



AKADEMIYA

The Expertise We Need. The Africa We Want.



KAMPALA POLICY BRIEF SERIES

ISSUE #15

Opportunities for Convergence Between the UN Food Systems Summit Process and the CAADP Kampala Agenda

By Hamady Diop, Katrin Glatzel, John Ulimwengu, and Augustin Wambo Yamdjeu

KAMPALA POLICY BRIEF SERIES

*Opportunities for Convergence Between the UN Food Systems Summit Process and the CAADP Kampala Agenda*¹

Issue #15, May 2026

By Hamady Diop*, Katrin Glatzel**, John Ulimwengu***,
and Augustin Wambo Yamdjeu****

Suggested Citation: Diop, H., K. Glatzel, J. Ulimwengu, and A. Wambo Yamdjeu. 2026. *Opportunities for Convergence Between the UN Food Systems Summit Process and the CAADP Kampala Agenda*. Kampala Policy Brief Series, No. 15. Kigali: AKADEMIYA2063.
<https://doi.org/10.54067/kpbs.15>

*Former CAADP Post-Malabo Process and Program Coordinator, African Union Commission
**Director of Global Strategy and Programs, AKADEMIYA2063
***Senior Research Fellow, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
**** Founder and Principal Strategist, AFRIKIYA Lab

¹This policy brief provides a summary of a chapter in the forthcoming 2026 Annual Trends and Outlook Report (ATOR), to be published in November 2026. Authors are listed in alphabetical order.

Editorial

Since its adoption by the African Union (AU) in 2003, the **Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP)** has been Africa’s primary policy framework for agricultural transformation, wealth creation, food security, economic growth, and prosperity. It guides the African Union Commission (AUC), the African Union Development Agency-New Partnership for Africa’s Development (AUDA-NEPAD), Regional Economic Communities (RECs), and Member States in driving agricultural transformation toward a self-reliant and productive Africa.

The **Kampala CAADP Declaration** on “**Building Resilient and Sustainable Agrifood Systems in Africa**” and the associated **CAADP Strategy and Action Plan (2026-2035)** will build on the success and deepen the progress achieved after two decades of CAADP implementation, during which Africa significantly improved in economic and agricultural growth, poverty reduction, nutrition outcomes, and agricultural trade expansion. The next 10-year cycle of CAADP implementation must further deepen its focus by incorporating lessons learned and responding to emerging challenges to accelerate sustainable agrifood systems transformation in the context of climate change and multifaceted stressors and shocks.

The longevity and continued success of CAADP can be attributed to its legitimacy as a shared framework that guides Member States toward agricultural transformation and economic growth. Guided by CAADP principles and values, particularly African ownership and mutual accountability, and strengthened through review and benchmarking mechanisms, data and analytics have been central to CAADP’s evidence-based planning and implementation. As Africa embarks on the implementation phase of the Kampala CAADP Declaration, which took effect on January 1, 2026, evidence and robust data analysis will remain indispensable to successful on-the-ground implementation. This is the rationale behind AKADEMIYA2063’s Kampala Policy Brief Series.

The policy briefs serve as reference documents for policy analysts and planners across AU Member States as they prepare their programs in response to the Kampala CAADP Declaration. The series provides a synthesis of a large body of research addressing topics of strategic relevance to Africa’s development agenda, alongside key issues to be tackled during the new phase of CAADP implementation, with the aim of generating insights, examining emerging ideas, reviewing cross-cutting thematic areas, and proposing policy recommendations that can be adapted and replicated for sustainable impact.

The evidence presented in the Kampala Policy Brief Series draws on published research and data from AKADEMIYA2063’s scientists and collaborators across Africa and beyond. These lessons are made accessible to policymakers, non-state actors, practitioners at continental, regional, and national levels, and development partners to support the implementation of CAADP 2026-2035. In addition to packaging the lessons and insights into comprehensive yet accessible knowledge products, AKADEMIYA2063 facilitates policy dialogue through webinars. During these sessions, the findings are presented to a broad range of stakeholders to inform programmatic interventions that support the implementation of the Kampala CAADP Agenda.

