

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK GROUP



“SAY NO TO FAMINE” REVISED VERSION FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT

PREPARED BY: SNVP/RDVP/AHVP/AHAI/PGCL

May 2017

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Results Management Framework | iv |
| I. INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE | 1 |
| 1.1 Background on the Current Situation | 1 |
| 1.2 Rationale and Scope of the Bank’s Response | 3 |
| 1.3 Lessons Learned from Similar Bank Interventions | 4 |
| II. “SAY NO TO FAMINE” DESCRIPTION | 6 |
| 2.1 Overview of the Response..... | 6 |
| 2.2 Target Area and Population..... | 7 |
| 2.3 Components - “Say No to Famine” | 7 |
| 2.4 Type of Response | 11 |
| 2.5 Costs, Financing Arrangements and Resource Mobilization | 12 |
| 2.6 Catalyzing External Donor Resources - ‘Alliance to End Famine’ | 13 |
| 2.7 Key Performance Indicators | 14 |
| III. FEASIBILITY OF THE RESPONSE | 15 |
| 3.1 Economic and Financial Performance..... | 15 |
| 3.2 Environmental and Social impacts | 16 |
| IV. IMPLEMENTATION..... | 16 |
| 4.1 Implementation Arrangements and Procurement..... | 16 |
| 4.2 Monitoring and Evaluation Arrangements | 18 |
| 4.3 Governance..... | 19 |
| 4.4 Sustainability | 20 |
| 4.5 Potential Risks and Mitigation Measures | 20 |
| 4.6 Knowledge Building..... | 21 |
| V. LEGAL INSTRUMENTS AND AUTHORITY | 21 |
| VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 22 |
| ANNEXES: | |
| Annex I: Tables of Internal Resource Mobilization (Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan and Uganda) | |
| Annex II: Details Internal Resource Mobilization (Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, South Sudan and Uganda) | |
| Annex III: Details Internal Resource Mobilization (Nigeria) | |
| Annex IV: Environmental Vulnerability, Drought and Fragility Assessment | |
| Annex V: Humanitarian Agencies as Implementing Partners | |

Annex VI: Lists of Potential Private Sector Companies to be approached for Awareness and Fundraising Campaign

Annex VII: Drought Resilience and Sustainable Livelihoods Program in the Horn of Africa

Annex VIII: Map of Bean Production and Flows (Uganda, South Sudan and Kenya)

Annex IX: Map of Sorghum Production and Flows (Uganda and South Sudan)

Annex X: Map of Maize Production and Flows (Uganda, South Sudan and Kenya)

Currency Equivalents

As of May2017

1 UA = USD 1.35389

1 UA = EURO 1.27762

Weights and Measures

1 metric tonne = 2204 pounds (lbs)

1 kilogram (kg) = 2.200 lbs

1 meter (m) = 3.28 feet (ft)

1 millimeter (mm) = 0.03937 inch (“)

