



EN

THIS ACTION IS FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION

ANNEX 1

of the Commission Decision on the financing of a special measure for 2022 for the EU response to the food security crisis and economic shock in African, Caribbean and Pacific countries following Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine

**Action Document for Food Production and Resilience of Food Systems
in African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries**

ANNUAL MEASURE

This document constitutes the annual work programme in the sense of Article 110(2) of the Financial Regulation

**1. Title/basic
act/ CRIS
number**

Food Production and Resilience of Food Systems in African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries.

CRIS numbers:

- Cameroon 2022/44510
- Caribbean region 2022/44429, 2022/44447
- Chad 2022/44454, 2022/44492
- Côte d'Ivoire 2022/44405
- Democratic republic of Congo 2022/44450
- Ghana 2022/44443
- Kenya 2022/44457
- Madagascar 2022/44456
- Malawi 2022/44436
- Mauritania 2022/44445
- Mozambique 2022/44431
- Niger 2022/44448
- Pacific 2022/44432
- Rwanda 2022/44449
- Senegal 2022/44438
- Somalia 2022/44460
- Togo 2022/44444
- Uganda 2022/44455

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Zambia 2022/44446 - Transversal component / All ACP 2022/44374 	
2. Zone benefiting from the action/location	<p>African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Countries</p> <p>The action shall be carried out at the following countries / regions: Cameroon, Caribbean, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Pacific, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Togo, Uganda, and Zambia.</p> <p>A transversal action will cover ACP countries.</p>	
3. Programming document	Council Decision 2022/1223 of 12 July 2022	
4. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)	<p>Main SDG: SDG 2 (Zero Hunger)</p> <p>Other significant SDGs: SDGs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14 and 15</p>	
5. Sector of intervention/thematic area	Food security; sustainable agriculture production, resilience	DEV. Assistance: YES
6. Amounts concerned	<p>Total estimated cost: EUR 336 500 000</p> <p>Total amount of EDF contribution EUR 336 500 000 of which:</p> <p>EUR 39 000 000 for budget support and</p> <p>EUR 1 000 000 for complementary support.</p>	
7. Aid modalities and implementation modalities	<p>Project Modality and Budget Support</p> <p>Direct management through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Budget Support: Sector Reform Performance Contract in Cameroon - Budget Support: State and Resilience Building Contract in Niger - Grants - Procurement <p>Indirect management with CIFOR, DANIDA, ENABEL, FAO, IFAD, SPC, and with the entities to be selected in accordance with the criteria set out in sections 5.4.4 and 5.4.6.</p> <p>Regional Blending Platform shall be implemented in indirect management by one or several of the entities indicated in the appendix to this action document, in accordance with the Regional Blending Platform's award procedure.</p>	
8 a) DAC codes	<p>310: Agriculture, forestry, fishing</p> <p>311: Agriculture</p> <p>430: Other Multisector</p> <p>510: General Budget Support</p> <p>520: Development Food Assistance</p>	

b) Main Delivery Channel	10000 – Public sector institutions 20000 – Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and civil society 40000 – Multilateral organisations 60000 – Private sector institutions			
9. Markers (from CRIS DAC form)	General policy objective	Not targeted	Significant objective	Principal objective
	Participation development/good governance	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Aid to environment	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Gender equality and Women's and Girl's Empowerment	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Trade Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Reproductive, Maternal, New born and child health	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Disaster Risk Reduction	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Inclusion of persons with disabilities	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Nutrition	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
	RIO Convention markers	Not targeted	Significant objective	Principal objective
	Biological diversity	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Combat desertification	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Climate change mitigation	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Climate change adaptation	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Internal markers	Policy objectives	Not targeted	Significant objective	Principal objective
	Digitalisation		X	
	Migration		X	

SUMMARY

The effects of Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine on global food security highlight the structural fragilities of food systems. Rising hunger is putting millions of lives and livelihoods as well as the stability of countries at risk today, while the situation is likely to deteriorate further in 2023. The UN Global Crisis Response Group warned that global food accessibility issues risk being compounded by global food availability issues in 2023. Several ACP countries are particularly at risk.

Considering the development and geopolitical ramifications of the unfolding food crisis, the European Council called for a comprehensive response comprising trade, solidarity, production and resilience, and multilateralism. The Council subsequently agreed on a response in a Team Europe approach to global food insecurity as well as an exceptional EUR 600 million allocation of de-committed EDF funds, subdivided as follows: up to EUR 350 million for food production and resilience of food systems, up to EUR 150 million for humanitarian assistance, and up to EUR 100 million for macro-economic support. The three components have been closely coordinated and will be implemented building on complementarities as well as synergies with a nexus approach, where possible.

The overall objective of this Action is to enhance sustainable food production and resilience of food systems.

In terms of thematic focus, in line with the European Green Deal, each action will balance social, environmental, and economic considerations through agro-ecological and other innovative approaches as part of a tangible and sustainable response to the unfolding food crisis. In this regard, four outcomes have been identified:

- (1) More economically sustainable and inclusive food systems
- (2) Reinforced environmental sustainability of food systems
- (3) Enhanced social sustainability of food systems (incl. food and nutrition security) and
- (4) Improved governance and institutional sustainability of food systems

In terms of geographic focus, programmes in Cameroon, Caribbean, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, DRC, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Pacific, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Togo, Uganda, and Zambia have been identified for their potential to sustainably enhancing production and/or their link to vulnerabilities and exposure in the current crisis context. By building on ongoing EU programmes the Action seeks to ensure scale and effectiveness.

Moreover, a transversal action will ensure coherence across the seventeen countries and two regional programmes as well as amplify their impact by leveraging additional financing and investments to small-scale producers as well as micro, small, and medium food enterprises.

In terms of operational focus, the selected implementing modalities reflect the need for an efficient implementation with a strategic impact at programme, policy, and political levels. They range from budget support to direct and indirect management.

In terms of geopolitical focus, it is crucial to effectively communicate about this additional support to partner countries following Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine, including in a Team

1 CONTEXT ANALYSIS

1.1 Context Description

The current global food crisis has been years in the making, but since Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine it has become a downward spiral that risks slipping out of control. Rising acute food insecurity and increasing food prices indicate that the resilience of food systems has been eroding around the world.¹ The effects of Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine further increases the pressure on food systems: supply chain disruptions are driving an increase in food prices that strain the livelihoods of vulnerable households and the budgets of fragile states.² The impacts are also highly regressive, as they affect poorest households, as well as women and girls, the most; especially in developing countries, in which more than 50% of the income of the poorest households is spent on food. Already in Africa, the average national percentage of people who cannot afford a healthy diet is 85% and there are an estimated 61.4 million stunted children under the age of 5 years.³ This alarming situation is further compounded by declining fertilizer affordability – meaning farmers can no longer afford to use fertilizers on crops and cannot increase or sustain production to meet local and global demand – as well as fertilizer and food export restrictions, and costs and availability of seeds. These disruptions of food production, agri-value chains, and food systems risk worsening the current global “food affordability” issues with global “food availability” issues likely to arise in 2023.⁴

This complex crisis is a pathway to instability in countries around the world, with a number of ACP countries particularly at risk. When food systems fail, the resulting disorder threatens nutrition, health and education outcomes, the economy, as well as natural resources, human rights, and peace and security. Food price increases have been strongly associated with social unrest. These complexities and risks necessitate a systemic approach, including through a humanitarian-development-peace nexus approach.

The EU and its Member States in a Team Europe approach are mobilising political, policy, and financial means to safeguard food security today while transitioning to more resilient food systems for tomorrow. The European Council called to prioritise their financial support for a comprehensive response to global food insecurity, in particular in the most affected and vulnerable countries.⁵ The recently adopted Council Conclusions on a Team Europe response to global food insecurity therefore put forward four strands of action: (1) Trade, (2) Solidarity, (3) production, resilience, and food systems transformation, and (4) multilateralism.⁶ This response is, amongst others, backed up by the following financial measures:

- Frontloading food systems actions within the current NDICI-Global Europe programming as part of efforts to safeguard food security and reinforce the resilience of food systems.⁷ Funds under the Neighborhood, Development and International

¹ In 2021, 193 million people were in acute food insecurity in 53 countries in need of external assistance – a 40 million increase compared to 2020. Moreover, FAO's food price index was 28.1% higher in 2021 compared to 2020.

² An all-time high of up to 49 million people in 46 countries could now be at risk of falling into famine or famine-like conditions, unless they receive immediate life and livelihoods-saving assistance (Hunger Hotspot Report, June 2022). Moreover, Global food prices in May 2022 were 22.8 % higher than in May 2021.

³ FAO, The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World, 2022.

⁴ UN Global Crisis Response Group on Food, Energy, and Finance, Global impact of the war in Ukraine: Billions of people face the greatest cost-of-living crisis in a generation, 8 June 2022.

⁵ European Council meeting conclusions of 24-25 March, 30-31 May, and 23-24 June 2022.

⁶ Team Europe response to global food insecurity– Council conclusions (20 June 2022)

⁷ European Commission, Communication 2022/133 on safeguarding food security and reinforcing the resilience of food systems, 23 March 2022.

Cooperation Instrument - Global Europe (NDICI-Global Europe) geographic pillar are fully programmed and around **EUR 3.2 billion** is already focusing on agriculture, nutrition, water and sanitation, and social protection programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean.

- In addition, the Council decided to allocate **EUR 600 million** of decommitted European Development Funds to address food crisis and economic shock in the most vulnerable ACP Countries, including up to 350 million for production and resilience of food systems, up to 150 million for humanitarian aid, and up to 100 million for macroeconomic support.⁸

The total EU support to the global response to food insecurity is currently estimated at **EUR 7.7 billion until 2024**,⁹ which is and will be further complemented by EU Member State responses.

This Action Document concerns the operationalisation of the up to EUR 350 million ‘food production and resilience’ component of the EUR 600 million decommitted funds.

1.2 Policy Framework

Team Europe approach to food insecurity. Investing in food production to address food insecurity and to support resilience is in line with the most recent European Council Conclusions on a Team Europe Response to Global Food Insecurity, and the Council decision concerning the allocation of decommitted funds to address the food security crisis.¹⁰ In particular, considering the following operational elements of the Council Conclusions on the Team Europe response to global food insecurity:

- Prioritize financial support for tailor-made food insecurity responses. Specific production and resilience actions have been selected for their potential to sustainably enhance production and/or their link to vulnerabilities and exposure in the current crisis context.¹¹
- Support to multilateral initiatives. The production and resilience actions are supportive to the proposals by the UN Global Crisis Response Group (UN GCRG) and the operationalisation of the Global Alliance for Food Security (GAFS) and the Food and Agriculture Resilience Mission (FARM), amongst others.¹²
- Monitoring and information. The production and resilience actions will be included in the joint monitoring system for the Team Europe approach to global food insecurity.¹³ The actions could also be considered as part of tracking of EU and EU Member States’ contributions to the Great Green Wall and other relevant initiatives where possible.

⁸ Council Decision concerning the allocation of funds decommitted from projects under the 10th and 11th European Development Funds for the purpose of financing actions addressing the food security crisis and economic shock in African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries following Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine (12 July 2022).

⁹ In addition to the EUR 3.2 billion and the EUR 600 million mentioned above, the EUR 7.7 billion includes an estimated EUR 2.2 billion in immediate humanitarian food and nutrition assistance (2021-24) and 1.7 billion in support to Neighbourhood countries.

¹⁰ European Council meeting (23 and 24 June 2022) – Conclusions; Team Europe response to global food insecurity– Council conclusions (20 June 2022); Council Decision concerning the allocation of funds decommitted from projects under the 10th and 11th European Development Funds for the purpose of financing actions addressing the food security crisis and economic shock in African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries following Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine (12 July 2022).

¹¹ Cf. Para. 17 (b) and (c) Council Conclusions on a Team Europe Response to Global Food Insecurity (22 June 2022).

¹² Cf. Para. 17 (a) Council Conclusions on a Team Europe Response to Global Food Insecurity (22 June 2022).

¹³ Cf. Para. 17 (d) and (f) Council Conclusions on a Team Europe Response to Global Food Insecurity (22 June 2022).

- Substantiate communication efforts. The production and resilience actions will also provide concrete examples to feed joint communication efforts at multilateral, regional, and country level – including as part of the Global Gateway.¹⁴

European Green Deal transition and related diplomacy. The production and resilience actions are embedded in the European Green Deal and Farm to Fork strategies. Concretely, investments in local production systems and agri-value chains are based on a sustainable development vision that includes agro-ecological and other innovative approaches to accelerate the transition towards sustainable, inclusive, and equitable food systems. These policy dimensions will be amplified through links with budget support programmes and other policy dialogues as well as the Global Gateway.¹⁵ In this regard, the Action will also build on the recent UN Food Systems Summit (September 2021) and the Nutrition for Growth Summit (December 2021).¹⁶ These summits resulted in (a) widespread agreement on the need for food system transformation to accelerate progress towards the SDGs and (b) new prospects for transformation with the development of over 100 country food system pathways.¹⁷

1.3 Public Policy Analysis of the partner country/region

- **Sub-Saharan Africa: Agenda 2063 and EU-AU Summit Joint Vision for 2030**

The Action is embedded in the African Union Agenda 2063, notably the Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP). CAADP aims to help African countries eliminate hunger and reduce poverty by raising economic growth through agriculture-led development. The last CAADP review (March 2022) confirmed a number of countries are making notable progress – e.g., Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mauritania, Rwanda, Senegal, Uganda, and Zambia. The Action also acknowledges the African Union’s 2022 ‘Year of nutrition’. The Action will build, as much as possible, on the existing framework and commitments, such as the EU-AU Global Gateway investment package for food systems and the Great Green Wall.

- **Caribbean: Joint communication on joining forces for a common future**

The Action is in line with the Communication on the EU-LAC-Caribbean partnership, which highlights the importance of cooperation on sustainable agricultural supply chains and food systems.¹⁸ It will also build on the recent commitment of the Caribbean Governments to invest in agriculture to reduce the Caribbean food import bill by 25% by 2025.

- **Pacific: EU-Pacific Green-Blue Alliance**

The Action fits within the framework of the EU-Pacific Green-Blue Alliance, which reaffirms the region’s ambition for a low carbon and resilient global economy by 2050. In this regard, the Alliance supports green and blue growth by promoting sustainable and climate-friendly aquatic and agri-food systems; in particular to the benefit of local livelihoods from ocean and coastal resources.

¹⁴ Cf. Para. 17 (a) Council Conclusions on a Team Europe Response to Global Food Insecurity (22 June 2022).

¹⁵ Cf. Dialogues initiated by EU and Global Network Against Food Crises, amongst others, after event on food security in Sahel and Lake Chad regions (06 April 2022) and roundtable on food security in Horn of Africa (24 April 2022).

¹⁶ Note: Commission announced a new pledge of EUR 2.5 billion for the period 2021 – 2024 to reduce all forms of malnutrition at the Nutrition for Growth Summit.

¹⁷ See: 2021 Food Systems Summit Dialogues Gateway: <https://summitdialogues.org/overview/member-state-food-systems-summit-dialogues/convenors>. See also Council Conclusions on the EU’s priorities for the 2021 United Nations Food Systems Summit (31 May 2021).

¹⁸ European Commission, Communication on European Union, Latin America and the Caribbean: joining forces for a common future, 16 April 2019.

1.4 Stakeholder analysis

Countries with potential to sustainably enhance production and/or exposure in the current crisis context. Countries and actions have been selected in line with the Council decision concerning the allocation of decommitted funds to address the food security crisis and the related European Commission proposal.¹⁹ In particular, the selection is based on three interrelated considerations:

- (i) levels of food insecurity and malnutrition;
- (ii) (likely) impact of Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine on food availability and affordability;
- (iii) potential to quickly implement and/or scale up relevant actions with a high likelihood for additional impact on production and resilience at local and regional levels.

Accordingly, programmes in **Cameroon, Caribbean-, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, DRC, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Pacific (regional), Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Togo, Uganda, and Zambia, as well as a transversal action on rural finance and investments**, have been identified for their potential to sustainably enhance production and/or their link to vulnerabilities and exposure in the current crisis context.

People and organisations at the heart of food security and nutrition in the current crisis context. Two-thirds of those experiencing acute hunger live in rural areas and rely on agriculture for their daily food and income. At the same time, small-scale producers – who produce more than 70% of the food calories in Latin America, sub-Saharan Africa and South and East Asia²⁰ – and micro, small, and medium sized enterprises are driving the transition towards more resilient local and regional agri-value chains. This Action is therefore about sustainably growing, processing and marketing more food where it is needed most.

The final beneficiaries of the intervention are the people most affected by and most vulnerable to food insecurity and malnutrition, with a special emphasis on women, children, and youth, including through a humanitarian-development-peace nexus approach.

The main target groups are the small farmers and food entrepreneurs (such as processors, distributors, and retailers), and the governments and public institutions of the partner countries in which the different initiatives will be implemented - including sector line ministries (e.g. agriculture, health, environment, social welfare, water, education, women) and coordinating ministries (finance, planning) - technical organisations (research entities, universities, statistics office, public health institutes) as well as local authorities, non-governmental organisations, farmers' organisations and private sector organisations. These stakeholders operate in diverse contexts with different resources, capacities and power; and their interpretation of, and emphasis on, the various dimensions of food systems may differ significantly. The Action will therefore be human-rights based and context-specific.

The actions will develop and strengthen strategic partnerships with the EU Member States, in a Team Europe approach. Where relevant, the DeSIRA Platform, the Knowledge for Nutrition

¹⁹ European Commission, Proposal for a Council Decision concerning the allocation of funds decommitted from projects under the 10th and 11th European Development Funds for the purpose of financing actions addressing the food security crisis and economic shock in African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries following Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine ((2022) 306 final), 20 June 2022 ; Council Decision 12 July 2022.

²⁰ Leah H Samberg *et al.*, 2016 Subnational distribution of average farm size and smallholder contributions to global food production, Environmental Research Letters, 2016.

(K4N) programme and the Global Network against Food Crises will be used to step up cooperation on resilient and sustainable food systems. The Action is also linked to the EU's support to the follow up to the UN Food Systems Summit, including the Commission's engagement in eight Coalitions for Action.²¹

1.5 Problem analysis/priority areas for support

Both acute and chronic food insecurity are worsening around the world.

- The **2022 Global Report on Food Crises** found that close to 193 million people were *acutely* food insecure (IPC/CH Phase 3 or above) in 53 countries/territories in 2021. This represents an increase of nearly 40 million people compared to 2020.
- The **2022 State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World** found that 828 million people were *chronically* (severely) food insecure in 2021. The number has grown by about 150 million since the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2019. Moreover, an estimated 22 % of children under 5 years of age were stunted and 6.7% were wasted in 2020. The Report also identified a 112 million increase in the number of people unable to afford a healthy diet to a total of almost 3.1 billion in 2021.