Executive Summary



Agrifood systems in Africa are under strain from the interplay of acute shocks and persistent structural weaknesses. Climate variability, recurrent droughts and floods, food price volatility, weak logistics, post-harvest losses, infrastructure deficits, rising debt, and shrinking fiscal space are converging to strain governments' capacity to respond. In this context, food and agriculture policy can no longer be evaluated solely through the lens of growth opportunities; it must also address nutrition, public health, economic opportunity, resilience, social inclusion, environmental sustainability, and governance performance. Two major policy processes—the UN Food Systems Summit (UNFSS) and the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) Kampala Agenda—are increasingly shaping how African governments approach these multidimensional challenges. This Policy Brief argues that deliberate convergence between the two processes is essential to strengthen ownership, align efforts, accelerate implementation, reduce fragmentation, and advance the objectives of Agenda 2063 and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

1. The Governance Challenge

African governments navigate this broader agrifood agenda through multiple governance channels. The 2021 UN Food Systems Summit (UNFSS) raised the global profile of food systems transformation and encouraged countries to develop national pathways through consultative processes. In this process, African countries adopted the Africa Common Position on Food Systems – a step that, a few years later, helped inform the Kampala Declaration, which provided a stronger framework for implementation, domestication, and accountability. The influence of this process is visible not only in the timing of the Kampala agenda but also in its substance. The Africa Common Position helped translate the UNFSS food systems discourse into an African policy framework centered on integrated agrifood systems transformation, linking production, nutrition, resilience, inclusion, sustainability, and governance. The Kampala CAADP Declaration and its associated CAADP Strategy and Action Plan (2026-2035) then carried this framing into an African Union-owned framework for domestication, investment planning, coordination, mutual accountability, and delivery, as reflected in its alignment with the Africa Common Position on Food Systems and its shift from an agriculture-led transformation to an agrifood-systems approach.

The coexistence of these frameworks creates both opportunity and complexity: multiple frameworks can mobilize resources, broaden coalitions, and attract political attention, yet they can also pose challenges, such as fragmented reporting, unclear mandates, parallel coordination, and initiative fatigue. The deeper challenge remains the lack of a unified, agreed-upon institutional framework, order, interface, and sequencing logic that links the two processes. This context sets the stage for the argument that follows.

The central argument is that ownership, alignment, and deliberate convergence between the UNFSS and the CAADP Kampala Agenda are critical to Africa's progress in agrifood systems. Although both frameworks target related outcomes, their processes have separate governance, timelines, and indicators, creating burden on governments to deliver and reducing overall policy effectiveness. Deliberate alignment and national ownership will address these obstacles and enhance the impact of each framework's indicators.

The UNFSS elevated food systems transformation within global development governance. Its core innovation was to move beyond traditional sectoral agricultural policy by integrating food systems as a domain that connects agricultural production, diets, health, the environment, markets, climate, social inclusion, and sustainability.

CAADP began as a continental framework focused primarily on agricultural growth, public investment, and sectoral planning. Under the Maputo Declaration, the emphasis was largely on investment commitments and agricultural growth targets. In later implementation cycles, especially under the Malabo Declaration, the agenda expanded to include resilience, nutrition, trade, data systems, results, and mutual accountability. The Kampala Declaration continues this evolution by moving more explicitly toward an agrifood systems transformation agenda. In this sense, the UNFSS process helped elevate the conceptual and normative foundations of food systems transformation, while the

Kampala CAADP agenda translated those principles into an African-owned strategy for coordinated planning, investment, mutual accountability, and delivery on agrifood systems transformation – thereby reinforcing the crucial role the agriculture sector continues to play in African countries.

The Kampala CAADP Declaration marks a significant step change in Africa's development; therefore, it should be seen not as a standalone declaration but as the latest milestone in a longer institutional development. It demonstrates and explains CAADP's shift from an agriculture-focused framework to a more comprehensive, explicit approach to agrifood systems transformation, emphasizing governance, domestication, delivery readiness, and integrated investment planning. This shift shows that a strong, broader African policy debate, in which sustained transformation depends not only on sectoral spending but also on the quality of public policy, institutions, and implementation, drives lasting transformation. Table 1 provides a comparative governance profile of the UNFSS and Kampala CAADP.

