



AKADEMIYA

The Expertise We Need. The Africa We Want.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Consultancy to Undertake an Assessment of the Agriculture Joint Sector Review Process in Selected Countries

1. INTRODUCTION

In January 2025, the African Union (AU) Heads of State and Government adopted the Kampala CAADP Declaration on Building Resilient and Sustainable Agrifood Systems in Africa and the CAADP Strategy and Action Plan for 2026–2035. The Declaration reorients CAADP from an agriculture-led agenda to a broader agrifood systems approach, addressing challenges and opportunities across the entire agrifood system to improve food and nutrition security, reduce poverty, create decent jobs, strengthen resilience, and drive inclusive and sustainable economic growth. Building on lessons from the CAADP Malabo Declaration implementation period, both the Kampala Declaration and the CAADP Strategy and Action Plan (2026–2035) place greater emphasis on resilient and sustainable agrifood systems, better nutritional outcomes, climate resilience, women and youth empowerment, private sector engagement, and stronger mutual accountability.

The Kampala Declaration calls on AU Member States to integrate the Declaration’s commitments into their national agrifood system investment plans (NASIPs) and to adopt agrifood governance best practices to guide planning, monitoring, reporting, learning, and accountability. Agriculture Joint Sector Reviews (JSRs) remain an important mechanism for mutual accountability under the CAADP Kampala Declaration. Functional JSR platforms at the country level are recognized as an indicator under Strategic Objective 6, “Strengthen Agrifood Systems Governance,” in the CAADP Strategy and Action Plan. As a key mutual accountability mechanism, the JSR provides a platform for government and non-state actors to jointly review progress, assess performance, identify implementation challenges, and agree on corrective actions to improve the effectiveness of agrifood system policies, investments, institutions, and results. By enabling a broad group of stakeholders to gain insights into and influence overall policies and priorities of the agrifood sector, JSRs serve as a management and policy support tool for inclusive stakeholder planning, programming, budget preparation and execution, monitoring and evaluation, and the overall development of the agrifood sector.

Between 2014 and 2019, the Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (ReSAKSS) supported the strengthening of agriculture JSR processes across Africa through assessments conducted in 21 countries and two Regional Economic Communities (RECs). These assessments have helped improve the functionality, regularity, inclusiveness, effectiveness, and sustainability of JSR platforms.

To support efforts to introduce JSR practices where they do not exist and to improve their quality where they do, ReSAKSS, with funding from the Gates Foundation, is conducting new assessments of agriculture JSRs in selected AU Member States, including [Country]. The assessment aims to evaluate the status and quality of the JSR process in [Country], review the policy and institutional environment for NASIP implementation, assess progress toward key agrifood commitments and targets, and identify actions needed to strengthen the JSR process and mutual accountability to foster agrifood systems transformation.

2. THE ASSIGNMENT

AKADEMIYA2063 seeks to engage a Consultant to undertake the JSR assessment in [Country]. This assignment will include stakeholder consultations, review and synthesis of relevant literature, collection and analysis of data, report writing, organization of a stakeholder validation workshop, and presentation of the JSR assessment report at the validation workshop. Specifically, the task will involve two sets of activities: i) Technical review and assessment and ii) National-level consultations. These are detailed below.

A. Technical Review and Assessment Activities

The ultimate objective of this activity is threefold:

1. Evaluate the policy and institutional environment supporting implementation of the NASIP or equivalent national agrifood system investment plan or strategy.
2. Examine progress toward achieving the NASIP's key targets and commitments and establish performance baselines for future reviews.
3. Assess the adequacy of existing JSR or JSR-like processes to effectively carry out a review in the future and identify actions to address identified weaknesses.

i. Status and quality of JSR processes

The benefit of a JSR process is determined by the adequacy of its coverage, the quality of its assessment tools, and its inclusivity. Gaps and weaknesses in these areas, as well as appropriate measures to address them, will be identified under this task. Annex 2 provides guidelines for reviewing the status and quality of a JSR or JSR-like process in the country.

ii. Policy review

This part of the evaluation focuses on the coherence, consistency, adequacy, and implementation status of policies affecting agrifood systems transformation. The review will cover policies within and beyond agriculture in [Country]. The review will track policy commitments by examining whether commitments are being met, whether all required policies and institutions are in place, whether policies are implemented adequately, and whether institutions operate effectively.