1 kilometer (km) = 0.62 mile

1 hectare (ha) = 2.471 acres

Acronyms and Abbreviations

| | |
|--------|---|
| ACFA | Accelerate Co-Financing For Africa |
| ARC | African Risk Capacity |
| ASAL | Arid and Semi-Arid Lands |
| ATASP | Agricultural Transformation Agenda Support Program |
| AVCP | Africa Venture Capital Project |
| AWF | African Water Facility |
| CAADP | Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Program |
| CDSF | ClimDev Special Fund |
| CTF | Clean Technology Fund |
| DFID | Department For International Development |
| DRSLP | Drought Resilience Sustainable Livelihood Support Program |
| ENABLE | Empowering Novel Agribusiness Led Employment |
| FAO | Food and Agricultural Organization |
| FPMA | Food Price Monitoring and Analysis |
| GCF | Green Climate Fund |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| GSMA | Global System Mobile Association |
| HNWI | High Net Worth Individuals |
| HOA | Horn Of Africa |
| ICT | Information and Communication Technologies |
| IDP | Internally Displaced Persons |
| IGAD | Intergovernmental Authority on Development |
| IPP | Independent Power Producer |
| JICA | Japan International Cooperation Agency |
| KFW | German Development Bank |
| MOU | Memorandum Of Understanding |
| NEWS | Nutrition Early Warning System |
| NSO | Non-Sovereign Operations |
| PCR | Project Completion Report |
| PPCR | Pilot Program for Climate Resilience |
| RMC | Regional Member Countries |
| SDRS | Sovereign Disaster Risk Solutions |
| SRF | Special Relief Fund |
| TSF | Transition Support Facility |
| UA | Units of Account |
| UNHCR | United Nations High Commission for Refugees |
| UNICEF | United Nations International Children's Fund |
| WFP | World Food Program |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Somalia and South Sudan are in urgent need of assistance with more than half of the population of Somalia (6.2 million people) and more than 40% of the population of South Sudan (5.5 million people) facing starvation. Other areas such as northeastern and coastal Kenya, northern Uganda, south-east Ethiopia are also affected by the ongoing drought and in parts are still recovering from El Nino induced drought of 2015/16. In the North East of Nigeria, more than 5.8 million people face extreme food and nutrition deficits. The situation is rapidly deteriorating and the number of people in need of livelihood and humanitarian emergency assistance is likely to increase as the dry and lean season continues, with significant negative impact on human health, local livelihoods and household assets (essentially livestock) as well as on the food security and nutrition of affected rural communities.
2. The response to the crisis in the Horn of Africa (Ethiopia, Somalia and South Sudan), Kenya, Uganda and Nigeria – branded “Say No to Famine” is the Bank’s commitment towards a coordinated response to its Regional Members Countries that have been severely affected by prolonged drought periods and unstable food production systems, leading to the increased exposure of vulnerable populations to chronic hunger and malnutrition. Coupled with weak institutions and governance systems and protracted conflicts, this humanitarian crisis exposes the relative fragility of these countries.
3. In line with the High 5 Priorities of the Bank, the ultimate goal of the proposed response is to promote regional integration to ensure that food surpluses in one region can balance food deficits in another by strengthening links between the production, distribution and consumption hubs of the food systems in the affected regions, leading to increased system-wide efficiency. The objective of the coordinated response is to decrease exposure of vulnerable populations to chronic hunger and malnutrition and enhance the resilience of households, communities and agro-systems to human-induced and natural shocks. The response will promote gender equality and strive to meet the needs of different groups of the population.
4. “Say No to Famine” creates the framework from which operations will be prepared to address the identified short, medium and long term interventions needed to cover the following broad areas: (i) Immediately, address humanitarian needs specifically for South Sudan and Somalia, especially in terms of food assistance and logistical support to get food from food surplus to food deficit areas; (ii) In the medium term, build sustainable and resilient food systems that facilitate access to economically viable and nutritious food products for the affected populations and build resilience against cyclical food security challenges and drought; and (iii) Longer term, support to relevant Government institutions in setting up an enabling environment for commodity value chain development with embedded climate resilience actions, gender empowerment and engagement of the private sector. The framework focuses on immediate crisis response in the six highly affected countries mentioned above but is intended to be scaled up continent-wide later on to end the cyclical famines on the African continent, once and for all.
5. The Bank will use its convening power to launch the Alliance to End Famine in Africa. The Alliance will partner with humanitarian agencies, UN, development partners, corporate bodies, philanthropic organizations, and public figures to collectively work on “Say No to Famine”. Internal resources to be committed include the utilization of savings from recently completed operations, reconfiguring low disbursing operations and head rooms created to add new operations. “Say No to Famine” would provide support to drought affected countries in the short, medium and long term with a total estimated value **UA 838.77 million (approximately USD 1.14 billion)**.