The negative food security trends are the result of a complex interaction of immediate and root causes. The protracted nature of most food crises shows that long-term environmental, social and economic drivers, compounded by increasing conflict and insecurity are eroding the resilience of food systems. For example, 39 countries/territories have been consistently in food crisis in all six editions of the Global Report on Food Crises (2016 – 2021).²² In these 39 countries/territories, the number of people in Crisis or worse (IPC/CH Phase 3 or above) or equivalent almost doubled between 2016 and 2021 – up from 94 million to almost 180 million. In recent years, Africa is the only region of the world that has seen an increase in the number of stunted children.²³

Russia's war of aggression in Ukraine is further aggravating food insecurity and challenging food systems to the core. Supply chain disruptions of Ukraine, one of the world's major players in global grains and oilseeds markets, are driving an increase in food prices that strain the livelihoods of vulnerable households and the budgets of fragile states – global food prices in June 2022 were 23.1% higher than in June 2021. Compounded by declining fertilizer and seed availability and affordability as well as food export restrictions, the current global food affordability issues risk being worsened by global food availability issues in 2023.

This complex crisis is a pathway to instability in countries around the world, with a number of ACP countries particularly exposed.

- **SAHEL AND WESTERN AFRICA**

²¹ Food is never waste coalition; Healthy diets from sustainable food systems for children & all coalition; School meals coalition, Aquatic and blue foods coalition; Agro-ecology coalition; Zero hunger coalition; Fighting food crises along the humanitarian-development-peace nexus coalition; and Sustainable productivity growth coalition.

²² Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Iraq, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

²³ <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/6c544141-48ee-11ec-91ac-01aa75ed71a1/language-en>

West Africa and the Sahel face unprecedented levels of acute food insecurity in 2022. Almost 41 million people in 15 countries are forecasted to be in Crisis or worse, driven by persistent insecurity and related population displacements, insufficient economic growth including as part of the COVID-19 fallout, the impact of weather extremes, barriers to regional trade, and increasing scarcity of natural resources, amongst other factors. There are an estimated 20.2 million stunted children under the age of five in the region.²⁴

West Africa's food demands are growing and diversifying – e.g., West Africa's population is projected to grow from 400 million in 2020 to 540 million in 2030. Food supply chains are the centre of economic activity – generating 35% of regional GDP and employing more than 100 million people – yet production and supply chains remain fragile.²⁵ For example, at the end of 2021, the results of the agropastoral season showed a significant drop in cereal production both compared to the previous year and compared to the average of the last 5 years, particularly in the Sahelian band (-11 % on average for the Sahelian zone).

These fragilities are compounded by Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine. An early IFPRI analysis points, amongst others, to (a) risks of rising prices with West Africa being an importer of sugar, vegetable oils, meat, and animals and households spending 55% of their income on food and (b) risks related to imports of fertilisers with West Africa importing 82% of its potassium consumption from Russia and Belarus.²⁶

The European Union, the secretariat of the Sahel and West Africa Club (SWAC/OECD), and the Global Network Against Food Crises organised a high-level meeting on food security in the Sahel and Lake Chad regions on 6 April 2022. This Action will build on this mobilisation; in particular the commitment of the EU and its Member States in a Team Europe approach to structurally address the root causes of food insecurity across humanitarian, development, and peace dimensions.

²⁴ UNICEF, WHO, and World Bank, Joint child malnutrition estimates, 2021.

²⁵ OECD West Africa and Sahel Club Secretariat, Food Systems Transformations in the Sahel and West Africa, April 2021.

²⁶ IFPRI, West Africa faces mixed food security impacts from the Russia-Ukraine conflict, April 2022.

Cameroon	<p>Since 2019, the share of the population affected by food insecurity has fluctuated between 7% and 11%. This average conceals great differences between regions, figures are highest in those regions facing insecurity and conflict and where population density is the highest. This is true in the North West-South West (NWSW) and Extreme North regions, where food insecurity has been on the rise: from 4% to 20% between 2019 and 2022 in the Extreme North and an average of 16% in the NWSW.</p> <p>The recently conducted Food Systems Assessment for Cameroon pointed to the low productivity of agriculture, with increasing production based on expansion of cultivated areas and the inefficient use of chemical inputs.²⁷ Furthermore, the agricultural sector does not have sufficient access to credit - less than 4% of total private sector credits in Cameroon go to agriculture.</p> <p>Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine has led to disruptions in supply and rising prices. In 2021, Cameroon imported 45% of its wheat and almost half of its fertilizers from Russia. At the end of March 2022, the Cameroonian government decided to increase the prices of wheat, flour, and bread by 20% in order to prevent producers from stopping production because of lack of profit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPC-CH 3 or above (June - August 2022 projected period): 2.4m people • Prevalence of undernourishment (2019-2021): 6.7% • Food imports/GDP: 2.65% • CAADP scorecard (2022): 4.58/10 • % Agriculture MIP (2021-2024): 27% • UN GCRG food score: n.a.
Chad	<p>In the wake of Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine, following the continuous and sharp fall of grain supplies, major food inflation, and the deterioration of food security indicators, Chad's transitional government officially declared the country in state of food emergency in June 2022.</p> <p>Chad's food system is one of the world's most vulnerable due to the adverse effects of climate change, affected by desertification, land degradation and extreme weather; in addition to local and regional conflict and insecurity. Reduced crop production, alongside below-average food import levels, is likely to contribute to a 291.000 tonnes deficit in food in 2021/2022 – implying a 10% decrease in per capita availability compared to the national objectives.</p> <p>The country lacks the resources required to boost the development and transformation of local agri-food systems. Chad's State budget is currently under pressure, including by the cost for implementing the ongoing political transition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPC-CH 3 or above (projection 2022): 2.1m people • Prevalence of undernourishment (2019-2021): 32.7% • Food imports/GDP: 0.7% • CAADP scorecard (2022): 3.88/10 • % Agriculture MIP (2021-2024): 15% • UN GCRG food score: 2 (medium risk pillar)

²⁷ EU, FAO, CIRAD, Profil des systèmes alimentaires – Cameroun. Activer la transformation durable et inclusive de nos systèmes alimentaires, 2022.

Côte d'Ivoire	<p>In 2020, 10.8% of people in Côte d'Ivoire were food insecure. Rural communities, notably in western and northern Côte d'Ivoire, are disproportionately more affected and vulnerable.</p> <p>In a context of rapid urban growth (53 % of the population lives in urban areas), regular supply to major city markets and increasing food prices pose significant challenges. For example, food inflation stood at 8.5% in March 2022, partly due to increasing prices of cereals and fertiliser imports following Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine.</p> <p>The recent food inflation is boosting the political willingness to reach food sovereignty and self-sufficiency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPC-CH 3 or above (projection 2022): 0.7m people • Prevalence of undernourishment (2019-2021): 4.4% • Food imports/GDP: 4.5% • CAADP scorecard (2022): 4.62/10 • % Agriculture MIP (2021-2024): 30% • UN GCRG food score: 3 (high risk pillar)
Ghana	<p>A recent IFPRI analysis indicates that the global food, fuel, and fertiliser crisis linked to Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine cause GDP and employment in Ghana to contract. GDP and employment losses are driven entirely by losses within the agri-food system, which comprises on-farm (primary agriculture) and off-farm (food processing, food trade and transport, and food services) components. Whereas GDP losses are similar in relative and absolute terms between the two agri-food components, employment losses are much larger in the off-farm components (-2.6%), with losses concentrated in the food processing and food trade and transport subsectors.</p> <p>Considering Ghana's food production has traditionally been well integrated with local, regional, and global markets; these losses will impact local and regional markets in a highly food insecure region, also affected by climate change and erratic rain falls. For example, nominal maize prices in Accra rose 65% between September 2021 and May 2022. Overall, the combined effect of the price shocks is a decline in consumption for all households in Ghana, but larger declines for households toward the lower end of the income distribution. Falling household consumption also leads to greater poverty, particularly in rural areas.²⁸</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPC-CH 3 or above (2021): 0.5m people • Prevalence of undernourishment (2019-2021): 4.1% • Food imports/GDP: 2.36% • CAADP scorecard (2022): 6.61/10 • % Agriculture MIP (2021-2024): 8% • UN GCRG food score: 2 (medium risk pillar)
Mauritania	<p>878.921 people in Mauritania are estimated to be in severe food insecurity during the 2022 lean period – this sharp increase means that 20% of the country population is in acute food insecurity. In relative terms, these are the highest numbers in the region and one of the largest rates in the continent.</p> <p>Mauritania's agricultural potential is significant but remains dramatically under-exploited. The usable agricultural area is estimated at less than 0.5% of the territory (513,000 ha), including rain-fed agriculture, irrigated agriculture, and</p>

²⁸ IFPRI, Ghana: Impacts of the Ukraine and Global Crises on Poverty and Food Security, July 2022.

	<p>the oasis sector. The agricultural sector is subject to climatic hazards, but the potential is there and could be much better exploited by investments in hydraulic infrastructures and by an increased role of the private sector.</p> <p>After COVID-19, increase of international food and energy prices, low rainfall and difficult harvests due to climate change, security concerns at the border with Mali resulting in inflows of refugees and trade obstacles, as well as the effects of Russia's war of aggression have heavily affected food inflation in Mauritania, which reached 13.4% in April 2022. The largest food category imported is wheat, of which 45% comes from Russia and Ukraine.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPC-CH 3 or above (projection 2022): 0.9m people • Prevalence of undernourishment (2019-2021): 10.1% • Food imports/GDP: 9.83% • CAADP scorecard (2022): 5.4/10 • % Agriculture MIP (2021-2024): 14% • UN GCRG food score: 3 (high risk pillar)
Niger	<p>4.4 million people are estimated to be in food crisis or worse during the 2022 lean season, driven by increasing conflict and displacement, disrupted trade flows, low cereal stocks from the 2021 harvest, and high food prices.</p> <p>Cereal production in 2021/2022 was nearly 40% below its year-earlier levels and the five-year average following the poor 2021 rainy season in combination with crop pest infestations and deterioration in security. Early depletion of food stocks, high consumer prices, and unfavorable terms of trade are projected to expose the most vulnerable households to unprecedented levels of acute food insecurity.</p> <p>The government does not have the financial capacity to boost production while meeting the climate change adaptation needs: e.g., for the preparation of the 2022 cereal crop year, only 2500 tonnes of improved cereal seeds are available out of a total demand of 10,900 tonnes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPC-CH 3 or above (projection 2022): 4.4m people • Prevalence of undernourishment (2019-2021): 19.8% • Food imports/GDP: 3.4% • CAADP scorecard (2022): 3.64/10 • % Agriculture MIP (2021-2024): 16% • UN GCRG food score: 2 (medium risk pillar)
Senegal	<p>The recent Food Systems Assessment highlighted several challenges, including the unsustainable pressure on natural resources and the increasing food demand. For example, the additional food demand in 2030 is estimated at 342.000 tonnes of rice, 964.000 tonnes of other grains, and 165.000 tonnes of roots and tubers.²⁹</p> <p>Food inflation is increasing (10.3%). Although the food import on GDP is quite limited (7.3%), the dependency from Russia on wheat (60%) and fertilizers (48%) is high.</p> <p>Risk of shortage could rise if the situation in the war in Ukraine and Black Sea persist. Senegal is also an oil importer from Russia with 18% of its total import.</p>

²⁹ EU, FAO, CIRAD, Profil des systèmes alimentaires – Sénégal. Activer la transformation durable et inclusive de nos systèmes alimentaires, 2022.

	<p>In Senegal, the government has given great importance and priority to the development and promotion of agricultural production to achieve self-sufficiency, and general speaking to reduce their dependence on imports including fertilisers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPC-CH 3 or above (projection 2022): 0.9m people • Prevalence of undernourishment (2019-2021): 7.5% • Food imports/GDP: 7.27% • CAADP scorecard (2022): 5.07/10 • % Agriculture MIP (2021-2024): 17% • UN GCRG food score: 2 (medium risk pillar)
Togo	<p>Togo's economy depends heavily on both commercial and subsistence agriculture, with both sectors providing employment for 60% of the labour force. Socio-political and economic turmoil, coupled with devastating floods and now COVID-19 have seen a deterioration in its food and nutritional situation.</p> <p>Togo is one of the countries with the lowest rate of use of quality inputs in West Africa. Barely 16% of the land is sown with certified seed. This affects agricultural yields. For example, the yield of maize, which is the most consumed cereal in the country, is between 0.8 and 1.2 tonnes per hectare, whereas the potential is 8 to 10 tonnes per hectare with improved seed varieties. To make up for the productivity deficit, production is being driven by the extension of land, resulting in the destruction of plant cover and soil degradation. This situation is likely to worsen with the surge in the price of agricultural inputs caused by Russia's war of aggression in Ukraine.</p> <p>In addition, small-scale farmers are vulnerable to climate change, which causes both floods and droughts, thus increasing food insecurity. The introduction and scaling up of production techniques based on sustainable agricultural intensification practices is needed in Togo to meet the challenge of adaptation, resilience, and productivity in agriculture.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPC-CH 3 or above (projection 2022): 0.2m people • Prevalence of undernourishment (2019-2021): 18.8% • Food imports/GDP: 12.29% • CAADP scorecard (2022): 4.67/10 • % Agriculture MIP (2021-2024): 20% • UN GCRG food score: 3 (high risk pillar)

• EASTERN AFRICA / GREAT LAKES

The East Africa region is witnessing an unprecedented acute food security crisis due to the combined impacts of weather extremes – including regional drought – conflict and conflict-related displacement, and macroeconomic challenges, including rising food prices linked to Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine. Over 50 million people are expected to face food Crisis or worse (IPC Phase 3 or above) conditions in seven IGAD member states in 2022.³⁰ There are an estimated 22.1 million stunted children under the age of five in the region.³¹ In

³⁰ IGAD, Regional Focus of the Global Report on Food Crises, July 2022.

³¹ UNICEF, WHO, and World Bank, Joint child malnutrition estimates, 2021.

addition, DRC remains the biggest food crisis country in absolute terms with more than 27 million people in acute food insecurity in 2021.

Cumulative rainfall amounts during the March–May 2022 rainy season was among the lowest on record in many areas of Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia, resulting in the worst drought in the last 70 years. The poor rains have been widespread in nature, affecting more than 80% of the eastern Horn of Africa, and the sequence of four consecutive below-average seasons is an event not seen in at least the last 40 years. Making the situation worse, there is a consensus across global and regional forecasts that there is an increased probability of another below-average rainy season between October–December 2022, linked to an increased probability of a La Niña and a negative Indian Ocean Dipole. If this were to occur, this would result in an unprecedented fifth below-average rainy season for the Horn of Africa. The drought has led to significant reductions in crop production, widespread livestock losses, severe water shortages, human displacement, and resource-based conflicts over limited resources.

The impact of the drought is compounded by Russia’s war of aggression against Ukraine. For example, below-average rains -compounded by limited availability or shortages of fertilizers and seeds - are further curbing food availability and contributing to higher local food prices. The IGAD region – a net importer of wheat and vegetable oils amongst other commodities – will need to import more food than usual while regional food prices have steeply increased since the war began.

The European Union co-organised a high-level roundtable on food security in the Horn of Africa on 26 April 2022. This Action will build on this mobilisation as well as a forthcoming regional event (early October 2022) co-organised by the EU, the Global Network Against Food Crises, and IGAD on structural policies to address the root causes of food insecurity across humanitarian, development, and peace dimensions.

DRC	<p>A record 27.3 million people were in Crisis or worse in DRC in 2021, driven by protracted conflict and recent escalations that continue to displace households and disrupt livelihoods, particularly in the Eastern provinces. Conflict, crop diseases, and pests also undermined food production and high food prices hampered household access to food across the country.</p> <p>The recently conducted Food Systems Assessment underlined DRC’s food contradiction: DRC has the potential to produce food for 2 billion people but it currently remains a food deficit country. Rising food production is not keeping pace with demographic growth and the agricultural sector remains structurally underfunded.³²</p> <p>Relying on imported food – around 23% of cereals are imported – and refined petroleum, the country is exposed to the ripple effects of the war in Ukraine. Across the country, consumers are facing high prices for both domestically produced and imported food commodities, such as maize and vegetable oil.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPC-CH 3 or above (projection 2022): 27.m people • Prevalence of undernourishment (2019-2022): 39.8%
------------	--

³² EU, FAO, CIRAD, Profil des systèmes alimentaires – République Démocratique du Congo, 2022.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food imports/GDP: 2.98% • CAADP scorecard (2022): 4.46/10 • % Agriculture MIP (2021-2024): 2% • UN GCRG food score: 2 (medium risk pillar)
Kenya	<p>According to the IPC projection update for March–June 2022, about 4.1 million people in the arid and semi-arid regions of Kenya were estimated to be in a situation of ‘Crisis or worse’. This includes 1.1 million people estimated to be in Emergency (IPC Phase 4). Of particular concern were Mandera, Marsabit and Wajir counties.</p> <p>These projections confirm that food insecurity has been on an upward trend in recent years in Kenya, a factor that can be attributed to a nexus of triggers including; frequent droughts, increase in inter-communal conflict, high cost of agricultural inputs (including fertilizers and seeds), unpredictable rains (Kenya relies heavily on rainfed agriculture), depleting fertility of soils (including in the grain basket), and demographic pressures. Kenya remains a net importer of staple foods particularly from neighbouring countries.</p> <p>This trend has also been aggravated by macro global dynamics, with the COVID-19 pandemic and more recently Russia’s war of aggression against Ukraine war taking centre stage. As regards Russia’s war of aggression against Ukraine, food and fertilizer imports have been disrupted. Kenya produces approximately 350,000mt of wheat annually, against an annual consumption estimated at 900,000mt, and thus a 550,000mt deficit exists at any given year. This deficit is bridged through imports, with more than 30% of wheat imports originating from Russia and Ukraine in 2021. Moreover, the impact of escalating fertilizer prices and shortages has negatively influenced crop yields and resulted in poor local harvests. This challenges food availability and accessibility - for example, the price of a 2kg packet of maize flour (a staple food in Kenya) has more than doubled compared to 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPC-CH 3 or above (projection 2022): 4.1m people • Prevalence of undernourishment (2019-2021): 26.9% • Food imports/GDP: 3.04% • CAADP scorecard (2022): 5.62/10 • % Agriculture MIP (2021-2024): n.a. • UN GCRG food score: n.a.
Rwanda	<p>A recent IFPRI analysis found that food, fuel and fertilizers shocks will have significant impacts on Rwanda’s GDP and employment. Real GDP falls by 2.5% due to the combined effects of the negative terms-of-trade shock and rising import costs. Employment also declines by 3.1%, as falling production leads to job losses. The percentage decline in agricultural GDP is much larger than the decline in total GDP; given the large size of the agriculture sector, this accounts for close to 40% of total GDP losses in the country. At the national level, about 85% of the decline in total employment occurs on-farm.³³</p> <p>Agricultural GDP losses are mainly driven by fertilizer shocks, which directly affect primary agricultural production, including by smallholder farmers which represent the majority of farmers in Rwanda and account for 75% of its</p>

³³ IFPRI, Rwanda: Impacts of the Ukraine and Global Crises on Poverty and Food Security, July 2022.