The Consultant will review the NASIP or equivalent agrifood systems plan or strategy, along with other program/strategy documents, and collect the relevant data as outlined in the Annotated Report Outline in Annex 1.

iii. Progress towards sector results and outcomes

The focus is on measuring progress toward targeted agrifood systems results and commitments. This includes key targets such as agricultural productivity, value addition, trade, food security, nutrition, poverty reduction, public and private investment, women's empowerment, youth employment, climate resilience, environmental sustainability, and other results defined in the NASIP (or equivalent national agrifood systems plan/strategy), the Kampala CAADP Declaration, the Kampala CAADP Strategy and Action Plan, and other policy and program documents. The review should also assess the implementation of financial and non-financial commitments made by government, development partners, private sector actors, farmer organizations, and civil society organizations.

The Consultant will gather information on the status and quality of the JSR process through desk reviews of the literature and consultations with key informants. After preparing the JSR assessment report and action plan, the Consultant will present the report at a stakeholder validation workshop. In collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture and AKADEMIYA2063, the Consultant will support the organization of the validation workshop. In consultation with the Ministry of Agriculture and AKADEMIYA2063, the Consultant will help identify key stakeholders to participate in the national stakeholder validation workshop.

The workshop will use the JSR building blocks/best practices matrix and the Annotated Report Outline in the Annex section as a guide.

B. National Level Consultation Activities

While AKADEMIYA2063/ReSAKSS will provide backstopping support, national stakeholders and experts must be at the center of the assessment activities listed above. This will be achieved through adequate consultations with teams overseeing NASIP and CAADP implementation and review in the country, as well as with national experts and stakeholders involved in the NASIP and CAADP processes. The Consultant will lead engagement and foster collaboration with national stakeholders and experts. The draft report, prepared based on knowledge gathered from the assignment activities, will be discussed and validated during the national stakeholder validation workshop.

3. EXPECTED OUTPUTS

The Consultant is expected to deliver the following outputs:

1. Inception Report including methodology, work plan, data collection tools, and stakeholders to be interviewed.
2. A JSR assessment report prepared according to the outline provided in Annex 1, including an action plan to address gaps and weaknesses in technical and institutional capacity and to promote the adoption of JSR best practices
3. Support the organization of a national stakeholder validation workshop in collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture and AKADEMIYA2063.
4. Submit the final report incorporating the comments from the validation workshop.

4. DURATION

The consultancy is expected to be completed within 20 business days.

5. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

The total consultancy fee, including transport and communication costs, is US\$6,000. The payment schedule is shown below.

Item	Deliverable	Payment (in %)
1	Inception Report	
2	Draft JSR Report	50%
3	Support Validation Workshop	
4	Final JSR Report	50%

6. APPLICATION PROCESS

- AGRODEP members with relevant expertise in agriculture policy, sector coordination, monitoring and evaluation, mutual accountability, and CAADP processes should submit a short expression of interest indicating which part of the consultancy they are interested in, the country, their relevant experience, and their CVs.
- Applications should be submitted to **Dr. Paul Guthiga** (pguthiga@akademiya2063.org), copying **Dr. Seraphin Niyonsenga** (sniyonsenga@akademiya2063.org).
- Deadline: **Tuesday, October 27, 2026.**
- Applicants should be residents of the selected countries of assignment.

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Annotated Report Outline

- I. Introduction and Background
 - Brief description of report context and objectives
 - Brief description of methodology used for the assessment (e.g. desk reviews, stakeholder consultations, and any key informant interviews)
 - Brief description of report structure
 - Short description of the country CAADP national agrifood systems investment plan (NASIP) (or equivalent national agrifood systems strategy)
- II. Status and quality of the JSR process in the country or JSR-like process(es) in the country
(Use and fill out tables in Excel File, Attachment)
 - Describe the JSR process or JSR-like process(es) followed by the country, including who is involved (government, farmers and farmers' organizations, private sector, civil society, development partners, etc.), and their roles in the process. Is the JSR process or JSR-like process(es) consultative?
 - What are the key questions, areas, and sectors covered by the reviews?
 - What are the key decisions and commitments that came out of the last JSR process or JSR-like process(es), and who are the responsible actors?
 - ⇒ Provide a summary of the activities needed to implement the decisions, responsible implementers, and timelines for implementation
 - What are the main gaps in the JSR process or JSR-like process(es), and what needs to be done to improve the process? Fill in column six of the Matrix in Annex 2 by comparing the JSR process or JSR-like process(es) to JSR best practices in Annex 2.
 - Develop an action plan to bridge the gaps and achieve JSR best practices in implementing the JSR process or JSR-like process(es). Fill in the last column of the Matrix in Annex 2 by comparing the JSR process or JSR-like process(es) to the JSR best practices in Annex 2.