Results Management Framework

NAME OF RESPONSE: **SAY NO TO FAMINE” - BANK RESPONSE TO THE HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN SOMALIA AND SOUTH SUDAN AND MEDIUM TO LONG TERM INTERVENTIONS FOR ETHIOPIA, KENYA, NIGERIA, SOMALIA, SOUTH SUDAN AND UGANDA**

ULTIMATE OBJECTIVE: TO PROMOTE REGIONAL INTEGRATION TO ENSURE THAT FOOD SURPLUSES IN ONE REGION CAN BALANCE FOOD DEFICITS IN ANOTHER BY STRENGTHENING LINKS BETWEEN THE PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION AND CONSUMPTION HUBS OF THE FOOD SYSTEMS IN THE AFFECTED REGIONS, LEADING TO INCREASED SYSTEM-WIDE EFFICIENCY

| RESULTS CHAIN | PERFORMANCE INDICATORS | | | MEANS OF VERIFICATION | RISKS/MITIGATION MEASURES | |
|---------------|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| | Indicator | Baseline | Target | | | |
| IMPACT | Reverse the cycle of chronic famine, as measured by exposure of vulnerable populations to chronic hunger and malnutrition and vulnerability to human-induced and natural shocks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population defined as food insecure by WFP (and those classified at immediate risk) | <p><i>20.7 million presently food insecure; a further 7.3 million at immediate risk (28 million total)</i></p> | <p><i>Eliminate systemic famine across the Horn of Africa by 2025</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vulnerability maps Food Security Reports Famine Early Warning Surveillance | <p>Risk: Political and Security: state failure, increased insecurity, and the reversal of the current political and security gains. Measure: Continued dialogue with AMISOM, the UN and other relevant institutions to scale up resources to address the underlying causes, drivers, and dynamics of conflict in Somalia; and concentrate interventions in regions that are secure and being flexible to move operations according to changes in security.</p> |
| | Immediate equitable and safe access to food delivery through resource mobilization and emergency funding to help alleviate humanitarian food crisis (dropping food and water) SOMALIA AND SOUTH SUDAN | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food security index in targeted areas in South Sudan and Somalia (# of food insecure; gender disaggregated) Number and percentage of vulnerable women, girls, men, and boys provided with life-saving assistance in humanitarian and disaster situations | <p><i>South Sudan 4.9 million food insecure Somalia: 2.9 million food insecure</i></p> | <p><i>Humanitarian assistance to reach 375 000 persons in Somalia and South Sudan</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vulnerability maps Food Security Reports Famine Early Warning Surveillance Regular reviews are undertaken of women’s and children’s protection needs during the humanitarian response | |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| | Enhanced resilience in target countries supported by increased agricultural productivity in production hubs for supplying food to the region in the medium term ETHIOPIA, KENYA, NIGERIA UGANDA, SOMALIA AND SOUTH SUDAN | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased productivity and capacity to produce in the target countries Implementation capacity to carry out contingency plans for climate and social related disasters, shocks and stressors | • N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food production increased Nutrition Surveillance Systems Sovereign Risk Disaster Solutions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food security and Nutrition Monitoring Surveys ICT Traffic from Mobile Service Providers E-Registration Returns ARC reports | <p>Risk: Capacity: institutional and human capacity weaknesses for response implementation Measure: Bank will work with third-party implementing partners who are already providing humanitarian support on the ground.</p> <p>Risk: Fiduciary: weak PFM and public procurement systems, misappropriation of funds, no formal financial institutions Measure: Procurement of goods and works and the acquisition of consulting services, financed by the Bank for the project, will be carried out in accordance with the “Procurement Policy for Bank Group Funded Operations”, dated October 2015 and following the provisions stated in the Financing Agreement.</p> |
| | Long-term-term solutions being implemented with an on-the-ground partner mix to tackle hunger and end famine in the Horn of Africa and neighbouring drought affected countries under the Say No to Famine Initiative | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No of new programs and projects developed with contingency planning and response to drought and famine in vulnerable countries (gender sensitive). No of cross border protocols established to increase movement of food and agricultural inputs (seeds, fertilizer) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IGAD-DRSLP program (Horn of Africa), Small Irrigation Value Chain (Uganda) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value Chain Development Programs for Increased Incomes Climate Resilient Development Programs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emergency aid bulletins Food price analysis and monitoring bulletins | |
| | Establishing Alliance for Ending Famine in Africa – Development partners, private sector collectively working to achieve a unified response to famine | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount mobilised through the Alliance for outreach Agreement with corporates and development partners Network of Africa’s High Net Worth Individuals (HNWIs) and celebrities established Evidence that policy and regulatory frameworks require the equal participation of women and girls in disaster preparedness and response | • N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> USD 200 million mobilised At least 3 joint agreements and 50 joint venture with corporates At least two outreach events for HNWIs in the immediate term and 3 in the medium term | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishment agreements for coordination Unit Media and Outreach reports of events by the Alliance for Ending Famine in Africa | |
| OUTPUT | Food and emergency supplies delivered by partners to reach people, including vulnerable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume in tons of emergency supplies reaching populations at risk | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11.7 million persons food insecure in | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 375 000 beneficiaries in Somalia and South Sudan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Execution reports of Partner Agencies Bank supervision reports | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| women and children needing humanitarian assistance and at risk of starvation from famine | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of beneficiaries reached with emergency food relief (of which women) Number and percentage of women and men whose livelihood is restored following a humanitarian disaster | <i>South Sudan and Somalia</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 50% of the 375 000 are women beneficiaries | | <p>Risk: Resource mobilisation: lack of adequate resources to deliver proposed response components. Measure: This response will be a high priority for the Bank and every effort will be made to mobilise the resources.</p> <p>Risk of gender gap: Women play important roles in fetching water and firewood, food security, livestock and household nutrition but are disadvantaged in terms of access to resources, participation in community decision-making processes. Mitigation: continued community sensitization, and targeted interventions that will address women.</p> |
| Production hubs to access fertilizer and seeds through E-Wallet schemes in ETHIOPIA, KENYA, NIGERIA UGANDA, SOMALIA AND SOUTH SUDAN | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No of registered farmers accessing seed and fertilizer during recovery from drought and in the long term reconstruction (gender balanced) No of functional E-Wallet platforms | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TBD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least half of the number of farmers to be determined registered in the short term and 100% to be reached in the long-term (50% women farmers) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Execution reports of Partner Agencies | |
| Increased food supplies available through commodity aggregation and food reserves in distribution hubs of producer countries ETHIOPIA, KENYA, NIGERIA, UGANDA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of registered farmers selling produce to food reserve hubs Number of businesses and relief agencies procuring from food distribution hubs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 30 % of registered farmers and businesses registered and transacting through food hubs (disaggregated by sex, and tend to reduce the gap in the % of registered women farmers) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bank supervision reports Execution reports of Partner Agencies | |
| Nutrition Surveillance System established | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No of communities with established Nutrition Surveillance Systems | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1,000 communities in the Nutrition Surveillance System | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bank supervision reports Execution reports of Partner Agencies | |