	<p>agricultural production. Agricultural productivity is a structural challenge with most crops only producing half of the potential yields.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPC-CH 3 or above (2021): n.a. • Prevalence of undernourishment (2019-2021): 35.8% • Food imports/GDP: 2.44% • CAADP scorecard (2022): 7.43/10 • % Agriculture MIP (2021-2024): 13% • UN GCRG food score: 2 (medium risk pillar)
Somalia	<p>Somalia is at risk of another famine, as continued violence and three consecutive seasons of severe rainfall deficits resulted in below-average harvests, widespread livestock deaths and climate and conflict-induced displacements. Moreover, rainfall forecasts show an increased probability of an unprecedented fourth consecutive failed rainy season further eroding livelihoods and increasing food and nutrition insecurity. Somalia's children are the most vulnerable, with 1.4 million younger than 5 facing acute malnutrition (UNICEF, 2022).</p> <p>The recently conducted Food Systems Assessment underlined that significant progress has been made in some aspects of the agri-food sector (e.g., livestock and agriculture share of GDP has risen to 75% and various agriculture processing industries have been established) but significant challenges remain.³⁴</p> <p>Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine revealed the risks of relying on a limited range of suppliers for imports with few substitutes. For example, more than 90% of Somalia's wheat imports in 2021 originated in either Ukraine or Russia. Domestic food prices are already almost approaching levels of the 2011 Famine and are expected to continue rising due to limited availability of food, compounded by global trends and dependency on imports.³⁵</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPC-CH 3 or above (projection 2022): 7.1m people • Prevalence of undernourishment (2019-2021): n.a. • Food imports/GDP: 20% • CAADP scorecard (2022): n.a. • % Agriculture MIP (2021-2024): 0% • UN GCRG food score: 3 (high risk pillar)
Uganda	<p>Since 2016, food insecurity in Uganda has progressively increased, driven by conflict and insecurity, including in neighbouring countries; delayed and erratic seasonal rains; and the socioeconomic impacts of COVID-19.</p> <p>Several areas in the unimodal agro-pastoral Karamoja region were classified in Crisis (IPC Phase 3), with some of the worst-affected households in Emergency (IPC Phase 4). Weather extremes resulted in significantly below-average crop production in Karamoja. Moreover, cattle raids and armed confrontations between security forces and raiders within Karamoja further aggravated poor food security outcomes.</p>

³⁴ EU, FAO, CIRAD, Food Systems Profile – Somalia. Catalysing the sustainable and inclusive transformation of food systems, 2022.

³⁵ Global Network Against Food Crises, Hunger Hotspot Report: June-September 2022 outlook.

	<p>The high number of refugees residing in the country, who have fled conflict in South Sudan and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, account for a significant portion of national acute food insecurity figures.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPC-CH 3 or above (projection 2022): 2.2m people • Prevalence of undernourishment (2019-2021): n.a. • Food imports/GDP: 0.97% • CAADP scorecard (2022): 5.89/10 • % Agriculture MIP (2021-2024): 0% • UN GCRG food score: n.a.

• SOUTHERN AFRICA

The number of people in acute food insecurity increased significantly in 2021, driven mainly by conflict in Mozambique, the adverse economic effects of COVID-19 restrictions, and devastating weather shocks. The number was projected to decline during the early 2022 lean season, reflecting the positive impacts of good cereal harvests in most countries of the region in 2021. However, the region relies heavily on imports for its fertiliser supply and elevated global fertiliser prices may negatively affect regional food production going forward. Moreover, as a net importer of commodities such as wheat and vegetable oil, high (local) food prices may further constrain food access for vulnerable households. There are an estimated 1.6 million stunted children under the age of five in the region.³⁶

Madagascar	<p>Three consecutive years of devastating drought had an intense cumulative effect on harvests and livelihoods in the Grand Sud, which, in tandem with COVID-19-related income losses, high food prices and chronic high rates of poverty, led to a dire food crisis towards the end of 2021.</p> <p>In early 2022, households faced high food prices during the lean season - prices of imported oil had increased by 25% on a yearly basis, 13% for local rice, 12% for imported rice and 10% for cassava. High costs of seeds, fertilisers and other agricultural inputs linked to Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine; substantial rainfall deficits in southern regions; and inundation of an estimated 432 000 ha of cropped land have sharply reduced 2022 crop production prospects.</p> <p>A recent Food Systems Assessment found that agricultural production is increasing overall, but it does not keep up with population growth. Madagascar is therefore increasingly dependent on food imports for several food commodities, including for grains and vegetable oils. For example, Madagascar imported 532 000 tonnes of rice and 312 000 tonnes of wheat in 2019.³⁷</p> <p>Sustainably increasing smallholder agricultural productivity has the potential to play a major role in the fight against poverty and zero hunger. This is particularly the case in the Vakinankaratra, Analamanga and Itasy regions,</p>
-------------------	---

³⁶ UNICEF, WHO, and World Bank, Joint child malnutrition estimates, 2021.

³⁷ EU, FAO, CIRAD, Profil des systèmes alimentaires – Madagascar. Activer la transformation durable et inclusive de nos systèmes alimentaires, 2022.

	<p>which constitute a strategic agricultural area and the main production basin of Madagascar.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPC-CH 3 or above (projection 2022): 1.68 m people • Prevalence of undernourishment (2019-2021): 48.5% • Food imports/GDP: 9.83% • CAADP scorecard (2022): 4.37/10 • % Agriculture MIP (2021-2024): 23% • UN GCRG food score: 3 (high risk pillar)
Malawi	<p>Malawi's economy is largely based on low-productivity and rain-fed agriculture. Recent years have shown how food systems are not resilient to recurrent climate and economic shocks. National dialogues ahead of UN Food Systems Summit of 2021 highlighted the urgent need and political engagement for food systems transformations. However, Government continues subsidising inefficient maize production, which puts a heavy toll on public finances and on the already degraded Malawian soils and environment. In addition to the negative returns on fertiliser application, smallholder farmers face multiple challenges that deter investments (limited access to finance and technologies, unsecure land tenure, scarce rural infrastructure, etc.).</p> <p>Whilst the impact of the supply shortage of wheat caused by the Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine is quite limited for Malawi, recent studies (IFPRI) show that the negative impacts of the war will mainly materialise through increase in the prices of cooking oil and inorganic fertilisers (whose price almost doubled already in 2021). The latter will reduce agricultural production, make government subsidies unaffordable and push up food prices. Increase in fuel cost will also make imported foodstuff more expensive, pushing food inflation over 25%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPC-CH 3 or above (projection 2022): 1.7m people • Prevalence of undernourishment (2019-2021): 17.8% • Food imports/GDP: 1.41% • CAADP scorecard (2022): 5.33/10 • % Agriculture MIP (2021-2024): 18% • UN GCRG food score: 2 (medium risk pillar)
Mozambique	<p>Conflict in Cabo Delgado, erratic and below-average rainfall in some areas as well as floods in others, and COVID-19-related economic shocks are driving the food crisis in Mozambique.</p> <p>A recent Food Systems Assessment found that family farmers and small-scale businesses lack public and private investment and institutional support.³⁸</p> <p>Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine is making the situation more complex with rising food and fertiliser prices. Indeed, food prices in Mozambique - a net importer of wheat, rice, and vegetable oils - have already surged. In addition, the country is likely to be affected by increases in agriculture production costs, mainly high cost of fertilisers, for which the country is totally reliant on imports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPC-CH 3 or above (projection 2022): 1.9m people • Prevalence of undernourishment (2019-2021): n.a. • Food imports/GDP: 13.39%

³⁸ EU, FAO, CIRAD, Food Systems Profile - Mozambique. Catalysing the sustainable and inclusive transformation of food systems, 2022.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAADP scorecard (2022): 4.14/10 • % Agriculture MIP (2021-2024): 13% • UN GCRG food score: 2 (medium risk pillar)
Zambia	<p>Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine has affected Zambia through different pathways:</p> <p>1) Food and commodity prices - the average cost of the basic needs and nutrition basket increased with 32% from between February and April 2022 while fertilizer farm gate prices increased with 18%.</p> <p>2) Fuel price and transport cost has been rising in Zambia since the war broke out. Fuel is used for transportation of agriculture inputs, land preparation, planting of crops and harvesting, transporting and processing products. Diesel price per litre increased from ZMW 18.93 in February to ZMW 26.22 in May 2022 (38% increase).</p> <p>3) Anticipated reduction in production of staple grains in 2022/23 season – despite Zambia producing over 3.3 million metric tons of maize in 2021, this fell to 2.7 million metric tonnes in 2022 and even though a one million metric ton exportable surplus exists, the high demand from food-deficit neighbours may induce food shortages.</p> <p>4) Loss of disposable income – rising inflationary pressure on food prices will reduce the purchasing power and disposable income in a country where income poverty is above 70% in rural areas. Zambia's agriculture growth will be constrained by the high price of fertiliser. The increase in the price is putting high pressure on the state budget for subsidy allocations through the Farm Input Support Programme (FISP).</p> <p>A recent Food Systems Assessment found that promoting the adoption of climate-smart agricultural practices is key to build resilience in food production.³⁹</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPC-CH 3 or above (projection 2022): 1.6m people • Prevalence of undernourishment (2019-2021): 30.9% • Food imports/GDP: 3.10% • CAADP scorecard (2022): 5.55/10 • % Agriculture MIP (2021-2024): n.a. • UN GCRG food score: n.a.

• CARIBBEAN

The Caribbean is highly food import dependent and Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine is already negatively affecting the availability and affordability of food in the region due to the spike in food and fuel prices. In this context, smaller and lower-income farmers with limited capital will face particular challenges for continuing production and ensuring their livelihood. Belize, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Jamaica, and Suriname are all considered to be at either medium or high food risk by the UN Global Crisis Response Group on food, energy, and finance. Recent Food Systems Assessments have been conducted for Belize, the Dominican Republic, and Jamaica.

³⁹ EU, FAO, CIRAD, Food Systems Profile – Zambia. Catalysing the sustainable and inclusive transformation of food systems, 2022.

In particular, the ongoing economic crisis, successive below-average harvests, and rising insecurity will continue to exacerbate already alarming levels of acute food insecurity in Haiti – 4.5 million people are in food crisis or worse. This situation is compounded by the effects of Russia’s war of aggression against Ukraine, considering that Haiti imports about 70% of its cereals supply. There are an estimated 400,000 stunted children under the age of five in the region.⁴⁰

- **PACIFIC**

Climate change poses a fundamental threat to Pacific food systems. In addition, the Pacific region is heavily and increasingly dependent on imported foods and suffered from devastating social and economic impacts caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. Half of the total household consumption expenditure in the Pacific region is dedicated to food. There are an estimated 560,000 stunted children under the age of five in the region.⁴¹ This situation is compounded by the impact of Russia’s war of aggression against Ukraine - the UN Global Crisis Response Group on food, energy, and finance brief n°2 (June 2022) highlights that many small island developing States of the region will struggle to pay for rising food and energy imports and face at least one severe exposure. Indeed, exposure of Pacific people to food insecurity is growing and the need to increase food production is a priority. However, increasing quality food production comes with the risk of over-exploitation of natural resources, reduced biodiversity and degraded ecosystems. It is therefore important to promote a resilient and sustainable transformation of the Pacific coastal food system.

- **TRANSVERSAL COMPONENT**

The transversal programme will ensure coherence across the seventeen countries and two regional programmes, and beyond.

First, with a view to amplifying the impact of EU support to food production systems, the transversal action will facilitate access to finance and sustainable investments for small-scale producers as well as micro, small, and medium food enterprises. This focus is based on recurrent and significant difficulties in mobilizing investments/finance in the rural world – in particular for agricultural and food systems activities – both through domestic and external public and private resources. This is particularly the case for small-scale actors and fragile countries.

Second, the transversal action will also ensure coordination and complementarity with the EU portfolio on food security and sustainable food systems as well as multilateral initiatives in response to the current food crisis – including the UN GCRG, the GAFS, the FARM, amongst others. This focus is based on the need for a well-coordinated response amidst multiple initiatives. In this regard, the transversal component will link to the humanitarian, development, peace coordination efforts within the Global Network Against Food Crises to tackle the root causes of food crises and promote sustainable solutions.

1.6 For budget support actions in Niger and Cameroon

1.6.1 Fundamental values

Cameroon faces governance, peace and stability challenges, notably due to the crisis in the south-west and north-western regions (NWSW), the continuing terrorist threats of Boko

⁴⁰ UNICEF, WHO, and World Bank, Joint child malnutrition estimates, 2021.

⁴¹ UNICEF, WHO, and World Bank, Joint child malnutrition estimates, 2021.

Haram/Islamic State in West Africa Province (ISWAP) in the Far North region bordering Nigeria and Lake Chad, and the presence of 485 729 refugees and asylum seekers mostly from the Central African Republic and Nigeria, as well as 936 676 internally displaced persons (IDPs) and 518 853 returnees (ex-IDPs), of whom around 61 % are in the NWSW. Frustration about legitimate but non-relaxed aspirations, especially of young people, exacerbates tensions in society. Cameroon has signed the main human rights conventions, although ratification is not complete for some conventions. The Universal Periodic Review (UPR) session in 2018 highlighted varying progress in the implementation of the accepted recommendations, and the next session is scheduled for May 2023. Overall, the legal framework remains restrictive and the enabling environment for the exercise of freedoms and the action of civil society organisations, which often face administrative obstacles, funding constraints and violations of individual rights and fundamental freedoms, in particular freedom of demonstration, peaceful assembly and expression (adversity also shared by journalists and opposition political parties). Furthermore, due to the use of anti-terrorism law and military courts, procedural safeguards are very weak. Cameroon's Penal Code provides for the death penalty, and although no executions have taken place since 1997, a number of people were sentenced to death in the fight against terrorism and the moratorium is often released. Children's rights remain very precarious in a context of impoverishment of households, poor access to basic services, security crises and forced displacement, and virtually non-existent or ineffective child protection institutional structures.

In coordination with EU Member States, the EU Delegation has prepared an EU Human Rights and Democracy Strategy (HRCS), an EU Road Map in support of civil society for the period 2021-25, and the Gender Action Plan III Country Level Implementation Plan with a range of actions to be pursued in the political and financial cooperation framework. As regards the latter, the EU has provided for a specific support pillar in priority 1.3. of Multiannual indicative programme-NDICI 2021-27, as well as through thematic lines. Cooperation activities are supported by the structured political dialogue on the security situation and conflicts in the north-west and south-west regions and in the Far North region. An agreement in principle has been reached by the authorities to set up a thematic working group on civil-military cooperation.

Niger has succeeded in 2021 its democratic transition despite a complex electoral process which tested a fragile system affected by an increase in political tensions and security threats. Niger has signed and ratified the main international human rights conventions and their protocols. These advances have resulted in the adoption of several laws as well as institutional reforms, including the establishment of a permanent Independent National Electoral Commission (CENI). The principles of equality and non-discrimination are enshrined in the Constitution and are meant to govern service delivery practices in all areas. However, its effectiveness is limited by the persistence of multifaceted barriers which may be linked to geographical isolation, illiteracy, non-availability of information and services, etc. The state of emergency, declared and renewed several times in the Diffa and Tillabéry regions, disrupts the functioning of state institutions and requires close vigilance in terms of human rights.

1.6.2 Macroeconomic policy

Cameroon's government maintained macroeconomic stability during the health crisis. Economic growth slowed to 0.5% in 2020 affected by the COVID-19 pandemic and security tensions in the region. Growth rebounded in 2021 and reached 3.6% for the year, supported by a domestic recovery and the general global economic recovery. Inflation for the year averaged

2.3% and the current account deficit (including grants) widened to 4.0 % of GDP. The economic outlook for 2022 is clouded with considerable uncertainty arising from the sharp increase in international commodity prices—especially for oil, fertilizer, and foodstuffs—accentuated by the war in Ukraine, and tightening conditions in international financial markets. The authorities are committed to a fiscal policy anchored on a gradual reduction of the deficit and are revising the budget to maintain the deficit. The medium-term outlook remains positive, though facing considerable uncertainties. The economic strategy remains focused on rebuilding fiscal and external buffers to sustain macroeconomic stability. At the same time, the pace of structural reform needs to be accelerated for the country to meet its development goals. The business environment needs to be improved for the private sector to take the lead role in supporting growth.⁴²

Niger's economy is vulnerable to various and varied shocks such as climatic hazards, high levels of insecurity at the national level and in the sub-region, and the volatility of commodity prices and international prices of imported products (including foodstuffs). The war in Ukraine is exacerbating these challenges particularly through its effect on food and fertiliser prices. Nevertheless, despite these challenges, the main macroeconomic and budgetary fundamentals are under control, as confirmed by the results of the June 2022 review of the economic and financial programme (Extended Credit Facility) of the IMF. In addition, with regards to public debt, the latest debt sustainability analysis (DSA 2021) indicates a moderate risk of overall and external debt distress.

1.6.3 *Public Financial Management (PFM)*

Cameroon achieved important milestones of the PFM reform in 2021. Namely, the Macroeconomic and Fiscal Framing Committee was formalised by Decree No 2021/0080/PM of 27 January 2021 setting up, organising and operating the Inter-ministerial Committee for Macroeconomic and Fiscal Framing; the *Chamber de Compte* carried out, for the first time, a management audit of the Special National Solidarity Fund for the fight against the coronavirus. The main weakness of PFM remains in the area of fiscal and accounting statistics, which weakens the ability to steer the state's macroeconomic and fiscal policy. The Government still needs to ensure that all decrees and laws transposing the six CEMAC directives, in particular the decrees laying down the general frameworks for presenting the State budget nomenclature and public accounts, are implemented effectively, in order to help improve the quality, reliability and transparency of financial and asset data and the efficiency of public expenditure.

Niger's fiscal space is highly dependent on external financing which represents more than 40% of the budget, including 5% of budget support. With regards to domestic resource mobilisation, tax and customs collection remains one of the lowest in the West Africa Economic and Monetary Union (WAEMU) and far from the WAEMU convergence criterion of 20% of GDP; the tax burden (tax revenues to GDP ratio) stands at 10.8% in 2021 and is expected to reach 14.4% by 2025 assuming that oil production and prices are favourable. After the implementation of the public finance management reform plan (PRGFPIV 2017-2020), which had mixed results, a new public finance management reform strategy 2021-2026 and its priority action plan were formulated and adopted in October 2021. In the course of 2022, the finalisation of a Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability diagnostic (PEFA) and a Methodology for Assessing Procurement Systems (MAP-self-evaluation) is expected. Furthermore, Niger has recently joined the Addis Tax Initiative (ATI).

⁴² see IMF press release/ 2nd Review ECF and EFF

1.6.4 Transparency and oversight of the budget

Cameroon's adoption of a new legal framework in 2018 for the transposition of the CEMAC Directives conferred new powers on auditing on the Chamber of Accounts, which implemented in 2020, led to the production of its first management report, published on 16 November 2021. This audit is the first of its kind to have been carried out in Cameroon in full independence and in accordance with the international standards of the Supreme Audit Institutions (ISSAI).