Viewed in this light, the relationship between the two frameworks is best understood as sequential and complementary. UNFSS elevated food systems transformation on the global agenda; the Africa Common Position translated that agenda into a continental African policy language; and the Kampala CAADP Declaration and its associated CAADP Strategy and Action Plan (2026-2035) embedded it within an AU-led framework for domestication, investment planning, monitoring, and accountability.



Table 1. Comparative governance profile of UNFSS and Kampala CAADP

Dimension	UNFSS	Kampala CAADP
Political locus	UN-linked global process	AU-led continental framework
Geographical scope	Global	African continental
Governance style	Voluntary, multi-stakeholder, soft coordination	Politically anchored, domestication-oriented, accountability-linked
Core strength	Agenda-setting, coalition-building, narrative reframing	Ownership, implementation architecture, mutual accountability
Main instruments	National pathways, dialogues, coalitions, stock takes	Declarations, National Agriculture Investment Plans (NAIPs)/National Agrifood Systems Investment Plans (NASIPs), Biennial Review (BR), Joint Sector Review (JSR), scorecards, diagnostic briefs
Accountability style	Variable and largely voluntary	Structured peer review and recurring monitoring, not legally binding though
Main weakness	Uneven national anchoring, softer follow-through	Delivery still depends heavily on national capacity
Best role in convergence	Visibility, participation, global linkage	Institutional backbone for planning, monitoring, implementation, mutual learning and dissemination of good practices

Source: Authors

Elements of the UNFSS process are also evident in the of the CAADP Strategy and Action Plan (2026-2035), which operationalizes the agrifood systems framing across nutrition, resilience, sustainability, inclusion, trade, technology, and governance, while embedding these priorities in national and regional agrifood investment plans and in CAADP’s accountability architecture.

The comparison between UNFSS and Kampala CAADP shows that this alignment is not merely theoretical but already represents a practical governance shift across Africa. Some countries have begun to respond. For example, Rwanda integrated agricultural and nutrition monitoring through inter-ministerial arrangements, reducing duplication and clarifying responsibilities. Ghana has embedded external partner priorities into national investment planning instruments rather than managing them separately. While these are not universal models, they show that consolidation, not proliferation, most effectively achieves convergence. As Table 2 shows, without deliberate convergence, governance costs rise.

Table 2. Where the lack of convergence overlaps creates governance costs

Governance issue	How it appears in the absence of deliberate convergence	Why it matters
Coordination	Multiple committees and secretariats	Weak ownership, rival calendars, unclear authority
Planning	Separate pathways and plans	Reduced coherence between ambition and execution
Financing	Donor-funded pilots detached from national plans	Projectization and weak budget traction
Accountability	Parallel reporting systems	Administrative burden and inconsistent evidence
Participation	Repeated dialogues without institutional anchoring	Consultation fatigue and limited follow-through
Legitimacy	UNFSS visible but external; CAADP-owned but capacity-constrained	Tension between visibility and governability

Source: Authors

Against this backdrop, African governments already engage with both agendas. The key question is whether they can structure this engagement to improve and organize themselves in ways that strengthen delivery rather than multiply institutional burdens. Convergence matters for at least four reasons.

First, convergence reduces administrative burdens. Ministries and planning units already manage extensive, heavy demands, including stakeholder engagement, convening stakeholders, collecting and validating data, revising strategies, reporting, and responding to global reviews. When similar frameworks require separate reporting and review, costs rise, and delivery slows.

Second, convergence safeguards national ownership. Preparing separate strategies or reports for different external audiences may meet procedural requirements, but it often weakens strategic coherence and complicates prioritization.

Third, convergence improves financing coherence. National pathways that do not integrate with planning and budgeting rarely influence actual investment decisions.

Fourth, convergence strengthens Africa's bargaining power. A unified articulation, a more coherent continental account of priorities, progress, and needs, strengthens Africa's influence in discussions and more broadly on food systems, climate, nutrition, and trade.

2. Pathways for Operational Convergence

Building on the importance of convergence, four areas are essential to achieving critical operational convergence between the two frameworks.

2.1. Institutional anchoring and coordination

Institutional anchoring is the first requirement for convergence. Governments should avoid creating new, stand-alone structures when they can be integrated into CAADP-aligned mechanisms. The preferred approach is institutional nesting: governments use CAADP-aligned coordination platforms as the primary institutional basis for agrifood systems convergence, broadening their mandates as needed to include UNFSS pathway revision, cross-sector participation, and linkage to review cycles.