III. Policy Review

What are the key existing and emerging policies, both within and outside agriculture, that affect the implementation of the NASIPs (or equivalent national agrifood systems strategy), positively or negatively? What gaps exist, and what adjustments or alignment are needed? Where appropriate, assign a rating using the traffic light scoring suggested in Annex 3.

- a) Inventory of existing and emerging policies
 - What policies are explicitly or implicitly contained in key policy and strategy documents?
 - What new policies have been introduced explicitly or implicitly through the NASIP (or equivalent national agrifood systems strategy)?

b) Quality of policy planning and execution

- Do policies define measurable and trackable targets?
- Do policies have a baseline to benchmark future progress?
- Do policies have an evaluation system in place to measure progress?
- Do policies have a review process in place?
 - ⇒ Is it independent?
 - ⇒ Is it inclusive?
 - ⇒ Is it evidence-based?

c) Consistency of policy mix

- Do all policies above complement or contradict each other in terms of desired development objectives, actions, expected outcomes, legal and regulatory instruments, etc.? Example: A policy that discourages the importation of high-yielding varieties contradicts a policy to subsidize fertilizer, given the former reduces the returns to the latter and may hamper its success.
- If not, what changes are needed to make policies consistent?
- Identify the policy consistency gap
 - ⇒ How many or what proportion of the policies that are conflicting/inconsistent are still in need of revision?

d) Alignment of policies with the NASIP (or equivalent agrifood systems strategy)

- Are ALL existing policies supportive of a successful implementation of the NASIP or not? Example: A policy that prohibits cross-border exports contradicts a NASIP target that seeks to raise producer incomes.
- If not, what changes are needed to align policies with the requirements of the NASIP?
- Identify the **policy alignment gap**
 - ⇒ How many, or what proportion, of the policies not aligned with the NASIP still need revision?

e) Policy implementation status

- Are current policies being adequately implemented? For example, policies may require several legal, regulatory, and operational steps by cabinet, parliament, line ministries, technical agencies, etc., to be implemented. If any of these steps is missing, implementation cannot proceed.
 - ⇒ If no, why not?
- What actions are needed to fully implement these policies (use Excel File template)?
- Identify the **policy implementation gap**
 - ⇒ How many or what proportion of policies are NOT being fully implemented?

f) Adequacy of policy coverage?

- Are all policies needed to support a successful implementation of the NASIP (or equivalent agrifood systems strategy) in place? For example, a NASIP requiring seed sector development needs an effectively implemented seed policy.
 - ⇒ If not, what actions are needed to develop such policies?
- Identify the **policy coverage gap**
 - ⇒ How many of the policies that are needed are not in place?

Assign a rating using the traffic light scoring suggested in Annex 3.

IV. Institutional Review

What are the key institutions that are involved in the implementation of NASIP (or equivalent national agrifood systems strategy)? How far is the institutional architecture aligned with the needs of successful NASIP implementation? What gaps exist, and what adjustments or alignments are needed to improve the quality of implementation for results?

Assign a rating using the traffic light scoring suggested in Annex 3.

- a) Institutional landscape of NASIP (or equivalent national agrifood systems strategy)
 - Do an inventory of key institutions involved in formulation and implementation of the NASIP (institutions include state and non-state actors; within state actors, this includes key government ministries, departments, units (MDUs) and agencies; non-state actors include NGOs, farmers' organizations, CSOs, private sector, donors, etc.)

Government institutions

- b) Coordination within government institutions
 - Are there institutional structures for MDUs and government agencies to coordinate actions around the NASIP?
 - ⇒ If not, are such structures needed and why?
 - What actions are needed to create them?
 - ⇒ If yes, do the institutional structures have the required capacities to deliberate, plan, and execute decisions?
 - If not, what actions are needed to become effective?

Non-State Actors (NSA)

- c) Participation by non-state actors in policy and program formulation
 - Are there institutional structures that allow NSA to participate in policy and program formulation?
 - ⇒ If not, are such structures needed and why?
 - What actions are needed to create them?
 - ⇒ If yes, do they all have the required capacities to deliberate, plan, and execute decisions?
 - If not, which ones need what actions to become effective?

d) Participation by non-state actors in policy and program implementation

- Are there institutional structures that allow NSAs to participate in policy and program implementation?
 - ⇒ If not, are such structures needed and why?
 - What actions are needed to create them?
 - ⇒ If yes, do they all have the required capacities to deliberate, plan, and execute decisions?
 - If not, which ones need what actions to become effective?