| | | | | | | |
|------------|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| | Premiums paid by RMCs for Disaster Risk Solutions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No of countries paying premium to the Africa Risk Capacity (ARC) facility | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>One country (KENYA)</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15 countries in the Horn of Africa and the Sahel regions that are vulnerable to drought paying the Disaster Risk Insurance Premiums | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ARC reports, Country Contingency Plans | |
| ACTIVITIES | COMPONENTS | | | | INPUTS | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Component 1: Humanitarian Appeal and Coordination of Global Response to Famine (SOUTH SUDAN and SOMALIA)</u> <p>Short term Emergency Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the consumption hubs, define and identify the target groups (gender disaggregated data), those that are affected and those that are at risk of famine Channel funding to humanitarian partners for food distribution to the target group of Already Affected People at the Risk of Famine/Starvation Provide rapid support to improve the distribution systems to stabilize delivery for food Build awareness on diverse diets and nutrition, targeting women. | | | | <p>Breakdown:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instruments: AFDB GRANT/LOANs (new money. Immediate assistance in grant and TSF (ADF 14) resources – see Annex I <p><u>Other Sources</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crowd-sourcing and mobilised resources Mobilized funding sources: private sector, philanthropic institutions and public figures. | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Component 2: Response for Delivery of Food and Increased Agricultural Productivity (ETHIOPIA, KENYA, NIGERIA, UGANDA, SOUTH SUDAN AND SOMALIA)</u> <p>Medium term food system interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Register farmers (gender focus) on an ICT platform to enable efficient distribution of agro inputs through mobile money, Register agents/vendors onto the platform. Provide seeds and inputs in the production hubs through the E-Wallet, E-registrations. Enhance extension and capacity building to targeted farmers (50% women farmers) for improving productivity Build commodity aggregation Hubs, warehouses and reserves Development of a Nutrition Surveillance System (NSS) Build capacity of countries to access climate risk insurance through Sovereign Disaster Risk Instruments in anticipation and early response to future famines and food insecurity - Africa Risk Capacity (ARC) | | | | <p>Breakdown per country, see Annex I</p> <p>Savings from ongoing Projects</p> <p><u>Other Sources</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crowd-sourcing and mobilised resources Mobilized funding sources: private sector, philanthropic institutions and public figures. | |