This move is the single most important step toward convergence because it addresses the core asymmetry between the two frameworks. The UNFSS offers substantial value as a global agenda-setting and alliance-forming process, but countries anchor it nationally in different ways. CAADP, by contrast, already integrates with AU political structures, regional processes, and national planning traditions. The integration literature supports this view: Candel and Biesbroek (2016) argue that building new coordination structures without nesting them within existing institutions can weaken—rather than improve—coherence.

This institutional nesting should not be limited to confining agrifood systems governance to the ministries of agriculture. Experience in several African countries shows emerging best practices in agrifood systems governance and indicates that confining transformation to a single sector leads to failure. Inter-ministerial coordination and ownership at the highest political levels are therefore essential to ensure convergence. A CAADP-linked coordination structure should include finance, planning, trade, health, the environment, and social protection. Planners must provide a clear mandate, predictable reporting lines, and strong political support at a sufficiently high level to manage trade-offs and ensure secure follow-through.

This recommendation aligns with the CAADP Strategy and Action Plan (2026-2035), which places implementation through national and regional agrifood investment plans, strengthened coordination systems, and biennial review-based accountability at the center of delivery.

2.2. Planning, financing, and implementation readiness

The second requirement is to move convergence from declaratory alignment to integrated planning and investment. While broad agrifood systems goals are often included in pathways and declarations, government planners are not always able to translate these into costed programs and clear financing responsibilities. CAADP's planning tradition offers a key major advantage. Governments should therefore embed UNFSS priorities in National Agricultural Investment Plans and emerging National Agrifood Systems Investment Plans, rather than treat them as separate parallel documents. This approach ensures that negotiators include these priorities in processes for determining priorities, setting budgets, and executing plans.

Jomo et al. (2025) directly support this planning-based logic by demonstrating that agrifood systems transformation commitments in Eastern Africa can be aligned with both the UNFSS action areas and the Kampala Declaration. Kalibata (2022) similarly argues that outcomes from food systems dialogues should be translated into concrete country action plans supported by appropriate technical institutions.

This integrated approach also counters projectization. Governments' agrifood systems transformation ambitions need to move away from isolated, scattered, donor-supported pilots that are disconnected from state budgeting and investment plans. Country leaders will benefit from developing costed, cross-sector programs that mobilize dedicated financing, sequence institutional actions, and support delivery. Leaders must link action areas such as nutrition-sensitive value chains, food safety, resilience, post-harvest systems, inclusive markets, and sustainable land management to financing and assign cross-sectoral implementation responsibilities.

Recent country examples further underscore the value of this approach. Uganda and Zambia offer important lessons: the Biennial Review country briefs show how continental accountability products can become country-facing diagnostic tools that inform domestic planning and performance dialogue. While they do not resolve a lack of convergence on their own, their value lies in demonstrating where operational planning and accountability intersect.



2.3. Interoperable monitoring, reporting, and accountability

The third requirement is to build an interoperable evidence and accountability system, rather than maintaining multiple parallel reporting structures. The goal is not for all frameworks to use identical indicators, but rather to avoid creating a situation in which countries must maintain separate evidence infrastructures for related agendas.

CAADP already provides a stronger accountability foundation than most stand-alone food systems initiatives through the Biennial Review (BR) processes, JSRs, ReSAKSS, and the ATOR series. Nhemachena et al. (2017) show that JSRs matter for mutual accountability and implementation review. Oehmke et al. (2018) explain why mutual accountability matters for collective action. Resnick et al. (2020) and Ulimwengu et al. (2023) show that the wider CAADP evidence ecosystem increasingly integrates analysis, policy planning, and continental accountability.

In practical terms, governments should collect this data, which could mean collecting it once through national systems, generating BR-compatible dashboards for continental review, and producing adapted outputs for UNFSS stock takes from the same evidence base. Teams should create crosswalk tables, harmonize indicator sets and reporting calendars, and ensure compatible data platforms to reduce repeated data requests. Politically, accountability systems strengthen African agency by ensuring that transformation is assessed through African-owned review processes—not just external architectures.