State and non-state actors

e) Institutional alignment with NASIP and Institutional gaps

- Is institutional leadership of major investment areas of NASIP clearly assigned among state and non-state actors?
 - ⇒ If not, what are the institutional gaps, i.e., areas with no clearly assigned institutional leadership?

f) Institutional implementation capacity

- Do all lead institutions have the required capacities to deliberate, plan, and execute decisions?
 - ⇒ If not, which ones need what capacities to effectively meet their implementation responsibilities?

Development partner organizations

g) Coordination among development partners

- Do donors have shared work or action plans?
- Do donors conduct joint analytical work and joint missions?
- Do donors pool technical or other capacities?
- Do donors share knowledge and information?
- Donor alignment with country policies and programs
 - ⇒ Is there synergy or concordance between donor and government programs regarding:
 - Program targets,
 - Funding allocation,
 - Implementation modalities,
 - Indicators to measure progress,

V. Review of key financial and non-financial commitments

What commitments have key stakeholders made, particularly the government, development partners, and the private sector, including farmers' organizations? To address this, we would need to scrutinize commitments in NASIPs (or equivalent national agrifood systems strategy), sector policy documents, strategy papers, and relevant regional and international agreements.

a) Government

1) Inventory of government budget and other financial commitments

- Has the government met each of its budgetary/financial commitments as planned?
 - ⇒ If not, what progress has been made? (Fill in the table in the Excel File, Government Financial Commitments worksheet).
 - ⇒ What actions are needed to fulfill commitments?

2) Inventory of government institutional and capacity development commitments

- Has the government met each of its non-financial, institutional, and capacity commitments as planned?
 - ⇒ If not, what progress has been made? (Fill in the table in the Excel File, Government Non-financial Commitments worksheet).
 - ⇒ What actions are needed to fulfill commitments?

b) Non-state Actors (NSAs) [Private Sector, Farmer's organizations, CSO, etc.]

3) Inventory of financial, institutional, and capacity development commitments by NSA

- Has each key NSA group met each of its financial/investment, institutional, and capacity commitments as planned?
 - ⇒ If not, what progress has been made? (Fill in table in Excel File, NSA Financial and Non-financial Commitments worksheets).
 - ⇒ What actions are needed to fulfill commitments?

c) Development Partners (DPs)

4) Inventory of each DP's non-financial commitments in terms of institutional and capacity support

- Has each DP met each of its institutional and capacity support commitments as planned?
 - ⇒ If not, what progress has been made for each commitment? (Fill in table in Excel File, DP Non-financial Commitments worksheet).
 - ⇒ What actions are needed to fulfill commitments? (Include actions in the above table)

5) Inventory of each DP's financial commitments

- Has each DP met each of its financial commitments as planned:

- ⇒ If not, what progress has been made for each commitment? (Fill in table in Excel File, DP Financial Commitments worksheet).
- ⇒ What actions are needed to fulfill commitments? (Include actions in above table)

VI. Agrifood Systems performance baselines

The objective is to collect recent data on key indicators described in the NASIPs (or equivalent national agrifood systems strategy) to serve as a reference base for future JSR assessments and other progress assessments during the next decade of CAADP. Please collect data for the years 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, and 2025. As much as possible, indicators should be disaggregated by gender, region, and other socio-economic strata. The country will need to add indicators for input, output, outcome, and impact targets that have been specified in, or could be derived from, its NASIP (or equivalent agrifood systems strategy) and other major program/strategy documents. Data to be collected should at least include those available in the Kampala CAADP indicators. The indicators cover (but are not limited to) agricultural productivity, value addition, trade, food security, nutrition, poverty reduction, public and private investment, women's empowerment, youth employment, climate resilience, and environmental sustainability. The indicators should align with the Kampala CAADP Results Framework and the NASIP targets (or equivalent agrifood systems strategy).

- Create a matrix listing the different input, output, outcome, and impact target indicators that need to be quantified for the country and derived as explained above.
- Evaluate each of the above targets for the time period 2021-2025. Use a table to list the various indicators and their baseline values (for 2021-2025).

VII. JSR Assessment conclusions and lessons

The purpose of this JSR assessment is to support country efforts to introduce JSR practices where they do not exist and to improve their quality where they do.