•Component 3: Sustainable Approaches to tackle Hunger and end Famine in Horn of Africa and neighbouring drought affected countries in line with Say No to Famine

•Long-term sustainability of climate resilient, nutrition sensitive value chain development programs

- Building value chain development projects promoting Food Security and Climate Resilience (**to be complemented by conflict prevention and resolution and activities to strengthen governance and gender equality**)
- Launch the Alliance for Ending Famine in Africa. The Alliance will partner with humanitarian, UN, development partners, corporates, philanthropic organizations, and public figures to collectively work to “Say No to Famine”. Initial focus on six countries listed, targeted roll-out continent-wide to end cyclical famines in Africa once and for all

Breakdown:

Instruments: AFDB GRANT/ LOANs (new Say No to Famine projects) Internal AFDB Resource Mobilization

TOTAL INTERNAL RESOURCES:

UA 838.77 million (approximately USD 1.14 billion) - see Annex I

I. INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

1.1 Background on the Current Situation

1.1.1. The Response to the Humanitarian Crisis¹ – in the Horn of Africa (Ethiopia, Somalia and South Sudan, Kenya, Uganda) and Nigeria – Branded “*Say No to Famine*” is the Bank’s response towards a coordinated support and assistance to Regional Members Countries (RMCs) for which the UN has launched an international appeal for support. These RMCs are severely affected by prolonged drought periods and unstable food production systems, leading to the increased exposure of vulnerable populations to chronic hunger and malnutrition. Coupled with weak institutions and governance systems, and protracted conflicts, humanitarian crisis exposes the relative fragility and vulnerability of these countries. The proposed response and the selection of the countries is based on recent assessments and reports by humanitarian agencies and development partners such as USAID, UN-OCHA, FAO, WFP, CIAT and others. “Say No to Famine” is to contribute to the effort to avert a looming food crisis that could potentially lead to famine and consequentially widespread fatalities, beginning with the most vulnerable - women and children².

1.1.2. The magnitude and severity of food insecurity resulting from extended droughts have reached unprecedented levels this year, i.e. the driest year on record over the past 60 years. The world faces the largest humanitarian crisis since the end of the Second World War with more than 20 million people requiring humanitarian assistance. Areas of immediate concern cover much of Somalia and South Sudan where reported casualties are highest. Other areas such as north-eastern and coastal Kenya, northern Uganda, south-east Ethiopia as well as the Afar region are also affected by the ongoing drought and in parts are still recovering from El Nino induced drought of 2015/16. In North East Nigeria particularly in Borno State and parts of Adamawa and Yobe States the Boko Haram insurgency further exacerbated the famine situation with communities in the recently liberated areas unable to farm for the last 3 years. Somalia and South Sudan are in urgent need of assistance with more than half of the population of Somalia (6.2 million)³ and more than 40% of the population of South Sudan (5.5 million)⁴ facing starvation.

1.1.3. As a result of prolonged drought and conflict, a large proportion of the population in the affected countries is in need of food assistance, as families face limited access to food and income, together with low cereal and seed stocks, and low milk and meat production. Repeated episodes of drought have led to consecutive failed harvests, animal and crop disease outbreaks, deteriorating water and pasture conditions and livestock deaths, contributing to chronic food insecurity. The situation is rapidly deteriorating and the number of people in need of livelihood and humanitarian emergency assistance is likely to increase as the dry and lean season continues, with significant negative impact on human health, local livelihoods and household assets (essentially livestock) as well as on the food security and nutrition of affected rural communities. In general, there is little ability of food systems to respond and recover rapidly from the effects of shocks and stressors.