Niger's authorities are still pursuing, as in previous years, initiatives to disseminate budget information to Nigerien citizens. Documents relating to finance laws and periodic reports (quarterly and annual) on the execution of the State budget are posted online⁴³ Overall, in terms of transparency, progress has been made in recent years as confirmed by the latest Open Budget Index (OBI) 2021 report. Indeed, Niger's transparency score is 27/100 in 2021, moderately higher compared to its 2019 score (17/100) and significantly higher than the 2017 score (0/100). In addition, recent developments on cases of corruption and mismanagement of public contracts in the security and defence sector during 2020 and 2021 can constitute strong signals for a real strengthening of transparency and budgetary control.

2 RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

Risks	Risk level (H/M/L)	Mitigating measures
Inadequate political support from partners to transform food systems in order to ensure their sustainability.	M	Political commitment is tested along the implementation phase and, eventually, policy dialogue is used to, amongst others, remind partners of policy commitments taken earlier by them (e.g. in the framework of the follow-up of the 2021 Food Systems Summit).
Competing visions, interests, and influence on balancing and managing trade-offs between social, environmental, and economic considerations of the transition to sustainable food systems.	H	Developing a shared understanding of the facts and evidence between different stakeholders, including through Food Systems Assessments and Value Chain Analysis for Development. Using the updated EU toolbox on applying the Human Rights Based Approach to place rights-holders at the centre of the actions. ⁴⁴
Spiralling food insecurity leads to widespread food systems collapse as well as unrest, insecurity, and instability at local, regional, and/or global levels.	M	Using the analytical capacities of initiatives like the UN Global Crisis Response Group and the Global Network Against Food Crises to inform the assessment of risks with a view to

⁴³ <http://www.finances.gouv.ne>

⁴⁴ European Commission, Applying the Human Rights Based Approach to international partnerships: an updated Toolbox for placing rights-holders at the centre of EU's Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation (SWD(2021)179 final), 30 June 2021.

		inform adaptation, rapid responses, and reviews where possible and necessary.
Challenges in striking the balance as well as managing potential trade-offs between short-term response to the current food crisis and medium-term sustainability of food systems.	M	Ensuring that the humanitarian, development, and peace nexus coordination is maintained throughout the programme.
Women farmers and food entrepreneurs do not benefit from the actions on the value chain they are or could be part of.	M	All actions will promote a transformative approach and will mainstream a gender perspective in line with the new Action Plan on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in External Relations 2020–2025 (GAP III). ⁴⁵
Violation of human rights (such as practices from different actors that undermine decent living and working conditions)	M	A 'do no harm approach' will be applied. Outcome 4 will make it easier for public policies to protect people from human rights violations generated in the agri-food sector.
Assumptions Key stakeholders maintain their commitment to implement Agenda 2030 and all the SDGs. The impact of COVID 19 is contained. Governments remain committed to improving nutrition and food security outcomes. Support organisations are able to propose to farmers climate relevant innovations and farmers able to adopt them. Support organisations and partners are able to identify in a participatory manner sustainable (economically, socially and environmentally) value chains. Appropriate services and tools identified which prevent and respond to shocks and stressors of food crises. National nutrition governance mechanisms are effective in mobilising all sectors and actors that play a role in nutrition-sensitive and nutrition-specific interventions and engaging them in an evidence-based policy dialogue.		

⁴⁵ Presidency Conclusions endorsed by 24 Member States on the Gender Action Plan (GAP) III: an ambitious agenda for gender equality and women's empowerment in EU External Action (SWD(2020)284 final), 25 November 2020.

For budget support:

Cameroon

Risks	Risk level (H/M/L)	Mitigating measures
Possible increase of tension in the South West, North West regions, and in the North of Cameroon.	M	Maintain dialogue with the authorities, and, if and when the political conditions are conducive, seek for economic opportunities.
Uncertainty arising from the sharp increase in international commodity prices—especially for oil, fertilizer, and foodstuffs—accentuated by the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine, and tightening conditions in international financial markets	M	Support to the import substitution policy could assist Cameroon to face the crisis. In addition, the IMF, during the recent review, provided some policy recommendations (restructuring the subsidy system) to maintain macro- economic stability while helping the population face the price increase.
Assumptions Sufficient political will is there to ensure ‘buy-in’ from government authorities. Stakeholders are committed to the emerging framework for sustainable production Private sector representatives recognise that there are commercial opportunities in the development of food production systems.		

Niger

Risks	Risk Level (H, M, L)	Mitigation measures
Vulnerability to climatic shocks and changes in international commodity, food and fertiliser prices.	H	Support for the national food crisis management and prevention mechanism (DNPGCA) in order to reduce the vulnerability of the population and ensure more stable funding for crisis response.
Increased insecurity linked to the situation in the Sahel and West-Africa sub-region.	M	Maintaining security measures and consultation at the regional level (establishment of the Joint Multinational Force)
Rapid population growth	M	Family planning policies, also promoted through policy dialogue.

Weak institutional capacity to implement public policies and reforms.	H	The existence of medium and long-term planning in the priority sectors will make it possible to anticipate responses, pool resources and achieve substantial savings.
Weaknesses in public sector management that can lead to corruption, including in the sectors targeted by this programme.	H	Political and technical support for government initiatives in the fight against corruption and the establishment of systems for monitoring the recommendations of the Court of Auditors and other control bodies.
Resistance to change and power relations embedded in society and culture.	H	Concerning gender based violence and discriminations, a gender analysis is being carried out by the Technical and Financial Partners (TFPs) which is expected to provide solutions to the risks and constraints identified.
Assumptions - Political and institutional stability which could be compromised in the event of non-intervention; - Determination to improve the mobilisation of domestic resources and the quality of expenditure - Political will and support to pursue all reform and actions as described in the mitigating measures - Continuation of support (e.g. financial, technical, capacity) from Technical and Financial Partners in the sectors concerned		

3 LESSONS LEARNT AND COMPLEMENTARITY

3.1 Lessons learnt

Though some of the initiatives foreseen in the Action entail new areas of intervention for the EU, they all incorporate lessons learned from many years of EU experience in the field of sustainable agriculture, agri-value chains, and food systems. Several of the initiatives represent a continuation of previous partnerships which have been adapted to take account of past experiences.

For budget support:

Cameroon. In Cameroon, the implementation of the first sectoral budget support (2017-21) confirmed the validity of the budget support approach. In a sector previously characterised by its lethargy, budget support has made it possible to reactivate processes dormant for years. It has succeeded in encouraging the authorities to better play their role as establishing relevant policies and strategies, from acting as a regulator towards becoming an enabling facilitator. It also helped giving them the tools to better steer sectoral policy, improving the effectiveness of the policy measures in favour of more sustainable agriculture production, while creating a dynamic inter-ministerial framework. The ongoing participatory evaluation report of the sectoral budget support highlighted the strong ownership of systemic reforms by the sectoral minister and the significant leverage effect on public and private investment.

Niger. The recent external evaluation of the 2016-2021 Niger food security and sustainable agriculture sectoral budget support informed the preparation of the logic of the intervention for the action in favour of Niger. In terms of crises and shocks, the COVID-19 pandemic, the 2020 floods and the 2022 food crises demonstrate that Niger has an effective tool in terms of monitoring, alert and management of various crises and disasters that deserves to be supported for an even better anticipation and mitigation of agriculture, food and nutrition risks.

3.2 Complementarity, synergy and donor coordination

The “production and resilience” Action is part and parcel of the comprehensive EUR 600 million package agreed by the Council. Complementarities and synergies with the humanitarian and macroeconomic support allocations will be actively pursued.

The Action will further strengthen the articulation of a Humanitarian-Development-Peace approach. This approach will be framed in the Global Network against Food Crises, enhancing the long term, production-oriented and innovative-financing-based component to match the engagement in lives and livelihoods saving interventions, which has been the historic focus of the members of the Global Network Against Food Crises.

Countries receiving additional humanitarian food assistance	Countries receiving additional humanitarian food assistance and production & resilience assistance	Countries receiving additional production & resilience assistance
Burkina Faso, Burundi (refugee crisis), CAR, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Mali, Nigeria, South Sudan, Sudan, Zimbabwe	Cameroon, Caribbean, Chad, DRC, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Somalia.	Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Malawi, Pacific Rwanda, Senegal, Togo, Uganda, Zambia

The component on macro-economic support will also amplify the effects of the interventions in a number of ACP LICs, by increasing liquidity and available budgetary resources in the ACP countries under IMF programmes financed by the Poverty Reduction and Growth Trust Fund (PRGT).

Moreover, the Action will be complementary to and be implemented in synergy with the current EUR 3.2 billion EU support to food security and food systems programmed under NDICI-Global Europe in Sub-Sahara Africa, Latin America and Caribbean, and Asia and Pacific, including frontloading efforts in response to the current food crisis, as well as the current EUR 7.7 billion wider EU support for global food security and food systems until 2024.

Team Europe. The Action is strongly embedded in the Council Conclusions on a Team Europe Response to Global Food Insecurity. A Team Europe approach will be ensured at all levels and Team Europe initiatives will be pursued whenever possible.

Effective multilateralism. The production and resilience actions are supportive to the proposals by the UN Global Crisis Response Group (UN GCRG) and the operationalisation of

the Global Alliance for Food Security (GAFS) and the Food and Agriculture Resilience Mission (FARM), amongst others.

Moreover, in line with the Team Europe Response to Global Food Insecurity, this Action will link to coordination efforts within the Global Network Against Food Crises. The Global Network – founded by WFP, FAO, and the EU with USAID and the World Bank amongst other key members – is the global alliance of humanitarian and development actors committed to tackling the root causes of food crises and promoting sustainable solutions.

For the purpose of ensuring complementarity, synergy and coordination, the Commission may sign or enter into joint donor coordination declarations or statements and may participate in donor coordination structures, as part of its prerogative of budget implementation and to safeguard the financial interests of the Union.

4 DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

4.1 Overall objective, specific objective(s), expected outputs and indicative activities

The **Overall Objective (Impact)** of this action is to **enhance sustainable food production and the resilience of food systems**.

The **Specific(s) Objective(s) (Outcomes)** of this action are:

- **SO1: More economically sustainable and inclusive food systems**
 - o OP1.1. Increased access to financial services
 - o OP1.2. Increased access to markets
 - o OP1.3 Responsible investments in sustainable and nutritious agri-food value chains
 - o OP1.4. Increased production capacity of smallholders
 - o OP1.5 Improved processing, marketing, and digital skills for all
 - o OP1.6 Improved quality of extension services
- **SO2: Reinforced environmental sustainability of food systems**
 - o OP2.1. Climate-smart, agro-ecological, and other innovative approaches developed
 - o OP2.2 Sustainable management practices for agricultural and pastoral ecosystems introduced
 - o OP2.3 Increased skills of smallholders on sustainable production methods
- **SO3: Enhanced social sustainability of food systems (incl. food and nutrition security)**
 - o OP3.1 Shock-responsive and gender sensitive social protection systems in place
 - o OP3.2 Improved gender sensitive access to basic services
 - o OP3.3 Increased share of the population able to afford a healthy diet
- **SO4: Improved governance and institutional sustainability of food systems**
 - o OP4.1. Better informed and inclusive policy making
 - o OP4.2 Enhanced capacities of public institutions and private organisations to moderate the impact of the global food crisis in their countries / regions, including farmers' organisations
 - o OP4.3. Improved food stock / food storage

- o OP4.4 Information, surveillance, and early warning systems in place
- o OP4.5 Smallholders supported to legalize their land tenure/ownership, either individual or communal

To ensure a sustainable impact on enhancing sustainable food production and the resilience of food systems (overall objective), each of the seventeen countries, two regional, and one transversal action will integrate and balance the economic, environmental, social, and governance dimensions of food systems (four specific objectives).

In addition, for Budget Support modality

For Cameroon, the current action will complement the 2017-2021 Rural Development Sector Reform Contract (SRC) programme. It will allow the implementation of reforms adopted by the government and aims to enhance food production and the resilience of food systems in the country and therefore it will reinforce existing targets of the SRC contract with regards to sustainability dimensions. The induced outputs are indicatively mentioned under the logframe in the appendix on the basis of the SRC logframe.

The expected induced outputs are: i) An efficient private seed production sector promoted; ii) Measures for climate change adaptation (CCA) and climate-smart agriculture (CSA) adopted; iii) An agro-ecological transition through sustainable intensification supported; iv) Investments in climate resilient agribusiness, while building up farmers capacity supported. The government of Cameroon's administrations, including the MINEPAT, and other ministries and public institutions at central and devolved level will be primarily responsible to design policies and implement the activities, financially assisted by the Agricultural Sector Development Funds and by Public Private Partnerships (PPPs). In addition, by working with IFIs, the action will facilitate access to credit, and provide additional technical capacity to support agricultural investments and agri-food processing in critical value chain.

For Niger, the amount allocated will complement the 2022-2024 Contrat relatif à la résilience et construction de l'Etat (SRBC) (NDICI AFRICA/2021/043-180) in order to enhance food production and the resilience of food systems in the country and therefore it will reinforce existing targets of the SRBC contract with regards to sustainability dimensions.

The induced outputs awaited are indicatively : i) Access to sustainable and inclusive finance in the sector, in particular for climate, environmental, social (inclusive) and economically sustainable agricultural activities, enhanced; ii) Access to and quality of advisory support services in the sector are improved, including for environmentally friendly and climate-adapted production; iii) Contributing to sustainable land management through the implementation of regional land-use plans ("Schéma d'Amenagement Foncier – SAF"); iv) The institutional and financial governance of the national food security mechanism is improved ; v)The system for warning, prevention and management of crises and shocks is improved.

<u>Indicative activities per country</u> ⁴⁶
WESTERN AFRICA /SAHEL

⁴⁶ On the basis of gender country profiles GAP III Country Level Implementation Plans and gender sector analyses, all activities will mainstream gender equality.

Cameroon	The proposed action aims at increasing agricultural productivity in selected agro–pastoral value chains that are inclusive and sustainable. The main activities include: (1) sustainable agro-ecological intensification (2) promotion of an efficient private and community seed sector, and (3) strengthening farmers’ resilience to climate change and reducing reliance on imported fertilisers, seeds, etc. Easing access to credit for small-scale agribusinesses, following a gender sensitive approach, and increasing capacity in the use of more sustainable, resilient farming practices will also be carried out.
Chad	The proposed action will support the sustainable development of nutritious oilseed-based value chains (production, processing and marketing). The availability of, and access to, locally produced, plant-based fortified foods (including plant proteins), will be ensured with a view to improving the incomes of most vulnerable actors such as small farmers and consumers. The targeted value chains will be selected based on their ability to be good vehicles for food fortification.
Côte d'Ivoire	The proposed action will contribute to increased sustainable food production and availability of food products in urban and peri-urban areas. The main activities include the formalisation of farmers’ organisations, optimising existing production infrastructure, providing technical assistance to food producers/farmers including women, improving farmers’ access to finance notably for women, improved storage, conservation and marketing facilities, and improved food processing and access to markets.
Ghana	The proposed action will promote crop-specific, agro-ecological systems and approaches and support the sustainable development of a select number of agribusiness value chains, including shea, soybean, beekeeping, and vegetables.
Mauritania	The proposed action will contribute to increase food production through socially, environmentally, and economically sustainable value chains. Priority will be given to the agricultural sectors of food crops and market gardening in the production basins that are particularly active around lakes, ponds and along rivers. Thanks to the additional resources, support could be extended to improve the value chains in the South and South-East by facilitating an increase in rice and/or other local crop production (Millet, Sorghum, Maize, Barley). Where possible, the products of inland fishing will also be promoted.
Niger	The proposed action will support the government’s capacity to mitigate the effects of the 2022 food crisis and price rises and to accelerate the implementation of structural reforms to address food insecurity. The main activities include the promotion of sustainable agricultural value chains, the sustainable reconstitution of the national food reserve, increased land rights (which will allow for increased access to finance), increased sustainable productivity and incentives for private sector investments. This action will complement the planned portfolio under the Multiannual Indicative Programme by adding an additional focus on the food system sustainability dimensions in the dialogue with the national authorities. It will also be complementary to the actions funded under FPI in support of social and political stabilization, as well as humanitarian assistance focusing

	on food assistance. Moreover, the selected structural reforms supported build on a Team Europe approach.
Senegal	The proposed action will increase agricultural production with a focus on sustainable value chains also capable of substituting imports and offering export opportunities to producers. Other activities include support to critical government reforms aimed at agricultural self-reliance and food security (agricultural subsidies, agri-food market regulations, credit reform, amongst others).
Togo	The proposed action aims to provide an urgent and sustainable response to the problems of access to inputs for vulnerable small-scale producers and to strengthen the food system's resilience to climate change. The main activities include the development of a digital application dedicated to supporting knowledge sharing and change of practices around production techniques , good agricultural practices, meteorological information, market information systems, monitoring of agricultural value chain actors and assessment of the food and nutritional security situation in the country; development and strengthening of the electronic input subsidy management application; establishment and management of a vegetable garden and support for the creation of small livestock units; supply of cereals and pulses to canteens through purchase contracts with local small producer organisations and capacity building of small producers' organisations and canteen management committees; nutritional education and awareness raising on good food, nutritional and hygiene practices; support to women's entrepreneurship in the processing of agricultural products and research into agro-ecology and organic agriculture.
EASTERN AFRICA / GREAT LAKES	
DRC	The proposed action will increase the sustainability of food and agricultural production and agri-food value chains in key landscapes. The main activities include improving the seed and agricultural extension sectors, boosting the agroecological production of local crops, in particular manioc, to replace wheat imports, and reducing losses at production and post-harvest stages. Where relevant, the action might also focus on the spread of plant pests and diseases.
Kenya	The proposed action seeks to enhance production and contribute to building resilience of the food system. The main activities include the promotion of conservation agriculture promoting agroecological practices, upscaling of the existing service provider model in order to boost extension services both through the public and private sectors, increasing access to water harvesting and mechanization services, applying innovative technologies, and boosting smallholders' production with access to mobile-based e-voucher agricultural inputs and services (through Government systems). Where relevant, links will be made to social safety net programmes.
Rwanda	The proposed action will increase domestic food production through the development of sustainable agri-food and aquaculture value chains, while simultaneous improving post-harvest management, infrastructures and strengthening the resilience of targeted communities in food crisis situations (agroforestry systems promotion, crop diversification).