The CAADP Strategy and Action Plan (2026-2035) provides a ready-made basis for interoperability by emphasizing strengthened agrifood knowledge systems, BR reporting, JSRs, and mutual accountability mechanisms, which together provide a stronger accountability base than stand-alone food systems reporting processes.

2.4. Participation, delivery support, and peer learning

The final requirement is to preserve the participatory gains associated with the UNFSS while avoiding governance fragmentation. One of the clearest contributions of the UNFSS has been procedural: it broadened participation by involving and helping to bring civil society, youth, women, researchers, and the private sector into agrifood systems discussions. This contribution should be retained and institutionalized within CAADP-linked planning and review cycles, rather than through separate ad hoc forums.

Participation, however, is not enough. Canfield et al. (2021) and Kraak (2021) warn that participation without accountability can reproduce power asymmetries and diffuse responsibility. The most promising model, therefore, is one in which CAADP provides the formal governance architecture, while UNFSS contributes participatory methods, broader coalition-building, and global linkage within that architecture.

Delivery support and peer learning are also essential. Countries need assistance not only in developing food systems pathways but also in mapping indicators, revising coordination, linking pathways to budgets, and sequencing implementation. A continent-wide learning mechanism, linked to BR cycles and supported by African institutions, could help countries share practical lessons on coordination, indicator mapping, financing, and implementation readiness.

3. Conclusion and Recommendations

The UNFSS process and the Kampala CAADP Agenda are best understood as complementary rather than competing frameworks. Both aim to advance agrifood systems transformation by linking food security to nutrition, resilience, sustainability, inclusion, and governance, yet they operate through different institutional logics. UNFSS has provided global visibility, coalition-building, and participatory momentum, while CAADP Kampala offers an African-owned framework for domestication, integrated investment planning, monitoring, and mutual accountability. The Africa Common Position on Food Systems helped bridge these two processes by translating the broader food systems agenda into a continental African policy framework, which the CAADP Strategy and Action Plan (2026-2035) then anchored through implementation and accountability mechanisms.

The central policy challenge, therefore, is not whether the two agendas should coexist, but how they should be aligned. When similar goals are pursued through parallel coordination structures, reporting systems, and planning instruments, governance costs rise, and delivery weakens. By contrast, deliberate convergence can reduce duplication, strengthen national ownership, improve financing coherence, and enhance implementation. This is consistent with the Kampala CAADP Strategy and Action Plan's emphasis on integrated agrifood systems transformation, domestication into national policies and budget frameworks, inclusive coordination, and stronger evidence and accountability systems.

A practical convergence model for Africa should assign distinct yet complementary roles to each process. UNFSS is most useful as a platform for agenda-setting, participation, and global linkage. CAADP Kampala is best positioned to serve as the institutional backbone for country-owned planning, implementation, review, and accountability. Its alignment with the Africa Common Position on Food Systems, its shift from an agriculture-led to an agrifood systems approach, and its reliance on national and regional agrifood investment plans make it the most appropriate anchor for operational convergence. A designated national coordinator, with clear reporting lines to relevant Ministries and based on the unique structure of each country, should report on CAADP progress and the alignment with other regional, continental, and global policy processes, including the UNFSS.

Five priorities follow from this analysis. First, governments should use CAADP-aligned national platforms as the institutional home for UNFSS follow-up rather than create separate structures. Second, UNFSS priorities should be embedded in national agricultural and agrifood investment plans rather than maintained as stand-alone commitments. Third, reporting and accountability should, as far as possible, align with existing CAADP instruments, including BRs, JSRs, and related knowledge platforms. Fourth, the participatory gains from UNFSS should be institutionalized within CAADP-linked planning and review cycles. Fifth, the AU and its partners should support interoperable evidence systems and peer-learning mechanisms to help countries translate convergence into practice.

In short, convergence should proceed through institutional nesting, not institutional multiplication. For African governments facing tight fiscal space and rising implementation demands, this is not merely a governance preference; it is a practical prerequisite for more coherent and effective agrifood systems transformation.