1.1.4. When local scale shocks (droughts / floods, etc.) or stressors (conflict, local insecurity, seasonal road inaccessibility, etc.) occur, vulnerable populations are hit hardest. While those events

¹ The official definition of famine:

- At least 20 percent of households in a given group face extreme food deficits, with no ability to cope;
- At least 30 percent of children in a given group are acutely malnourished, meaning that their weight is dangerously low compared to their height; and
- Mortality rates exceed two people per 10,000 populations per day. For comparison, a no crisis rate in contemporary sub-Saharan Africa would be about 0.3.

² Report on Horn of Africa: A Call for Action, February 2017- UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.

³ 2.9 million in Somalia are severely food and nutrition insecure and require urgent humanitarian assistance, while another 3.3 million need support to avert crisis. (WFP, March 2017)

⁴ 4.9 million in South Sudan people estimated to be food insecure and a further 600,000 at immediate risk (WFP, February 2017)

affect to various degrees all the different actors involved in local/regional food supply chains (food producers, retailers, transporters, etc.), women, youth and smallholder farmers are highly vulnerable to extreme poverty. These prevent some of them from operating efficiently, resulting in physical and economic disruptions of the food supply operations, leading to food shortage, food losses, and or price volatility in both rural and urban areas, with consequences both in terms of hunger and malnutrition. The severe crises in Somalia and South Sudan is further aggravated by the ongoing conflicts, which has caused a particularly heavy burden on pastoralists in the region.

1.1.5. In the entire region, the ongoing drought has restricted harvests, devastated livestock and pushed the prices of cereals and other basic foods to unusually high levels. Local prices of maize, sorghum and other cereals are near or at record levels in certain areas of Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, South Sudan, Uganda and Tanzania, according to the latest Food Price Monitoring and Analysis Bulletin (FPMA) released in February 2017. In some particular cases, it is not a question of food availability; but rather of access and/or affordability of food mainly due to poverty. Local market traders have food for sale, but at exorbitant prices. The prices of livestock have also dropped by at least 40% because of poor conditions and death due to lack of feed and water.

1.1.6. Nine (9) out of every ten South Sudanese refugees arriving in neighboring countries are either women or children. Uganda hosts a huge refugee caseload of over 1 million refugees living in 12 settlement sites around the country. In some host communities, the number of refugees has exceeded the number of inhabitants and this is causing further food insecurity in already impoverished households. Women and girls face a severe crisis as they struggle to cope with sexual violence and exploitation, severe trauma, high rates of maternal death and other risks to their health and well-being and in north-east Nigeria, about 1.75 million are women and girls of childbearing age who need sexual and reproductive health services.

1.1.7. Some countries are banning food export to offset domestic food insecurity. Due to war-related destruction, poor infrastructure and lack of investment in the agriculture sector, South Sudan and Somali are now net importers of food. They currently import as much as 50% of their needs from neighboring countries, particularly Ethiopia, Uganda and Kenya. However, in 2016, Tanzania imposed export restrictions after a poor harvest, and Uganda may follow suit as the number of food insecure people has recently quadrupled. Many countries in southern Africa have banned exportation since they are also recovering from a recent drought crisis. Closed borders have significant implications for regionally held stocks that could be used to respond to the food shortage as large volumes of humanitarian and commercially purchased food will need to be transported through limited port facilities in the Horn of Africa and into remote areas, which could become a key constraint.

1.1.8. The “Say No to Famine” is the Bank’s Framework towards a coordinated response to its Regional Members Countries in instances of humanitarian crises as a result of natural catastrophe (mainly drought and floods) leading to unstable food production systems and increased exposure of vulnerable populations to chronic hunger and malnutrition. The selection of countries eligible for assistance within the Framework will be based on the criteria that will be developed by the Bank in collaboration with UN Agencies based on evidence based assessment of the severity and magnitude of the crisis in a given geographical areas.