	<p>The main activities include the promotion of conservation agriculture, scale-up investments in actions that enhance sustainable crop productivity for smallholder farmers (greenhouses, small-scale irrigation, ponds, post-harvest process...) including extension. In complement to the on-going support to the government actions and to the private sector, the activities will be executed by international and Rwandan Non-state actors: NGOs, cooperatives.</p> <p>Access to local markets will be linked to the existing Team Europe Initiative elaborated around the future Kigali Wholesale Market.</p>
Somalia	<p>The proposed action will increase domestic food production through the development of sustainable agri-food, fisheries, and livestock value chains, while simultaneously strengthening the resilience and access to basic services of targeted communities in food crisis situations. The main activities include upgrading production and processing systems along agro-ecological processes, adding value to selected food chains; supporting (including through financial services and products) and integrating smallholders, farmers' cooperatives and small and medium agribusinesses into sustainable agribusiness and food value chains; supporting gender-sensitive, climate- smart and nutrition- sensitive agri- and aquatic-food extension trainings through Farmer Field Schools (FFS), and specialised TVET training; promoting policies that support sustainable agribusinesses and food value chains; supporting capacity building activities to strengthen public-private collaboration on sustainable food value chain development, including water resource management and supporting infrastructure interventions for local communities to facilitate connectivity of goods, people and services.</p>
Uganda	<p>The proposed action includes two components: 1) a contribution to the Agricultural Business Initiative to support competitive, profitable and sustainable agriculture and agribusiness sectors and 2) scaling up a programme to increase resilience to food shocks of chronic and acute food insecure households living in Karamoja. The main activities include the provision of grants to agri-businesses and smallholder farmers; support to SMEs in the green agribusiness space; Business Development Services (BDS) for both suppliers (farmer organisations etc.) and demanders (agro-processing, trading and/or exporting SMEs); support to smallholder farmers to establish, maintain and expand functional and profitable market linkages and partnerships with off-takers; enhance downstream and upstream market access and improve their production planning, financial planning and farm management.</p>
SOUTHERN AFRICA	
Madagascar	<p>The proposed action will support small-scale producers to better structure themselves within five value chains (horticulture, poultry, milk, rice-fish farming, and improved charcoal production) along agro-ecological principles which do not require investment or significant initial cash flow or particular technical capital, but for which there is strong demand and which allow substantial margins to be generated, capable of significantly reducing the pressure on rice cultivation. This will be done through productivity gains and better</p>

	<p>structuring of producers allowing economies of scale and increased marketing opportunities. The proposed action will promote increased diversification of production systems between agriculture, agroforestry systems and forest plantations making it possible for small-scale farmers and charcoal producers to diversify the sources of income during the year by increasing the resilience of these production systems in the face of climate change in particular (drought via the duration and distribution rains). In addition, support for diversified food production chains and related increased incomes will have an impact on the nutritional status of women and children. Increased land tenure security for producers, integrated into an effort to develop the municipal territory and to strengthen the development capacities of municipalities through improved decentralized taxation and participatory budgeting, will play an incentive role in terms of productive investment and resilience.</p>
Malawi	<p>The proposed action will support agricultural diversification, value addition and commercialisation as a means of increasing smallholders' income and encourage import substitution. The main activities include support for the development of productive alliances of smallholders through innovative financing mechanisms (such as matching grants), increased access to agricultural technologies, as well as last mile infrastructure such as irrigation schemes and clean energy production. By promoting production along agro ecological principles, reducing dependence on inorganic fertilisers, resilience will be increased, and market failures will be addressed by linking producers to market operators. Ongoing and upcoming support to food system transformations under the Kulima, Afikepo and UCHI programmes, as well as the agricultural research DeSIRA intervention will also be strengthened.</p>
Mozambique	<p>The proposed action aims at (a) mitigating the impact of the increased costs of agricultural inputs (fuel, fertilizer, quality seeds) for domestic food production and (b) foster productivity increases of staple food crops through the provision of temporary, smart subsidies and the integration of strategic food reserves. The main activities include expanding an existing electronic co-payment scheme for agriculture inputs (fertilisers and seeds) making it accessible and available through local agro-dealers to smallholder farmers and medium scale producers; support to commercial producers in localities where storing/aggregation facilities exist; support integration of producers with aggregators and local strategic reserves, and support more effective management of warehouses; and the sustainable use of agricultural inputs, and strengthen extension support to small-scale producers to increase their productivity and resilience to the expected price shocks; promote adequate soil management practices and better use of chemical and organic fertilisers; support evidence based policy to promote structural and regulatory reform conducive to the stabilisation of food prices and production costs, including streamlining trade procedures, import tariff revision, and increased public investments in productive infrastructure, and promotion of agricultural innovation and food product quality.</p>

Zambia	<p>The proposed action will scale up support to the sustainable intensification of smallholder farming systems along agroecological principles.</p> <p>The main activities may include expanding the number of targeted smallholder farmers from the current 16,000 to 60,000; promoting sustainable practices and technologies among smallholders for increased yields, while promoting climate resilient nutrition sensitive agriculture; strengthening access by smallholders to agricultural input and output markets, including the provision of targeted matching grants to smallholders and cooperatives via e-vouchers; enhancing community level multiplication of legume seeds and the production of quality declared seeds; expanding agroforestry and appropriate land management practices; promoting appropriate and environmentally friendly agricultural mechanisation (for irrigation, crop production and post-harvest handling); strengthening links between smallholder farmers and the private sector, and facilitating sustainable technology transfers to the government's social protection and social sustainability programs (the Food Security Pack and the Farmer Input Support Programmes) and the Green Growth strategy.</p>
CARIBBEAN	
	<p>The proposed action aims to support the transition to more sustainable and resilient agri-food systems in the Caribbean, while a component will target the specific challenges of Haiti's acute food crisis.</p> <p>The main activities include direct income grants and links to institutional markets; agro-meteorological information tools and services for promoting climate-smart and agro-ecological approaches in agriculture value chains; strengthened social protection systems for vulnerable households and small agro-businesses and farmers; promotion of climate-smart agriculture investments and intra-regional value chains using digital and other types of technology; increasing the competitiveness and production capabilities of smallholder farmers and processors.</p> <p>The specific Haiti component aims to support sustainable agricultural production and enhanced community-based responses to malnutrition in Haiti.</p> <p>The main activities include support to nutritional surveillance capacities, nutritional practices, and related skills at community level; strengthening of smallholder farmers' agro-ecological production, agri-business and climate smart practices (food production, processing, distribution, farmers' organizations) and support to the creation of opportunities for off-farm revenues for rural youths.</p>
PACIFIC	
	<p>The proposed action aims to contribute to increased climate-resilient green food production while sustaining the natural resource base in</p>

	<p>coastal and atoll communities in the Pacific. The main activities include promoting agro-ecology and organic regenerative farming systems, agroforestry and circular water-agriculture systems, and strengthening the food/water/energy nexus. Additional activities include capacity building (e.g. training in agro-ecology, regenerative organic farming, agroforestry); establishment of farmer field schools; support of farmer to farmer exchanges; support of collaborative farmer-led knowledge production and dissemination); support to the implementation of sustainable land management techniques and approaches to strengthen natural resource sustainability, and of protection measures for riparian zones; promotion of farming practices that improve the sustainability of agricultural landscapes and efficient water use technologies for both crops and livestock; development of investment and support packages to enable participating governments, communities and stakeholders to demonstrate how strengthening relevant components of the Pacific food/water/energy nexus can contribute to local development and resilience outcomes, and implementation of the agreed local demonstration activities in close collaboration with farmer organisations and communities.</p>
TRANSVERSAL ACP	
ACP	<p>The proposed action aims to amplify the EU's support to food production systems. To this end, the proposed action aims to support access to finance and financial products for the immediate needs of rural households and small-scale producers, and for the investments needs of micro and small rural food enterprises.</p> <p>This will be achieved through internal and external public funding to be blended, where appropriate, with loans, insurance, and remittance-based products to be delivered by local financial intermediaries where possible. In terms of activities, this will include both activities that (a) facilitate financial support and (b) deploy catalytic capital.</p> <p>The proposed action and activities will be implemented while actively pursuing coherence, coordination, and complementarity with the seventeen country and two regional actions, the broader EU portfolio on food security and sustainable food systems, as well as the multiple multilateral initiatives in response to the current food crisis – including the UN GCRG, the GAFS, the FARM, amongst others. In terms of activities, this could include specific activities in the framework of the Global Network Against Food Crises.</p>

4.2 Intervention Logic

The logic underpinning the production and resilience strand of the EU and Member States response stresses the importance of improving food security and nutrition outcomes in the short-term while accelerating **medium-term solutions** to address the root causes of food insecurity and malnutrition in a Team Europe approach. The hypothesis is that strengthening sustainable local production capacities and the resilience of food systems in partner countries, complementing the humanitarian response to food crises – as part of a humanitarian, development, peace nexus effort – will foster a transition to more sustainable, aquatic and agri-food systems (SAAFS). The sustainable transformation of agri-food systems is in turn considered key to achieving the overall SDG 2 objectives on food and nutrition security. By adopting a sustainable aquatic and agri-food systems approach to food security and nutrition, this intervention seeks to contribute to the four outcomes identified above, namely:

1. More economically sustainable and inclusive food systems
2. Reinforced environmental sustainability of food systems
3. Enhanced social sustainability and gender responsiveness of food systems (incl. food and nutrition security) and
4. Improved governance and institutional sustainability of food systems

Areas singled out as being key to this transition include, inter alia, investments in agro-ecological and other innovative approaches; measures to enhance access to affordable healthy food; to reduce dependence on and use of fossil fuels, facilitate more efficient and sustainable use of synthetic inputs (fertilisers, pesticides) and promote alternatives (such as organic fertilisers, biocides, etc.); measures to improve resilience to climate change and loss of biodiversity; strengthened transboundary water cooperation; to improve natural resource governance, including tenure rights and equitable access to land, fisheries and forests⁴⁷; and enhance capacities of local producers and economic empowerment of women; measures against food loss and waste; measures to integrate local and regional markets; access to finance by smallholder farmers and farmers' organisations, and relevant digital solutions. The gender equality and youth dimensions of food security are also given particular importance.

The urgency of the situation coupled with the EU's current focus on supporting the transition to sustainable food systems in partner countries led to the choice to reinforce and consolidate existing support programmes and projects in the most impacted countries and those with the greatest potential, rather than developing new interventions. In the same vein, consideration has been given to ongoing successful humanitarian development, peace nexus efforts and the possibility to strengthen complementary modalities and delivery channels. Hence countries that have been identified for their potential to sustainably enhance production and/or their link to vulnerabilities and exposure in the current crisis context; while ensuring complementarity across the humanitarian, development, and peace nexus where possible. The assumption is that by targeting a limited number of countries and by building on ongoing EU interventions, this Action will be able to ensure scale and enhanced effectiveness and impact. Two core assumptions underpinning the intervention logic of this Action are therefore that the ongoing interventions have been well conceived and are being appropriately implemented, and secondly, that they have the capacity to absorb these additional resources effectively.

The specific intervention logics underpinning the targeted interventions are identified in the corresponding intervention documentation.

⁴⁷ FAO, Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security, revised version (May 2022), 2022.

The package of interventions supported under this Action entails a comprehensive and coherent way of working towards achieving food and nutrition security and, at the same time, of contributing to fair, healthy and environmentally-friendly food systems. As for the activities and outputs to be delivered by the package of initiatives supported through this intervention, they will be entrusted to specialised entities with a proven track record in their area of work, further strengthening the probabilities of achieving high quality outputs that will in turn lead to the stated outcomes.

4.3 Mainstreaming

Gender, human rights (including the right to food), climate change, conflict sensitivity, peace and resilience, are all prominent cross-cutting elements of the various interventions to be supported by this Action. As described in detail in the corresponding project documents, and on the basis of sound analysis, women, youth, and children are specifically targeted by various interventions, including by supporting the prospects and living standards of women and young people in rural areas, ensuring decent working conditions, and eliminating child labour. The interventions supported by this Action are aligned with a human rights-based approach and support knowledge and evidence on food security and food systems sustainability as a global public good. Moreover, an agroecological approach to food systems transformation favours the use of natural processes and agro-biodiversity and stresses the importance of local knowledge and participatory processes that develop knowledge and practice through experience, as well as scientific methods, and the need to address social inequalities. Environmental, climate and biodiversity issues will be actively promoted through the promotion of sustainable and inclusive agri-food systems that contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation, less social and economic disparities, greater food security and the sustainable and conflict sensitive management of natural resources and the preservation of biodiversity. Humanitarian, development, peace nexus approaches will be promoted and strengthened.

Environmental Protection & Climate Change

The interventions to be supported by this Action systematically integrate environmental concerns into their design and seek to bring a meaningful contribution to improve the state of the environment. From the overall and specific objectives identified under 4.1 it is clear that this Action aims to improve – even if indirectly – the sustainable management of - and access to natural resources by promoting a shift towards sustainable aquatic and agri-food systems. The proposed approach recognises the interlinkage between food, health, climate and development and will contribute to advancing the commitments made at the 26th UN Climate Change Conference of the Parties (COP26) for tackling climate, environmental, nutrition and health as interconnected challenges; as well as linking to the forthcoming COP27.

Human Rights

In line with the EU consensus on development “our world, our dignity, our future” and the 2030 Agenda⁴⁸, the EU uses a rights-based approach as a working methodology. A rights-based approach underpins all the interventions covered by this Action, through EU toolbox on applying the Human Rights Based Approach. The prioritisation of improved governance on the one hand (the duty bearers) and the rights of women, children, indigenous peoples, and other

⁴⁸ https://international-partnerships.ec.europa.eu/policies/european-development-policy/european-consensus-development_en.

groups in vulnerable situations on the other (the rights holders), is a core feature of the different initiatives. A systematic approach to the right to food serves to reinforce efforts to ensure the inclusion of the most vulnerable people's priorities at the heart of food system transformation.

Gender equality and empowerment of women and girls

The EU is strongly committed to gender mainstream all activities in line with the Gender Action Plan III and complying with the NDICI-Global Europe targets which indicates that 85% of all new external actions will be gender mainstreamed or gender targeted by 2025. As per OECD Gender DAC codes identified in section 1.1, this Action is labelled as G1 which implies that gender equality is a significant objective, and will be pursued through specific activities, related results will be monitored.⁴⁹ In line with the GAP III, each intervention covered under this Action will be informed by a gender analysis and will address gender inequality pursuing specific outputs and objectives. The action will also promote women and women's organisations' active and meaningful participation in the solutions to food insecurity and all forms of malnutrition, recognising the central and transformative role that women and girls have in food systems as well as outcomes relating to healthy diets, including infants and young children. Whenever possible indicators will be sex disaggregated and GAP III indicators will be used. Special focus will be on youth, in line with the EU Youth Action Plan in EU external action 2022 – 2027 to be adopted in autumn 2022.

Disability

As per OECD Disability DAC codes identified in section 1.1, this action is labelled as D0 as it doesn't directly target persons with disabilities. Nevertheless, some of the interventions under this action document will target all citizens and thus will have consequences that impact positively on the conditions of persons with disabilities and/or will have to reflect on how to better ensure access on equal basis for them.

Conflict sensitivity, peace and resilience

The impacts of food insecurity on conflict and violence can be felt far beyond the directly affected livelihoods. Food insecurity has contributed to refugee crises, which consequently put added pressure on social services, political systems and human security.⁵⁰ Sustainable agriculture interventions, despite their best intentions, 'may induce (latent) conflict in settings that are not even considered conflict areas'.⁵¹

Issues related to agriculture, food security and land, are closely connected to conflict and conflict risks. The frequency of violent conflicts often increases when food security is threatened, or where the sharing and use of land between humans, animals and crops is fraught. These issues are compounded in fragile contexts with weak governance that lack the institutions, functions or capacities necessary to mitigate land tenure insecurity, food shortages or supports to sustainable agriculture.

Due consideration of conflict sensitivity, peace and resilience is by its nature context specific and will be mainstreamed on a case-by-case basis, but generally concern most of the countries

⁴⁹ See GAP III Brief No. 6 Designing a G1 intervention – Guidance for EU practitioners

⁵⁰ <https://www.fao.org/3/c0335e/c0335e.pdf>.

⁵¹ Reference Document No31 Guidance notes on conflict sensitivity in development cooperation, DG INTPA, 2021.

targeted, the majority of which have been targeted by conflict analysis screening and ensuing recommendations.

In general terms, the Action acknowledges that increased pressure on land and natural resources and their unsustainable and exclusionary management opens the way to conflict and instability, which reinforce each other in a vicious circle. Consequently, there is an increased need for cooperation between stakeholders at all levels, and types of resource governance from local to transboundary and global. Increased cooperation is dependent on, and can only be sustained through inclusive, participatory, and transparent governance frameworks that address, and ultimately prevent, conflicts.

Disagreements about legal ownership and titling of lands intersect with other conflict drivers. Such drivers include historical injustices, the prevalence of small arms and light weapons in certain regions, pastoralist practices disrupted by conflict dynamics, profound gender inequalities, and a lack of recognition of customary uses and ownership of land (e.g. collective and communal use, lands traditionally used and occupied by indigenous people), including related demarcation issues. At a minimum, from a conflict sensitivity perspective, do no harm risks will be considered, and conflict sensitivity requirements and analyses promoted with implementing partners and in synergy with other cross-cutting issues.

Disaster Risk Reduction

The attention to agroecological approaches to support food systems transformation is a contribution to more resilient agriculture and food systems, better equipped to face risks of different nature (from climate change, as highlighted in the 2022 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report, to disruptions in trades of international agricultural products and inputs).

4.4 Contribution to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

The main SDG targeted by this Action is SDG 2 (Zero Hunger) while SDGs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14 and 15 are considered secondary SDGs. Transforming food systems, including agricultural production, is a key component of sustainable development and to sustained progress on many of the SDGs as well as making a major contribution to achieving the 2030 Agenda as a whole.

The 2019 Global Sustainable Development Report (GSDR)⁵² as well as the recent UN Food Systems Summit (September 2021) and the Nutrition for Growth Summit (December 2021) identified food systems and nutrition as one of a few key entry points to accelerate the worldwide transition to a more sustainable trajectory. Food production is a strong lever to improve human and planetary health, while providing the basis for livelihoods and healthy diets as well as income-earning opportunities. Sustainable agri-food systems will therefore not only assist countries in combating hunger (SDG 2.1) but also in reducing poverty (SDG 1) and generating employment (SDG 8). The enhanced nutrition outcomes (SDG 2.2) lead to improvements in health (SDG 3). They strengthen resilience and the capacity to adapt to climate-related hazards, help to reduce the contamination of air, water and land by hazardous chemicals, and ensure sustainable production and consumption patterns with environmental benefits (SDGs 12 and 13). By improving the sustainable use of land, fish stocks, biodiversity

⁵² https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/24797GSDR_report_2019.pdf

and other resources, they help to achieve SDGs 14 (life below water) and 15 (life on land). Moreover, they are strong entry points to economically empower and increase the participation of women in all decision-making (SDG 5) and to improve water and sanitation (SDG 6).

5 IMPLEMENTATION

5.1 Financing agreement

In order to implement this action, it is foreseen to conclude financing agreements with Cameroon, Niger, Malawi, Senegal. It is not foreseen to conclude a financing agreement with Caribbean, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mozambique, Pacific, Rwanda, Somalia, Togo, Uganda, Zambia nor for the transversal component.

5.2 Indicative implementation period

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in section 4 will be carried out and the corresponding contracts and agreements implemented, is 90 months from the date of entry into force of the financing agreements for the 4 countries that foresee to conclude a financing agreement or from the date of the adoption by the Commission of this Financing Decision for the countries/regions and the transversal component that do not foresee to conclude a financing agreement.