References

Candel, J., and R. Biesbroek. 2016. "Toward a Processual Understanding of Policy Integration." *Policy Sciences*, 49(3), 211–231. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-016-9248-y>

Canfield, M. J. Duncan, and P. Claeys. 2021. "Reconfiguring Food Systems Governance: The UNFSS and the Battle over Authority and Legitimacy." *Development*, 64(3–4), 181–191. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41301-021-00312-1>

Jomo, S., V. Mbao, and K.H.D. Tiessen. 2025. "Food Systems Transformation Commitments in Eastern Africa and their Alignment with the UNFSS Action Areas and the Kampala CAADP Declaration." *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2025.1653570>

Kalibata, A. 2022. "Reflections on Food Systems Transformation: An African Perspective." *Global Social Challenges Journal*, 1(1), 138–150. <https://doi.org/10.1332/ooyl3696>

Kraak, V.I. 2021. "Advice for Food Systems Governance Actors on Deciding Whether and How to Engage with the Agri-food and Beverage Industry to Address Malnutrition within the Context of Healthy and Sustainable Food Systems." *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.34172/ijhpm.2021.70>

Nhemachena, C., G. Matchaya, and S. Nhlengethwa. 2017. "Strengthening mutual accountability and performance in agriculture in Southern Africa." *South African Journal of Science*, 113(5/6). <https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2017/20160185>

Oehmke, J.F., S.L. Young, and G. Bahiigwa. 2018. "The Behavioral Economics Basis of Mutual Accountability to Achieve Food Security." *Politics & Policy*, 46(1), 32–57. <https://doi.org/10.1111/polp.12244>

Resnick, D., X. Diao, and G. Tadesse (Eds). 2020. *Sustaining Africa's Agrifood System Transformation: The Role of Public Policies*. ReSAKSS 2020 Annual Trends and Outlook Report. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI); Kigali: AKADEMIYA2063. <https://doi.org/10.2499/9780896293946>

Ulimwengu, J.M., E.M. Kwofie, and J. Collins. 2023. *African Food Systems Transformation and the Post-Malabo Agenda*. ReSAKSS 2023 Annual Trends & Outlook Report (ATOR). Kigali: AKADEMIYA2063; Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). <https://doi.org/10.54067/9781737916482>

ABOUT AKADEMIYA2063

AKADEMIYA2063 is a pan-African non-profit research organization with headquarters in Kigali, Rwanda, and a regional office in Dakar, Senegal. Inspired by the ambitions of Agenda 2063 and grounded in the recognition of the central importance of strong knowledge and evidence systems, the vision of AKADEMIYA2063 is an Africa with the expertise we need for the Africa we want. This expertise must be responsive to the continent's needs for data and analysis to ensure high-quality policy design and execution. Inclusive, evidence-informed policymaking is key to meeting the continent's development aspirations, creating wealth, and changing livelihoods for the better. AKADEMIYA2063's overall mission is to create, across Africa and led from its headquarters in Rwanda, state-of-the-art technical capacities to support the efforts of the Member States of the African Union to achieve the key goals of the African Union's Agenda 2063: transforming national economies to boost growth and prosperity. Following from its vision and mission, the main goal of AKADEMIYA2063 is to help meet Africa's needs at the continental, regional, and national levels in terms of data, analytics, and mutual learning for the effective implementation of Agenda 2063 and the realization of its outcomes by a critical mass of countries. AKADEMIYA2063 strives to meet its goals through programs organized into five strategic areas—policy intelligence, knowledge systems, data intelligence and governance—as well as partnerships, and communication and outreach activities. For more information, visit www.akademiya2063.org.

Building Resilient and Sustainable Agrifood Systems in Africa



AKADEMIYA2063 is supported by the African Development Bank (AfDB), the Gates Foundation, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) through the German Corporation for International Cooperation (GIZ), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), and the Mastercard Foundation. The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the partners.

GET IN TOUCH

AKADEMIYA2063 HEADQUARTERS

Kicukiro/Niboye KK 341 St 22 | P.O. Box 1855
Kigali-Rwanda

☎ +250 788 318 315

✉ kigali-contact@akademiya2063.org

AKADEMIYA2063 REGIONAL OFFICE

Lot N*3 Almadies | P.O. Box 24 933
Dakar-Senegal

☎ +221 338 652 881

✉ dakar-contact@akademiya2063.org

🌐 www.akademiya2063.org

For inquiries on this publication, contact communications@akademiya2063.org.

    @AKADEMIYA2063