- Synthesis of JSR assessment findings and action plan
 - ⇒ Summarize key findings with respect to agrifood systems performance, policy processes, institutional landscape, and financial and non-financial commitments.
 - ⇒ Describe how actions called for in each of the above areas will be implemented and monitored, including indicators for progress.
- Synthesis findings regarding JSR practice and improvement plan
 - ⇒ Summarize key findings with respect to the status and quality of the JSR process.
 - ⇒ Describe how actions plan to improve the current JSR process and achieve best practices will be carried out and monitored, including indicators of progress.

Annex 2: Guidelines for strengthening mutual accountability through the agrifood joint sector review process at country level

#	JSR BUILDING BLOCKS	PURPOSE/TASKS: BEST PRACTICES	WHAT IS THE CURRENT PRACTICE IN THE COUNTRY?	HOW DOES THE CURRENT PRACTICE DIFFER FROM BEST PRACTICE?	WHAT ACTIONS ARE NEEDED TO ACHIEVE BEST PRACTICE?
1	Set Up a JSR Steering Committee (SC)	SC provides strategic direction for the establishment and operation of the JSR. It is usually made up of 2 co-chairs from the Ministry of Agriculture and a leading development partner agency and 3-4 other representatives of key stakeholder groups.			
2	Establish a JSR Secretariat	Secretariat coordinates activities and operations of the JSR and JSR SC. It can be made up of core staff from the Planning & M&E Unit of the Ministry of Agriculture			
3	Develop Terms of Reference (TOR) for the JSR	TOR to lay out JSR objectives, state and non-state stakeholders and their roles, roles of the SC and Secretariat, operating principles, structure and frequency of JSR meetings and follow up and implementation of actions, etc. TOR may also need to be developed consultants hired to conduct JSR studies.			

4	Mobilize resources	Mobilize resources (human and financial) to support operations of the JSR.			
5	SC/Secretariat invites a broad and inclusive group of state and non-state actors/stakeholders to participate in JSR (with clear objectives, expected outcomes, and roles of different actors)	A key aspect of the JSR is that it allows broad group of state and non-state stakeholders to influence overall policies and priorities of the sector by assessing how well they have implemented their commitments stipulated in the NASIP (or equivalent national agrifood systems strategy) and related agreements.			
6	Assess any existing agrifood policy dialogue and review processes; data quality and analytical capacities	An assessment of any existing agrifood policy dialogue and review processes, data quality, and analytical capacities and tools and networks and any existing knowledge systems is key to identifying any gaps and coming up with ways to fill gaps and enhance capacities, tools, and processes through the JSR			
7	Commission JSR Studies	Consultants may need to be hired and supervised by the SC to conduct JSR studies. Consultants can come from think tanks, universities, or private companies and should work closely with staff from the Planning Unit, and the JSR SC and Secretariat.			

8	Establish JSR Review Team*	Team made up of a multi-stakeholder group (state and non-state actors) with technical expertise to review and comment on various JSR studies and reports and ensures outputs of reviews are implemented.			
9	Prepare JSR Report	Preparing evidence based on relevant high-quality studies and reports on the JSR content areas. To be an effective mutual accountability process, the JSR Report will need to be grounded in high quality data and analysis as well as transparency and inclusive stakeholder participation.			
10	Conduct JSR Meeting	Organize meeting over 1-3 days, using various formats (plenary, small groups, field visit, etc.) to allow stakeholders to discuss/verify the evidence and recommendations presented in the JSR Report. This can be done at different levels (national and sub-national). The process should assist in identifying sector priorities and policies and specific actions for the different stakeholders to put in place. These would be captured in a JSR Aide Memoir.			
11	Follow up on JSR Meeting Actions	Closely monitor and ensure implementation of recommendations and decisions of the JSR meeting (embodied in the JSR Aide Memoir). monitoring forms the basis of the next JSR cycle.			

12	Share JSR experience with other countries	It is essential to share lessons learned, best practices, and experiences to further strengthen country JSRs. Forums such as the CAADP PP and other knowledge sharing platforms provide an opportunity to do this.			
----	---	--	--	--	--

Annex 3: Traffic Light Scoring

Progress in implementing policies, programs and institutions

Indicator and measurement	Status* Current
Indicator 1	Narrative ...
Indicator 2	
...	
Indicator n	

* Use color codes based on narratives:

Green	Target achieved or surpassed
Yellow	On track
Red	Not on track or deteriorated
Grey	No data (explain why there is no data)