Extensions of the implementation period may be agreed by the Commission's authorising officer responsible by amending this decision and the relevant contracts and agreements; such amendments to this decision constitute non-substantial amendment in the sense of Article 9(4) of Regulation (EU) 2015/322.

5.3 Implementation of budget support components

5.3.1 Rationale for the amounts allocated to budget support

5.3.1.1 Cameroon

The amount allocated for the budget support component is EUR 15 000 000. This amount is based on the consideration that this action intervenes in the interim of a larger initiative in the framework of the next AAP 2023. It complements a sectoral budget support programme 2017-2021. The EUR 15 000 000 budget support will indicatively be split into one fixed tranche of a maximum of EUR 2 000 000 and variable tranches of a minimum of EUR 13 000 000. The exact amounts will be negotiated with the Government of Cameroon, jointly with the detailed indicators. In case of a significant deterioration of fundamental values, budget support disbursements may be suspended, reduced or cancelled, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the financing agreement.

Criteria for disbursement of budget support

a) The general conditions for disbursement of all tranches are as follows:

- Satisfactory progress in the implementation of the Rural Sector Development Strategy and continued credibility and relevance thereof;
- Maintenance of a credible and relevant stability-oriented macroeconomic policy or progress made towards restoring key balances

- Satisfactory progress in the implementation of reforms to improve public financial management, including domestic revenue mobilisation, and continued relevance and credibility of the reform programme >;
- Satisfactory progress with regard to the public availability of accessible, timely, comprehensive and sound budgetary information.

b) The performance indicators for disbursement that may be used for variable tranches are the following:

Indicator 1: Sustainable intensification and agro-ecological transition

Indicator 2: Promotion of the private seed production sector:

Indicator 3: Implementation of climate change adaptation measures.

c) Modifications: The performance indicators and targets chosen to be used for the disbursement of the variable tranches will apply for the duration of the action. However, in duly justified cases, the partner country and the Commission may agree to modifications of the indicators or upward/downward revisions of the targets. These modifications are authorized in writing *ex ante*, at the latest at the beginning of the period under review applicable to the indicators and the objectives.

In exceptional and/or duly justified cases, for example when unexpected events, external shocks or changing circumstances have rendered the indicator or the target irrelevant and could not be anticipated, a variable tranche indicator may be deleted. . In these cases, the corresponding amount could either be reallocated to the other indicators of the variable tranche in the same year, or transferred to the next variable tranche the following year (according to the initial weighting of the indicators). It could also be decided to reassess an indicator the following year against the initial target, if there was a positive trend and the authorities were not meeting the target due to factors beyond their control. The use of this provision must be requested by the partner country and approved in writing by the Commission.

d) Fundamental values: In the event of a significant deterioration in fundamental values, budget support disbursements may be suspended, reduced or cancelled, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the financing agreement.

5.3.1.2 Niger

The amount allocated for the budget support component is EUR 24 000 000 and for complementary support is EUR 1 000 000. This amount is based on the consideration that this action intervenes in reinforcing and expanding the support and policy dialogue regarding the sustainability dimensions and implemented as a complement to an existing SRBC 2022-2024(see appendix) and in synergy with the other initiatives programmed under the MIP (the Great Green Wall, support for vegetable protein sectors and the modernization of infrastructure in large public irrigation for agriculture adapted to the climate). The EUR 24 000 000 budget support will indicatively be split into one fixed tranche in 2022 of a maximum of EUR 10 000 000 and variable tranches in 2023 and 2024 of a minimum of EUR 14 000 000. In case of a significant deterioration of fundamental values, budget support disbursements may be suspended, reduced or cancelled, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the financing agreement.

Criteria for disbursement of budget support

a) The general conditions applicable to the disbursement of all tranches are as follows:

- Satisfactory progress in implementing the economic and social development plan (to be adopted by the government) and confirmation of the credibility and relevance of this strategy or any successor strategy;
- Maintaining a macroeconomic policy based on stability, credible and relevant, or making progress towards restoring the main balances;
- Satisfactory progress in implementing reforms aimed at improving public finance management, including domestic revenue mobilization, and maintaining the credibility and relevance of the reform program;
- Satisfactory progress in providing the public with timely, accessible, comprehensive and reliable budget information.

b) the performance indicators for disbursement that may be applied to the variable tranches will relate to sustainable agricultural development and agro-food systems.

c) Modifications: The performance indicators and targets chosen to be used for the disbursement of the variable tranches will apply for the duration of the action. However, in duly justified cases, the partner country and the Commission may agree to modifications of the indicators or upward/downward revisions of the targets. These modifications are authorized in writing *ex ante*, at the latest at the beginning of the period under review applicable to the indicators and the objectives.

In exceptional and/or duly justified cases, for example when unexpected events, external shocks or changing circumstances have rendered the indicator or the target irrelevant and could not be anticipated, a variable tranche indicator may be deleted. . In these cases, the corresponding amount could either be reallocated to the other indicators of the variable tranche in the same year, or transferred to the next variable tranche the following year (according to the initial weighting of the indicators). It could also be decided to reassess an indicator the following year against the initial target, if there was a positive trend and the authorities were not meeting the target due to factors beyond their control. The use of this provision must be requested by the partner country and approved in writing by the Commission.

d) Fundamental values: In the event of a significant deterioration in fundamental values, budget support disbursements may be suspended, reduced or cancelled, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the financing agreement.

5.3.2 Budget support details

5.3.2.1 Cameroon

Budget support is provided as direct untargeted budget support to the national treasury. The crediting of the euro transfers disbursed into Central African Francs (CAF) will be undertaken at the appropriate exchange rates in line with the relevant provisions of the financing agreement.

5.3.2.2 Niger

Budget support is provided as direct untargeted budget support to the national treasury. The crediting of the euro transfers disbursed into West African Francs (XOF) will be undertaken at the appropriate exchange rates in line with the relevant provisions of the financing agreement.

5.4 Implementation modalities

The Commission will ensure that the appropriate EU rules and procedures for providing financing to third parties are respected, including review procedures, where appropriate, and compliance of the action with EU restrictive measures⁵³

5.4.1 Grants: (*direct management*)

5.4.1.1 Caribbean

(a) Purpose of the grant(s)

The grant will contribute to the achievement of the four specific objectives of the present Action. More specifically, the grant will contribute to enhanced community-based responses to malnutrition in the Northwest Department of Haiti, one of the country's five areas classified in a situation of Emergency according to the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (corresponding to IPC 4).

(b) Type of applicants targeted

AVSI (Association of Volunteers in International Service), a Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO).

(c) Justification of a direct grant

Under the responsibility of the Commission's authorising officer responsible, the grant may be awarded without a call for proposals to AVSI. The envisaged entity has been selected using the following criteria: proven expertise and practice in nutrition in Haiti; capacity for operational implementation in Haiti; presence in the country's regions of interest.

Under the responsibility of the Commission's authorising officer responsible, the recourse to an award of a grant without a call for proposals is justified because the country is in a crisis situation as referred to in Article 2(21) FR at the date of the Financial Decision, and the nature of the action itself aimed at responding to the food crisis situation in accordance with Article 195 (a) FR.

5.4.1.2 Côte d'Ivoire

a) Purpose of the grant(s)

The grants will contribute to achieving the four specific objectives of the present Action, increasing food production and availability of food products in urban and peri-urban areas and providing models of sustainable agrifood production that can be replicable country wide.

(b) Type of applicants targeted

The type of applicants targeted are non-profit-making legal entities, whether non-governmental organisation, public sector operators; international organisations and EU Member States agencies.

⁵³ www.sanctionsmap.eu Please note that the sanctions map is an IT tool for identifying the sanctions regimes. The source of the sanctions stems from legal acts published in the Official Journal (OJ). In case of discrepancy between the published legal acts and the updates on the website it is the OJ version that prevails.

5.4.1.3 Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)

a) Purpose of the grant(s)

The grants will contribute to the four specific objectives of the present Action.

(b) Type of applicants targeted

For landscapes of Virunga (linked to the Goma city), Upemba (linked to Lubumbashi city) and provinces around Kinshasa city.

Lot 1 “Landscapes of Virunga and Upemba ”:

NGOs or foundations with relevant experience in the conservation of protected areas.

Lot 2 “Kinshasa”:

NGOs and/or CSOs with (1) experience using the landscape approach in DRC, and (2) experience in implementation of food security actions in DRC, (3) demonstrated capacity to work on food security actions in the provinces of Kwango and Central Congo, (4) Strong field connection with farmers' organisation and civil society involved on agriculture and food security in the targeted provinces.

5.4.1.4 Madagascar

(a) Purpose of the grant(s)

The grants will contribute to the four specific objective of the present Action by promoting the intensification and diversification of production systems between agriculture, agroforestry systems and forest plantations.

Five grants are foreseen in support to the following value-chains and strategic sectors: Horticulture/poultry, Milk, Rice-fish farming, Forestation/agroforestry/improved charcoal production, Land rights management/local governance/decentralised taxation.

This will make it possible for small-scale farmers and producers of improved charcoal and energy efficient stoves to increase and diversify their sources of income during the year thereby increasing the resilience of these production systems in the face of climate change in particular (drought via the duration and distribution rains).

(b) Type of applicants targeted

NGOs, research centres, private companies (for the land rights management component) and economic interest group (Malagasy parastatal)

(c) Justification of a direct grant

These actions will be used to build on the results of an ongoing programme known as “AFAFI Centre” targeting similar objectives of promoting increased food production and food systems resilience. The planned activities will seek to consolidate and upscale the results achieved so far under this programme in the same regions (Analamanga and Itasy) as well as in a third one (Vakinankaratra) for the milk value chain component as this region is the country’s milk production basin.

Under the responsibility of the Commission’s authorising officer responsible, the grant may be awarded without a call for proposals to FERT association (for horticulture/poultry/farmers’ organisations strengthening), to Malagasy Dairy Board (MDB) for milk, to Planète Urgence for rice-fish farming for forestation/agroforestry/improved carbonisation/charcoal production), to

APDRA (rice-fish farming) and GEOSYSTEMS for land rights managements and local governance.

Under the responsibility of the Commission's authorising officer responsible, the recourse to an award of a grant without a call for proposals is justified because of the unique technical competence and presence in the identified regions, the acquired specialisation in these sectors as well as the need to provide a support in a food crisis situation where these organizations are already present and active, as foreseen in Article 195 (f) FR.

5.4.1.5 Rwanda

(a) Purpose of the grant(s)

The grants are foreseen contributing to the four specific objectives of the present action, enhancing sustainable food production of inclusive agriculture value chains targeting local markets.

(b) Type of applicants targeted

The targeted applicants are non-state actors such as NGOs, cooperatives and private sector associations with technical capacities in the areas contributing to the objective of this action, administrative and financial capacities, working experience at local level and with a solid and proven positive track record with the EU or other donors operating

5.4.1.6 Somalia

(a) Purpose of the grant(s)

The grant(s) are foreseen contributing to the four specific objectives of the present action: making communities climate-resilient through climate change adaptation actions including the adoption of climate-smart agriculture practices and protection of natural capital; and achieving durable solutions to displacement by supporting inclusive, disaster-resilient and sustainable urban development and expanding access to basic services and protection, in line with the outputs and indicative activities outlined in section 3 of this action document.

(b) Type of applicants targeted:

NGOs or NGO consortia with operational presence in the areas of intervention and expertise in food production, improvement of food security and enhancement of resilience among vulnerable population, and with a solid and proven positive track record with the EU or other donors operating.

5.4.2 Prize(s) (direct management)

N/A

5.4.3 Procurement (direct management)

Country	Subject	Indicative type (works, supplies, services)	Indicative trimester of launch of the procedure

Côte d'Ivoire	Technical assistance and institutional support (SO 4 of the present Action)	Services	T2 2023
Madagascar	Technical assistance: support to project implementation, coordination, monitoring and evaluation (SO 4 of the present Action)	Services	T2 2023
Niger	Technical assistance and institutional support (SO 4 of the present Action)	Services	T2 2023
Somalia	Technical assistance: support for project implementation, coordination, and institutional capacities (SO 4 of the present Action)	Services	T1 2023

5.4.4 Indirect management with a pillar-assessed entity

5.4.4.1 Cameroon

A part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with an entity which will be selected by the Commission's services using the following criteria:

- Sound experience in providing (or managing projects that provide) technical assistance to agriculture holders in various domains;
- Sufficient operational capacity;
- Value added in sustainable and climate change resilience techniques

The implementation by this entity entails contributing to four specific objectives of the present action, notably by providing technical capacity to support agricultural investments and agri-food processing in critical value chains.

In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select another replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.4.2 Caribbean

5.4.4.2.1 Caribbean 1

A part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with an entity which will be selected by the Commission's services using the following criteria:

- Domain of expertise in the fields targeted by the action;
- Administrative and financial capacity;
- Presence and regional operational capacity;
- Proven and solid experience working with national and regional partners in the Caribbean.

The implementation by this entity entails to contribute to the four specific objectives of the present action (with a focus on supporting vulnerable populations and regional agri-food value chains).

In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select another replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.4.2.2 Caribbean 2

A part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). The envisaged entity has been selected using the following criteria:

- Administrative and financial capacity;
- Capacity for operational implementation in Haiti;
- Proven experience and added value in the sector of agri-food systems food security;
- Experience working with authorities at central and local level;
- Presence in the country's regions of interest, complementarity with humanitarian projects,
- Past experience with the EU Delegation, including for implementation of the EU-funded response to the August 2021 earthquake in the South of the country.

. The implementation by this entity entails to contribute to four specific objectives of the present action through modernizing and increasing local and sustainable agricultural production, trade and consumption and supporting specific value chains in Haiti's Centre Department, one of the country's five areas classified in a situation of emergency.

In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select another replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.4.3 Chad

This action may be implemented in indirect management with the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and the World Food Programme, through a multi-party agreement. The two United Nations agencies will work in the framework of a consortium under the leadership of FAO. This implementation entails the contribution to the four specific objectives of the present action.

The envisaged entities have been selected using the following criteria:

- Strong and proven operational, technical and thematic expertise in the fields of the action in the region and in Chad,
- Capacity to coordinate with national authorities and to work with local authorities. This includes the provision of technical support to the food systems targeted by this action, in the areas of food production, transformation (including food fortification) and value chain development, following an agro-ecological approach.

- Expertise in social marketing with a nutrition sensitive approach. This will enable the MSMEs to be financially strong enough to continue producing fortified foods after the end of the EU funded programme.

In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select another replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.4.4 Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)

5.4.4.4.1 Indirect management with a pillar-assessed entity for Yangambi landscape

A part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with the Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR). The implementation by this entity entails to contribute to four specific objectives of the present action.

The envisaged entity has been selected using the following criteria:

- Expertise in the field of forest research and management;
- Previous and successful experience in the field of sustainable agriculture in Yangambi.

In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select another replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.4.4.2 Indirect management with a pillar-assessed entity for the support to national seed and extension services.

A part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with an entity which will be selected by the Commission's services using the following criteria:

- Recognized experience in provision of agricultural support;
- Experience in supporting public reforms in DRC;
- Experience in dealing with issues of food insecurity in DRC at both policy and technical level.

The implementation by this entity entails to contribute to four specific objectives of the present action.

In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select another replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.4.5 Ghana

This action may be implemented in indirect management with an entity, which will be selected by the Commission's services using the following criteria:

- Specific expertise in agribusinesses
- Specific expertise in bringing added value in agro-ecology and natural resource governance.

The implementation by this entity entails the contribution to the four specific objectives of the present Action.

In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select another replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.4.6 Kenya

This action may be implemented in indirect management with IFAD selected on the basis of the following criteria:

- Specific sector/thematic expertise
- Logistical and/or management capacities (including being already well-rooted in Kenya).

The implementation by this entity entails contributing to four specific objectives of the present action.

In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select another replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.4.7 Malawi

This action may be implemented in indirect management with an entity which will be selected by the Commission's services using the following criteria:

- Experience in managing donor funding using Government systems, preferably through pooled funding;
- Wide experience in support of agricultural production and commercialisation (including via innovative financing tools),
- Long-lasting and good relations with the Government of Malawi and responsible line Ministries.

The implementation by this entity entails to contribute to four specific objectives of the present action.

In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select another replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.4.8 Mauritania

This action may be implemented in indirect management with ENABEL, the Belgian development agency. The implementation by this entity entails to contribute to the four specific objectives of the present action.

The envisaged entity has been selected using the following criteria:

- Specific expertise in the sector of rural development, in particular in the institutional support to Ministries of agriculture and livestock;
- Proven ability to set up multidisciplinary teams with the possible participation of expertise from the European administration;

- Specific and recent expertise (over the last 5 years) in Mauritania and in the sub-region in the rural development sector and more specifically in enhancing agri-food value chains in rural areas;
- Effective strategic and operational contribution to the Team Europe initiative for the transition to a “green and blue economy”.

In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission’s services may select another replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.4.9 Mozambique

This action may be implemented in indirect management with the Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations (FAO). This implementation entails activities contributing to the four specific objectives of the present action.

The envisaged entity has been selected using the following criteria:

- Specific expertise in supporting sustainability of food production and food systems resilience, as well as a long year active presence in Mozambique;
- Expertise in the design and implementation of smart subsidies for agro-inputs;
- Operational structures and working relationships with provincial and local Governments, Civil Society and selected private entities in the target locations.

In case the envisaged entity could need to be replaced, the Commission’s services may select another using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.4.10 Pacific

This action may be implemented in indirect management with the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC). The implementation by this entity entails contributing to the four specific objectives of the present action.

The envisaged entity has been selected using the following criteria:

- High level technical expertise in agriculture, climate and ocean science, gender, culture and social development;
- Proven experience in working across sectors to enhance food systems;
- Strong presence in the PICs, existing in-country and regional institutional leverage;
- Track record of successfully managing large programmes in the Pacific region.

In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission’s services may select another replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.4.11 Senegal

This action may be implemented by ENABEL selected on the basis of the following criteria:

- Experience in supporting agro-silvo-pastoral and fisheries value chains;

- Good knowledge of the concentration area of the Agropole Center project and agro-industrial development issues in Senegal;
- Sufficient technical and operational capacity for implementation;
- Leverage capacities with additional financing both for investments and for project management assistance;
- Ability to mobilize around the TEI for a greater impact of the action.

The implementation by this entity entails to contribute to four specific objectives of the present action. In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select another replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.4.12 Somalia

A part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with a pillar-assessed entity, which will be selected by the Commission's services using the following criteria:

- Expertise on smart agriculture, sustainable management of agricultural, pastoral and coastal eco-systems, improvement of riverine agriculture including irrigation systems management and sustainable agri-food systems production, nutrition promotion and disaster risk reduction and preparedness.

