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) under the Feed the Future initiative. The contents are the responsibility of the study authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government or the University of Pretoria.*

**Copyright © 2018 University of Pretoria and Michigan State University and the International Food Policy Research Institute. All rights reserved. This material may be reproduced for personal and not-for-profit use without permission from but with acknowledgement to the University of Pretoria and MSU.**

**Published by the Institute for Food, Nutrition, and Well-being, PBagX20, Hatfield, 0028, Pretoria, South Africa.**