The implementation by this entity entails to contribute to the four specific objectives of the present action. The proposed action will specifically support gender-sensitive, climate-smart and nutrition-sensitive agri- and aquatic-food extension training through Farmer Field Schools (FFS), and specialised TVET training; promote policies that support sustainable agribusinesses and food value chains; support capacity building activities to strengthen public-private collaboration on sustainable food value chain development, including water resource management and support infrastructure interventions for local communities to facilitate connectivity of goods, people and services.

In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select another replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.4.13 Togo

This action may be implemented in indirect management with pillar-assessed entities which will be selected by the Commission's services using the following criteria:

- Expertise in supporting transition towards sustainable agriculture and food systems, in particular through agroecology and high nutritional value-chains;
- Expertise in supporting small-scale producers, women entrepreneurship, innovations for sustainable food systems.

The implementation by this entity entails to contribute to the four specific objectives of the present action.

In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select another replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.4.14 Uganda

5.4.4.14.1

A part of this action (component 1) will be implemented in indirect management with the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA). The implementation by this entity entails to contribute to the four specific objectives of the present action.

The envisaged entity has been selected using the following criteria:

- The organisation has all the tools and processes on the ground, together with the willingness to build upon this intervention
- Demonstrated itself to be a dynamic, accomplished, and entrusted organisation in Uganda

In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select another replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.4.14.2

A part of this action (component 2) will be implemented in indirect management with the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). The implementation by this entity entails to contribute to the four specific objectives of the present action.

The envisaged entity has been selected using the following criteria:

- Improve nutrition and increase agricultural productivity;
- Bring a wealth of expertise working on drought response and early warning for food security in Uganda
- Willingness and readiness to build upon this intervention.

In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select another replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.4.15 Zambia

A part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) as a top-up to an ongoing action (FED/2019/39612). The implementation by this entity entails to contribute to the four objectives of the present action.

The entity has been selected based on the following criteria:

- Implementation capacity in Zambia;
- Technical capacities and ability to promote climate smart agriculture and enhance the resilience of smallholder farmers;
- Knowledge of the Zambian agriculture sector;

- Previous successful experience in managing and accounting for EU funds in sustainable agriculture and;
- Transparent systems for efficient and effective project implementation, monitoring and reporting.

In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select another replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.4.16 ACP countries / Transversal Component

This Action may be implemented in indirect management with the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). The implementation by this entity entails to contribute to the four specific objectives of the present action.

The entity has been selected based on the following criteria:

- implementation capacity in financing agriculture and rural development;
- technical capacities and ability to promote climate smart agriculture and enhance the resilience of smallholder farmers;
- involved in the work streams focusing on sustainable production under the GAFS and FARM initiatives;
- ensuring coherence, coordination and complementarity with EU and UN portfolios on food security and sustainable food systems as well as multilateral initiatives in response to the current food crisis;
- ensure the coherence by amplifying the impact of the EU support to food production and resilience of food systems and previous successful experience in managing and accounting for EU funds in sustainable agriculture and;
- transparent systems for efficient and effective project implementation, monitoring and reporting.

In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select another replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

5.4.5 *Indirect management with a regional organisation or partner country*

N/A

5.4.6 Contribution to the Africa Investment Platform (AIP)

5.4.6.1 Cameroon

This contribution may be implemented under indirect management with the entities, called Lead Finance Institutions, identified in the appendix to this action document
Priority will be given to the EIB (topping up of the current credit line CRIS: 2021/39870).

5.4.7 *Changes from indirect to direct management mode due to exceptional circumstances*

5.4.7.1 Cameroon

Should the contribution to the AIP reveal not possible due to circumstances outside of the Commission's control part of this action may be implemented through a grant for the purpose of setting up a financial mechanism known as *prêt d'honneur*; a revolving fund for loans at zero interest rate to smaller agri-food companies which are not big enough to partner with banks but whose contribution is essential to food supply, creation of jobs and reduction of poverty in the production areas. This will be specifically targeted to smaller companies operating in selected food crop value chains and in specific zones under food crisis threat. This grant will contribute to the four specific objectives of the present Action.

Applicants for this grant would be any non-profit organization with sound experience in small business support services including financial services to the agricultural sector specifically.

5.4.7.2 Somalia

If negotiations with the entity(ies) fail or if the implementation mechanism proves not to be satisfactory in terms of value for money, fund management or operational effectiveness, the Commission may change the implementation modality to direct management through grants, targeting NGOs or NGO consortia with operational presence in the areas of intervention and expertise in food production, improvement of food security and enhancement of resilience among vulnerable population, and with a solid and proven positive track record with the EU or other donors operating.

5.5 Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants

The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents shall apply, subject to the following provisions.

a) The Commission decides that natural and legal persons from the following countries having traditional economic, trade or geographical links with neighbouring partner countries shall be eligible for participating in procurement and grant award procedures: Haiti, Côte d'Ivoire, Madagascar, Niger, Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda, Somalia. The supplies originating there shall also be eligible.

b) The Commission's authorising officer responsible may extend the geographical eligibility in accordance with Article 22(1)(b) of Annex IV to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement on the basis of urgency or of unavailability of products and services in the markets of the countries concerned, or in other duly substantiated cases where the eligibility rules would make the realisation of this action impossible or exceedingly difficult.

5.6 Indicative budget

BUDGET	Implementation modalities	EU Contribution (EUR)
--------	---------------------------	-----------------------

WESTERN AFRICA /SAHEL		
Cameroon		20 000 000
	Budget support	15 000 000
	Contribution to Africa Investment Platform (AIP) - cf. section 5.4.6	3 000 000
	Indirect management with a pillar-assessed entity - cf. section 5.4.4.1	2 000 000
Chad		10 000 000
	Indirect management with pillar-assessed entities: FAO and WFP - cf. section 5.4.4.3	10 000 000
Côte d'Ivoire		10 000 000
	Grants (direct management) - cf. section 5.4.1.2	9 600 000
	Procurement (direct management) - cf. section 5.4.3	400 000
Ghana		10 000 000
	Indirect management with a pillar-assessed entity - cf. section 5.4.4.5	10 000 000
Mauritania		12 000 000
	Indirect management with a pillar-assessed entity: ENABEL - cf. section 5.4.4.8	12 000 000
Niger		25 000 000
	Budget support	24 000 000
	Procurement (direct management) - cf. section 5.4.3	1 000 000
Senegal		15 000 000
	Indirect management with a pillar-assessed entity: ENABEL - cf. section 5.4.4.11	15 000 000
Togo		10 000 000
	Indirect management with a pillar-assessed entity - cf. section 5.4.4.13	10 000 000

EASTERN AFRICA / GREAT LAKES		
DRC		25 000 000
	Grants (direct management) - cf. section 5.4.1.3	17 000 000
	Indirect management with a pillar-assessed entities (CIFOR) - cf. section 5.4.4.4	8 000 000
Kenya		10 000 000
	Indirect management with a pillar-assessed entity: IFAD - cf. section 5.4.4.6	10 000 000
Rwanda		10 000 000
	Grants (direct management) - cf. section 5.4.1.5	10 000 000
Somalia		20 000 000
	Grants (direct management) - cf. section 5.4.1.6	12 000 000
	Procurement (direct management) - cf. section 5.4.3	500 000
	Indirect management with a pillar-assessed entity - cf. section 5.4.4.12	7 500 000
Uganda		10 000 000
	Indirect management with a pillar-assessed entities: DANIDA and FAO - cf. section 5.4.4.14	10 000 000
SOUTHERN AFRICA		
Madagascar		10 000 000
	Grants (direct management) - cf. Section 5.4.1.4	8 100 000
	Procurement (direct management) - cf. section 5.4.3	1 900 000
Malawi		15 000 000
	Indirect management with a pillar-assessed entity - cf. section 5.4.4.7	15 000 000
Mozambique		15 000 000
	Indirect management with a pillar-assessed entity: FAO - cf. section 5.4.4.9	15 000 000

Zambia		20 000 000
	Indirect management with a pillar-assessed entity: FAO - cf. section 5.4.4.15	20 000 000
CARIBBEAN		27 000 000
	Grants (direct management) – cf. section 5.4.1.1	2 000 000
	Indirect management with a pillar-assessed entity - cf. section 5.4.4.2.1.	19 000 000
	Indirect management with a pillar-assessed entity: FAO – cf. section 5.4.4.2.2.	6 000 000
PACIFIC		10 000 000
	Indirect management with a pillar-assessed entity: SPC – cf. section 5.4.4.10	10 000 000
TRANSVERSAL ACP		52 500 000
ACP	Indirect management with pillar-assessed entities: IFAD - cf. section 5.4.4.16	52 500 000
	Grants – total envelope under section 5.4.1	58 700 000
	Procurement – total envelope under section 5.4.3	3 800 000
	Evaluation - cf. section 5.9 Audit – cf. section 5.10	Covered by another decision
	TOTAL	336 500 000

5.7 Organisational set-up and responsibilities

The implementation arrangements already agreed and adopted in the framework of the existing interventions, will be maintained under the current Action.

However, in the framework of the new interventions funded under the present Action, a steering committee will be put in place to ensure guidance and a proper implementation of the interventions according to the objectives set and on the basis of the progress and management reports. The steering committee will meet once a year to examine the progress reports, to decide on the main orientations according to the objectives set in the Action document and to approve the implementation plan of next year's activities.

As part of its prerogative of budget implementation and to safeguard the financial interests of the Union, the Commission may participate in the above governance structures set up for governing the implementation of the action.

5.8 Performance and Results monitoring and reporting

The day-to-day technical and financial monitoring of the implementation of this action will be a continuous process, and part of the implementing partner's responsibilities. To this aim, the implementing partner shall establish a permanent internal, technical and financial monitoring system for the action and elaborate regular progress reports (not less than annual) and final reports. Every report shall provide an accurate account of implementation of the action, difficulties encountered, changes introduced, as well as the degree of achievement of its results (outputs and direct outcomes) as measured by corresponding indicators, using as reference the Logframe matrix (for project modality) or the partner's strategy, policy or reform action plan list (for budget support).

Indicators relating to the SDGs and indicators defined by mutual agreement will have to be taken into account and gender-specific if relevant. In addition, the monitoring of the implementation of this action will also be ensured within the framework of policy dialogue between the beneficiary country and the EU. Data provided by national bodies for Statistics, sector surveys as well as the results of the general population census (and related analyses) will be used to assess program performance. External monitoring missions can be contracted and managed by the Delegations of the European Union. As an indication, a follow-up mission could be carried out every year to assess the state of progress of the program on the axes and measures identified, to provide elements to feed the dialogue on the process of regulatory convergence supported by the program, or the verification of the disbursement conditions of the budget support, based on a review of the supporting documents provided by the authorities.

The Commission may carry out other monitoring visits to the project, through its own staff and independent consultants directly recruited by the Commission to carry out independent monitoring checks (or recruited by the relevant agent engaged by the Commission to implement these controls).

Reports shall be laid out in such a way as to allow monitoring of the means envisaged and employed and of the budget details for the action. The final report, narrative and financial, will cover the entire period of the action implementation.

The Commission may undertake additional project monitoring visits both through its own staff and through independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission for independent monitoring reviews (or recruited by the responsible agent contracted by the Commission for implementing such reviews).

5.9 Evaluation

Having regard to the nature of the action, an evaluation will not be carried out for this action or its components.

In case an evaluation is not foreseen, the Commission may, during implementation, decide to undertake such an evaluation for duly justified reasons either on its own decision or on the initiative of the partner. In this case and for budget support interventions, the evaluation of this action may be performed individually or through a joint strategic evaluation of budget support operations carried out with the partner country, other budget support providers and relevant stakeholders. The Commission shall inform the implementing partner at least three months in advance of the dates foreseen for the evaluation missions. The implementing partner shall

collaborate efficiently and effectively with the evaluation experts, and inter alia provide them with all necessary information and documentation, as well as access to the project premises and activities.

The evaluation reports shall be shared with the partner country and other key stakeholders. The implementing partner and the Commission shall analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations and, where appropriate, in agreement with the partner country, jointly decide on the follow-up actions to be taken and any adjustments necessary, including, if indicated, the reorientation of the project.

The financing of the evaluation shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing decision.

5.10 Audit

Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, on the basis of a risk assessment, contract independent audits or expenditure verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

The financing of the audit shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing decision.

5.11 Strategic Communication and Public Diplomacy

The 2021-2027 programming cycle has adopted a new approach to pooling, programming and deploying strategic communication and public diplomacy resources. In addition, a communication plan on the Global Food Crisis Response is in preparation. It will remain a contractual obligation for all entities implementing EU-funded external actions to inform the relevant audiences of the Union's support for their work by displaying the EU emblem and a short funding statement as appropriate on all communication materials related to the actions concerned. This obligation will continue to apply equally, regardless of whether the actions concerned are implemented by the Commission, partner countries, service providers, grant beneficiaries or entrusted or delegated entities such as UN agencies, international financial institutions and agencies of EU member states. However, action documents for specific sector programmes are no longer required to include a provision for communication and visibility actions promoting the programmes concerned. These resources will instead be consolidated in Cooperation Facilities established by support measure action documents, allowing Delegations to plan and execute multiannual strategic communication and public diplomacy actions with sufficient critical mass to be effective on a national scale.

APPENDIX - INDICATIVE LOGFRAME MATRIX⁵⁴

On the basis of this indicative logframe matrix, a more detailed logframe(s) might be developed at contracting stage linked to this AD.

The indicative logframe matrix will evolve during the lifetime of the Intervention. The activities, the expected outputs and related indicators are indicative and may be updated during the implementation of the Intervention as agreed by the parties (the European Commission and the implementing partner/s). Additional specific objectives and outputs focusing on gender equality in line with the GAP III will be included on the basis of a gender analysis. To the maximum possible extent, GAP III indicators will be used and indicators will be sex disaggregated.

	Results chain: Main expected results (maximum 10)	Indicative Indicators⁵⁵ (at least one indicator per expected result)	Sources of data	Assumptions
Impact (Overall Objective)	Enhanced sustainable food production and resilience of food systems	1. Number of people in food crisis (Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) rating), by country, region/district 2. Average income of small-scale producers, by sex and indigenous status^, by country, region/district 3. Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognised documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by country, location, sex and by type of tenure 4. Annual agricultural production weight ^ 5. Proportion of land that is degraded over total land area ^ 6. Forest area as a proportion of total land area^ 7. Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels ^ 8.. Proportion of women who participate in decisions about use of productive resources (choice of crops, inputs, timing of cropping, sale/transfer of land) ^, by country, region/district 9. Level of dependency on food imports, by country (value and quantity in tonnes) 10. Level of dependency on imported agricultural inputs (value and quantity in tonnes) 11. Volume of post-production losses in tonnes, per year ^, by country		<i>Not applicable</i>

⁵⁴ Indicators aligned with the programming document are marked with '*', indicators aligned to the GERF are marked with '**' and OPSYS core indicators are marked with '^'. Indicators used within variable tranches are flagged **in bold**.

⁵⁵ All indicators to be disaggregated by sex where possible

Outcome(s) (Specific Objective(s))	SO1: More economically sustainable food systems	<p>1.1 Number of (a) jobs, (b) green jobs supported/sustained by the EU ** ^</p> <p>1.2 Number of households (HHs) reporting new income sources thanks to support of EU-funded interventions^, disaggregated by country, location and sex (HH)</p> <p>1.3 Number of farmers reporting increased turnover (as a result of direct support of the investment), disaggregated by sex, age, region, and other appropriate groups ^, disaggregated by country, location and sex</p> <p>1.4 Volume of responsible private sector investment in sustainable agri-food systems</p> <p>1.5 Proportion of added value going to smallholder farmers, disaggregated by agricultural product</p> <p>1.6 Amount of local seed production, by country, region/district</p>		<p>The key assumption underpinning the impact of this intervention is that the existing interventions it is being appropriately implemented. The partner governments follow-up on the relevant policy mechanisms, statistical and early warning systems and on encouraging sustainable and growth-oriented practices</p> <p>No major additional (natural and/or man-made) crises happen during the reference period.</p>
	SO2: Reinforced environmental sustainability of food systems	<p>2.1 Percentage of smallholders practicing sustainable agriculture (e.g., conservation agriculture, agro-ecology, Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) approaches, etc.), disaggregated by country, region/district, location, sex^</p> <p>2.2 Use of pesticides per crop land tonnes/ha, by country, region/district</p> <p>2.3 Number of countries where integrated water resources management is performed, disaggregated by districts or watershed areas</p> <p>2.4 Marine areas under a) protection, b) sustainable management with EU support (km²) **</p> <p>2.5 Areas of terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems under (a) protection, (b) sustainable management with EU support (km²) **</p>		
	SO3: Enhanced social sustainability of food systems (incl. food and nutrition security)	<p>3.1 Prevalence of undernourishment^ (**GERF 1.24), by country</p> <p>3.2 Prevalence of stunting among children under 5 years of age (**GERF 1.25) ^, by country</p> <p>3.3 Prevalence of moderate or severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)^, by country, region/district</p>		

	SO4: Improved governance and institutional sustainability of food systems	<p>3.4 Number of countries with strengthened social protection systems</p> <p>3.5 % of targeted population with access to all basic social services^ (** includes GEF 1.30 and 1.31), by country and region/district</p> <p>4.1 Number of public policies for the implementation of the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement a) developed/revised, and/or b) under implementation with EU support^, disaggregated by country</p> <p>4.2 Number of public policies promoting social inclusion a) developed/revised with EU support^, disaggregated by country</p> <p>4.3 Proportion of local governments that adopt and implement local disaster risk reduction strategies in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction^, disaggregated by country, region/district</p> <p>4.4 Number of partner countries using the knowledge and/or expertise on sustainable agriculture (including fisheries and aquaculture), food security and/or nutrition generated by EU supported global services, platforms, and networks.</p> <p>4.5. Number of partner countries with adequate levels of food reserves</p>		
Outputs	<p>OP1.1. Increased access to financial services</p> <p>OP1.2. Increased access to markets</p> <p>OP1.3 Increased production capacity of smallholders</p>	<p>1.1.1 Number of beneficiaries with access to financial services with EU support: (a) firms, (b) people (all financial services), (c) people (digital financial services), disaggregated by country, location and sex (for people and the owner/manager of the firm) (** GEF 2.17)</p> <p>1.2.1 Number of smallholders reached with EU supported interventions aimed to increase their access to markets, disaggregated by country, location and sex (** GEF 2.1 – related to the part for access to markets)</p> <p>1.3.1 Number of smallholders reached with EU supported interventions aimed to increase their sustainable production, disaggregated by country, location and sex (** GEF 2.1 – related to the part for increased production)</p>		<p>Willingness of partner governments to improve governance structures and systems</p> <p>Willingness of partner governments to implement improved policies</p>

	OP1.4 Improved processing, marketing, and digital skills	1.4.1 Number of persons with increased processing, marketing and digital skills, disaggregated by country, location and sex		Willingness of smallholders to adopt new practises
	OP1.5 Improved quality of extension services	1.5.1 Number of extensionists with increased skills, disaggregated by country, location and sex		Ability of target groups to apply new capacities and reach smallholders
	OP2.1. Climate-smart, agro-ecological, and other innovative approaches developed	2.1.1 Number of climate-relevant, agro-ecological, and other innovative approaches developed, disaggregated by countries, areas/locations		Appropriate dissemination of new information, knowledge and technologies to smallholders
	OP2.2 Sustainable management practices for agricultural and pastoral ecosystems introduced	2.2.1 Areas of agricultural and pastoral ecosystems where sustainable management practices have been introduced with EU support (ha) ^ (**GERF 2.2.), disaggregated by countries		The partner governments efficiently utilise the policy, policy-implementation and monitoring systems and early warning systems.
	OP2.3 Increased skills of smallholders on sustainable production methods	2.3.1 Number of people trained by the EU-funded intervention who increased their knowledge of and/or skills in sustainable land and water management practices (disaggregated by country, location, sex, age and population group) **^		
	OP3.1 Shock-responsive social protection systems in place	<p>3.1.1 Number of countries which have benefitted from EU support to strengthen their social protection systems (** GERF 2.31), disaggregated by country</p> <p>3.1.2 Number of persons with access to social protection provided with support of EU-funded intervention (disaggregated by country, sex, age, population group, location - urban/peri-urban/rural) ^</p>		The civil society partners are active in monitoring and reporting on the efficiency of the absorption of results and

	OP3.2 Improved access to basic services	3.2.1 Number of people with access to improved drinking water source and/or sanitation facility with EU support (** GERF 2.38) disaggregated by country, location, sex		governments measures on follow-up.
	OP3.3 Improved access to nutritious food	3.3.1 Number of food insecure people receiving EU assistance (** GERF 2.32), disaggregated by country, location, sex 3.3.2 Number of women of reproductive age, adolescent girls and children under 5 reached by nutrition-related interventions supported by the EU (** GERF 2.33), disaggregated by country, location, and by sex for children		
	OP4.1. Improved capacity for policy making	4.1.1 Number of government policies developed or revised with civil society organisation participation through EU support (** GERF 2.29), disaggregated by country 4.1.2 Number of EU supported global services, platforms and networks providing knowledge and/or expertise as input for evidence-based policy making on sustainable food systems, food security and/or nutrition		
	OP4.2 Enhanced capacities of public institutions and private organisations to moderate the impact the global food crisis in their countries / regions, including farmers' organisations.	4.2.1 Number of persons/organisations with increased capacities to moderate the impact the global food crisis in their countries / regions, disaggregated by country, location, sex, type of organisation 4.2.2 Number of national and subnational institutions trained and equipped by the EU-funded intervention to resolve disputes over ownership, access, and use of natural resources in a non-violent manner ^, disaggregated by country 4.2.3 Number of farmers organisations strengthened, disaggregated by country and location		

	OP4.3. Improved food stock/ food storage	4.3.1 Number of partner countries with food stock, food storage and institutional purchase systems in place with the direct support of the EU intervention, disaggregated by country		
	OP4.4 Information, surveillance, and early warning systems in place	4.4.1 Number of partner countries with information, surveillance and early warning systems in place with the direct support of the EU intervention, disaggregated by country 4.4.2 Status of food security early warning systems supported by the EU-funded intervention ^, disaggregated by country, region/district		
	OP4.5 Improved land tenure for smallholders	4.5.1 Number of smallholders reached with EU supported interventions aimed to increase their security of land, disaggregated by country, location, sex (** GERF 2.1 – related to the part for increased land tenure security		

Appendix – Indicative Logframe Matrix for Budget Support in Cameroon⁵⁶

On the basis of this indicative logframe matrix, a more detailed logframe(s) might be developed at contracting stage linked to this AD.

This indicative logframe matrix will evolve during the lifetime of the Intervention. The activities, the expected outputs and related indicators are indicative and may be updated during the implementation of the Intervention as agreed by the parties (the European Commission and the implementing partner/s).

The amount allocated to Cameroon complements the 2017-2021 Rural Development Sector Reform Contract programme. It will allow the implementation of reforms adopted by the government and aims to enhance food production and the resilience of food systems in Cameroon and therefore it will reinforce the targets of the SRC contract with regards to sustainability dimensions. The induced outputs are indicatively mentioned in the logframe below on the basis of the SRBC logframe. **The logframe of this action will be finalised and included in the Financing Agreement, following discussions with the Government of Cameroon on the variable tranche indicators, reforms, and complementary support to be pursued. Once these are agreed on the baseline and target data will be completed as will the sources of data.**

	<u>Results chain</u>	<u>Indicators⁵⁷</u> <u>(max. 15)</u>	<u>Baselines</u> <u>(year)</u>	<u>Targets by the end</u> <u>of the budget</u> <u>support contract</u> <u>(year)</u>	<u>Sources of data</u>
Expected impact of the policy (Overall objective)	Enhanced sustainable food production and resilience of food systems	1. Number of people in food crisis (according to Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) rating), by country, region/district 2. Annual agricultural production weight^ 3. Level of dependency on food imports, by country (value and quantity - in tonnes) 4. Level of dependency on imported agricultural inputs (value and quantity in tonnes)	1. TBD 2. TBD 3. TBD 4. TBD	1. TBD 2. TBD 3. TBD 4. TBD	1. TBD 2. TBD 3. TBD 4. TBD

⁵⁶ Indicators aligned with the programming document are marked with '*', indicators aligned to the GERP are marked with '**' and OPSYS core indicators are marked with '^'. Indicators used within variable tranches are flagged **in bold**.

⁵⁷ All indicators to be disaggregated by sex where possible

Expected outcomes of the policy (Specific objective(s))	SO1: More economically sustainable food systems	1.1 Average income of small-scale food producers, by sex and indigenous status** (GERF 1.1 SDG 2.3.2)	1.1 TBD	1.1 TBD	1.1 TBD
		1.2 Number of (a) jobs, (b) green jobs supported/sustained by the EU ** ^	1.2 TBD	1.2 TBD	1.2 TBD
		1.3 Amount of local seed production, by region/district	1.3 TBD	1.3 TBD	1.3 TBD
	SO2: Reinforced environmental sustainability of food systems	2.1 Areas of agricultural and pastoral ecosystems where sustainable management practices have been introduced with EU support (ha) ** (GERF 2.2)	2.1 TBD	2.1 TBD	2.1 TBD
		2.2 Percentage of smallholders practising sustainable agriculture (conservation agriculture, agro-ecology, Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) approaches), disaggregated by country, region, district, sex^	2.2 TBD	2.2 TBD	2.2 TBD
	SO3: Enhanced social sustainability of food systems	3.1 Prevalence of undernourishment by region/district, sex (**GERF 1.24)	3.1 TBD	3.1 TBD	3.1 TBD
		3.2 Prevalence of stunting among children under 5 years of age by region/district, sex (** GERF 1.25)	3.2 TBD	3.2 TBD	3.2 TBD
		3.3 Prevalence of moderate or severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)^, by region/district, sex	3.3 TBD	3,3 TBD	3.3 TBD
	SO4: Improved governance and institutional sustainability of food systems	4.1 Implementation of targeted reforms of subsidy policies in priority value chains to promote CCA and CSA	4.1 TBD	4.1 TBD	4.1 Implementation reports, implementation rate of MINADER budget lines and adoption of the budget related to grants (Cat 1) by

					the agricultural subsidies policy steering committee
Induced outputs	<p>OP 1.1 An efficient private seed production sector promoted</p> <p>OP1.2 Responsible investments in sustainable and nutritious agri-food value chains</p> <p>OP 2.1 Measures for climate change adaptation (CCA) and climate-smart agriculture (CSA) adopted</p> <p>OP 2.2 An agro-ecological transition through sustainable intensification supported</p> <p>OP 2.3. Improved access to equipment and small works for CCA and CSA</p> <p>OP3.1 Increased availability of nutritious food</p> <p>OP4.2 Collection of relevant data for evidence-based agricultural policy making</p>	<p>1.1.1. Number of seed production units supported by Government</p> <p>1.2.1 Volume of responsible investments in sustainable and nutritious agri-food value chains, disaggregated by location and value chain</p> <p>2.1.1. Number of financing mechanisms for agroforestry, CO² capture measures in place</p> <p>2.2.1 Number of extension service schemes put in place by the government that are adapted to the needs of the specific agro-ecological areas and value chains</p> <p>2.3.1 Number of people with access to equipment and small works for the Climate Change Adaptation and Climate Smart Agriculture activities thanks to government support</p> <p>3.1.1 Number of food insecure people receiving support disaggregated by district/ location, sex</p> <p>4.1.1 Availability of data for evidence-based policy making on sustainable food systems, food security and/or nutrition</p>	<p>1.1.1 TBD</p> <p>1.2.1 TBD</p> <p>2.1.1 TBD</p> <p>2.2.1 TBD</p> <p>2.3.1 TBD</p> <p>3.1.1 TBD</p> <p>4.1.1 0</p>	<p>1.1.1 TBD</p> <p>1.2.1 TBD</p> <p>2.1.1 TBD</p> <p>2.2.1 TBD</p> <p>2.3.1 TBD</p> <p>3.3.1 TBD</p> <p>4.1.1 Census completed</p>	<p>1.1.1 TBD</p> <p>1.2.1 MINADER budget lines and adoption of the budget related to subsidies policy</p> <p>2.1.1 TBD</p> <p>2.2.1 TBD</p> <p>2.3.1 TBD</p> <p>3.3.1 TBD</p> <p>4.4.1 Databases of census results (General Census of Agriculture, General Census of Population and Housing)</p>
Direct outputs	DO.1. Increase in the amount of external aid available in the national budget;	1. Number of budget support disbursement respecting the calendar	1. TBD	1. TBD	1. Governments reports

	DO 2. The sectoral dialogue is reinforced	2. Number of official policy dialogue meetings with main sectoral actors	2. TBD	2. TBD	2. TBD
	DO.3. Performance evaluations of sectoral strategies are available	3. Number of performance evaluations of sectoral strategies	3. TBD	3. TBD	3. TBD
	DO.4. Civil service capacity is improved (complementary support)	4. Number of civil servants with increased capacities to moderate the impact of the global food crisis	4. TBD	4. TBD	4. TBD

Appendix – Indicative Logframe Matrix for Budget Support in NIGER⁵⁸

On the basis of this indicative logframe matrix, a more detailed logframe(s) might be developed at contracting stage linked to this AD.

The indicative logframe matrix will evolve during the lifetime of the Intervention. The activities, the expected outputs and related indicators are indicative and may be updated during the implementation of the Intervention as agreed by the parties (the European Commission and the implementing partner/s).

The amount allocated to Niger tops-up the 2022-2024 Contrat relatif à la résilience et construction de l'Etat (SRBC) (NDICI AFRICA/2021/043-180). This top-up aims to enhance food production and the resilience of food systems in Niger and therefore it will reinforce existing targets of the SRBC contract with regards to sustainability dimensions. The induced outputs are indicatively mentioned under the logframe below on the basis of the SRBC logframe. **The logframe of this action will be finalised and included in the Financing Agreement, following discussions with the Government of Niger on the variable tranche indicators, reforms and complementary support to be pursued. Once these are agreed on the baseline and target data will be completed as will the sources of data.**

	Results chain	Indicators ⁵⁹ (max. 15)	Baselines (year)	Targets by the end of the budget support contract	Sources of data
Expected impact of the policy (Overall objective)	Enhanced sustainable food production and resilience of food systems	1. Number of people in food crisis (according to Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) rating), by country, region/district 2. Annual agricultural production weight^ 3. Level of dependency on food imports, by country (value and quantity - in tonnes)	1. 27% (2019) 2. TBD 3. TBD	1. 20% (2027) 2. TBD 3. TBD	1. Report from DNP-GCA 2. TBD 3. TBD

⁵⁸ Indicators aligned with the programming document are marked with '*', indicators aligned to the GEF are marked with '**' and OPSYS core indicators are marked with '^'. Indicators used within variable tranches are flagged **in bold**.

⁵⁹ All indicators to be disaggregated by sex where possible

Expected outcomes of the policy (Specific objective(s))	SO1: More economically sustainable food systems	1.1 Average income of small-scale food producers, by sex and indigenous status (GERF 1.1 SDG 2.3.2) **	1.1 TBD	1.1 TBD	1.1 TBD
		1.2 Volume of responsible private sector investment in agri-food systems	1.2 TBD	1.2 TBD	1.2 TBD
	SO2: Reinforced environmental sustainability of food systems	2.1 Areas of agricultural and pastoral ecosystems where sustainable management practices have been introduced with EU support (ha) ** (GERF 2.2)	2.1 TBD	2.1 TBD	2.1 TBD
		2.2. Percentage of smallholders practising sustainable agriculture (conservation agriculture, agro-ecology, Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) approaches), disaggregated by country, region, district, location, sex^	2.2. TBD	2.2 TBD	2.2 TBD
	SO3: Enhanced social sustainability of food systems (incl. food and nutrition security)	3.1 Prevalence of undernourishment^ (** GERF 1.24), by country	3.1. TBD	3.1 TBD	3.1 TBD
		3.2 Prevalence of stunting among children under 5 years of age (** GERF 1.25) ^, by country	3.2 TBD	3.2 TBD	3.2 TBD
	SO4: Improved governance and institutional sustainability of food systems	4.1 Quantity of national food reserves (in tonnes)	4.1 TBD	4.1 TBD	4.1 TBD
		4.2 Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognised documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by country, location, sex and by type of tenure	4.2 TBD	4.2 TBD	4.2 TBD

Induced outputs	OP.1.1 Access to sustainable and inclusive finance in the sector, in particular for climate, environmental, social (inclusive) and economically sustainable agricultural activities, is enhanced;	1.1.1 Number of new performance contracts between FISAN (Window 1) and partner institutions 1.1.2 Annual budgetary allocation towards FISAN (from the government) 1.1.3 Number of producer organisations/SMEs receiving financial support from FISAN	1.1.1 : 6 (2021) 1.1.2 : 150 million FCFA (2021) 1.1.3: 1575 (2021)	1.1.1 : 15 (2023) 1.1.2: TBD 1.1.3 : 7000 (2027)	1.1.1 Reports FISAN 1.1.2: Budget laws 1.1.3 Activity reports of the « Agence pour la Promotion du Conseil Agricole (APCA) »
	OP1.2 Access to quality advisory support services in the sector are improved, including for environmentally friendly and climate-adapted production.	1.2.1 Number of new performance contracts between FISAN (via window 3 managed by APCA) and Producers' Organisations (POs)/farms to carry out agricultural advisory support actions for their members 1.2.2 Number of producers benefiting from advisory support services offered by APCA-funded producer organisations/farms 1.2.3. Number of structures benefiting from FISAN financial support for Facility 3	1.2.1 : 6 (2021) 1.2.2: TBD 1.2.3 : 6 (2021)	1.2.1 : 14 (2027) 1.2.2: TBD 1.2.3 : 14 (2027)	1.2.1 Activity reports of the « Agence pour la Promotion du Conseil Agricole (APCA) » 1.2.2 Reports FISAN 1.2.3 Reports FISAN
	OP2.1. Adoption of sustainable regional land-use plans (“Schéma d’Amenagement Foncier – SAF”)	2.1.1 Number of SAFs adopted (together with their operational texts)	2.1.1 : 4 (2020)	2.1.1 : 8 (2024)	2.1.1 Monitoring/evaluation report of the National Permanent Secretariat of the Rural Code (SPCR) Ministry of Agriculture

	OP3.1. Adoption and operationalisation of the national food security mechanism	<p>3.1.1 Status of a programme specifically for the national food security mechanism</p> <p>3.1.2 Annual budgetary allocation to the national food security mechanism</p> <p>3.1.3 Number of severely food-insecure households assisted on time</p> <p>3.1.4 Tonnes of local purchases made within the timeframe of the national mechanism</p>	<p>3.1.1 : 0 programmes (2021)</p> <p>3.1.2: TBD</p> <p>3.1.3: estimated 200,000 (2020)</p> <p>3.1.4: 5.200 (2020)</p>	<p>3.1.1 : 1 programme adopted (2022)</p> <p>3.1.2: TBD</p> <p>3.1.3: -10 %/year</p> <p>3.1.4: 22.500 (2024)</p>	<p>Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) reports of the National Mechanism (“Dispositif National”)</p> <p>3.1.2: Budget laws</p> <p>3.1.3 TBD</p> <p>3.1.4 TBD</p>
	OP4.1 The system for warning, prevention and management of crises and shocks is improved	4.1.1 Status of food security early warning systems supported by the EU-funded intervention ^	4.1.1: 0 (2021)	4.1.1: in place and operational	<p>4.1.1 Ministry of Humanitarian Action Reports</p> <p>Report of the national mechanism</p>
Direct outputs	<p>DO.1. Increase in the amount of external aid available in the national budget;</p> <p>DO 2. The sectoral dialogue is reinforced</p> <p>DO.3. Performance evaluations of sectoral strategies are available</p> <p>DO.4. Civil service capacity is improved (complementary support)</p>	<p>1. Number of budget support disbursement respecting the calendar</p> <p>2. Number of official policy dialogue meetings with main sectoral actors</p> <p>3. Number of performance evaluations of sectoral strategies</p> <p>4 Number of civil servants with increased capacities to moderate the impact of the global food crisis</p>	<p>1 : 0 (2021)</p> <p>2 : 1/an (2021)</p> <p>3 : 0 (2021)</p> <p>4: 0 (2021)</p>	<p>1: 1 per year (2022-2024)</p> <p>2: 2 per year (2022-2024)</p> <p>3: 1 per year (2022-2024)</p> <p>4: TBD</p>	<p>1. Government reports</p> <p>2. TBD</p> <p>3. TBD</p> <p>4. TBD</p>

Appendix – List of eligible Lead Finance Institutions

Acronym of Legal Entity	Legal Entity (sub-entities covered (if any) via hyperlink)
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AfDB	African Development Bank
AU-IBAR	African Union
CABEI	Central American Bank for Economic Integration
CIFOR	Centre for International Forestry Research
EBRD	European Bank for reconstruction and development
EIB	European Investment Bank
EIF	European Investment Fund
IADB	Inter-American Development Bank
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
NEFCO	Nordic Environment Finance Corporation
OIE	World Organisation for Animal Health
SPC	The Pacific Community
SPREP	South Pacific Regional Environment Programme
WBG	World Bank Group (IBRD, IDA, IFC, MIGA, ICSID)

WFP	World Food Programme
-----	----------------------

Acronym	National Agency, Country
AECID	Agencia española de cooperación internacional al desarrollo, Spain
AFD	Agence française de développement, France
CDP	Cassa depositi e prestiti S.p.A., Italy
COFIDES	Compañía española de financiación del desarrollo, Spain
DEG	Deutsche Investitions- und Entwicklungsgesellschaft mbH, Germany
FMO	Nederlandse Financierings-Maatschappij voor Ontwikkelingslanden, Netherlands
KfW	Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau, Germany
PROPARCO	Groupe Agence Française de Développement, France
RVO	Rijksdienst voor Ondernemend Nederland, Netherlands
SIMEST	Società Italiana per le Imprese all'Estero, Italy