1.1.9 The “Say No To Famine” Framework is an AfDB initiated, broad-based partnership of the leading stakeholders to end famine across the African continent once and for all. As such, the following rationale for interventions and principles for country eligibility and selection apply:

Rationale for future interventions under the Framework:

- I. Directly aligned with and mutually reinforces the implementation of AfDB's Feed Africa Strategy as well as the other related Bank Strategies and Policies;
- II. Follows a multi-pronged regional response to an anticipated or ongoing humanitarian crisis that comes with negative spill-over effects across borders (for example large number of refugees crossing from one country to another);
- III. Applies what has worked best to prevent and counter famines to improve the Quality of Lives of Africans.

Country eligibility and selection:

- I. Based on the assessment of a credible and internationally recognized source, e.g. but not limited to the UN or the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC)⁵, of the existing food insecurity and funding gap for the African countries affected;
- II. Cognizant to address the various interconnected reasons that can lead to famines (severe and prolonged drought; lacking local capacity for drought response; security and conflict exacerbating the situation for the poorest; weak governance among others);
- III. The Say No To Famine framework plans to begin, consolidate and coordinate the drought response initially in the six stipulated AfDB regional member countries (RMCs);
- IV. Is open to all AfDB RMCs and
- V. Based on a country's intention and explicit government request to join the Say No To Famine framework to work towards eliminating famines through building resilience on African soil

1.2 Rationale and Scope of the Bank's Response

1.2.1. As part of its mandate, the Bank would support its RMCs in this dire situation. Despite Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda and Nigeria having had relative political stability and economic growth, the famine could jeopardize all the gains achieved in recent years and plunge the affected countries into political and economic turmoil with serious consequences on the food systems across the entire region. A pre-famine alert has been issued for Somalia and an immediate and at scale humanitarian response is urgently required. Nigeria's north-east region is experiencing severe poverty, underdevelopment dominated by subsistence farming and minimal agricultural development.⁶ Hundreds of thousands of children under the age of five years suffer from severe acute malnutrition, with 20% dying according to UNICEF.

1.2.2. Conflict, instability, and food insecurity have contributed to Horn of African countries having one of the highest levels of displacement on the continent. The region had over 2 million refugees and more than 5 million internally displaced people (IDPs), in 2014⁷. The socioeconomic impacts of displacement and forced migration due to conflicts, drought, and environmental pressures are particularly significant. Refugees and displaced populations pose significant pressure on weak local and national institutions and place significant strains on national and local governments and host communities. In addition, displaced and refugee populations are frequently the most deprived, vulnerable, and excluded with the attendant costs on human and social capital, economic growth, and poverty reduction. Addressing the challenges of food insecurity is therefore critical in addressing the more complex challenge of induced migrations and displacements, and reducing intercommunal conflict over scarce resources such as water holes and pasture for animals.

⁵ UN: <https://www.un.org/press/en/2017/sc12748.doc.htm> and http://interactive.unocha.org/emergency/2017_famine/ & Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC): <http://www.ipcinfo.org/ipcinfo-about/en/>.

⁶ Around 1.8 million people are internally displaced and in the hot weather, some mothers feed water their babies below age six months which has increased malnutrition especially in areas where water purity is low. The estimated number of affected children is now 450,000 with some 14 million people estimated to require full humanitarian assistance across the region.

⁷ UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), Eastern Africa: Displaced Populations (as at 31 March 2014), 11 June 2014, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/53a005664.html> [accessed 25 March 2015]

1.2.3. “Gender inequalities that have been deepened by the crisis. Women are particularly affected by the famine as the malnutrition rates increased among pregnant and lactating women (PLW): in South Sudan for example, 1 out of 4 pregnant and lactating women (PLW) are malnourished. Women are often the first to reduce their food intake even when they are pregnant or breastfeeding because of the cultural norm. Women and girls in drought stricken parts are making increasingly long journeys to fetch water for drinking, cooking and washing and they run the risk of sexual violence along the way. As a result of the drought women and girls face a triple burden in some cases: to survive, care for their families and evade sexual violence in the process.

1.2.4. Recurrent episodes of acute food insecurity can be addressed by increased production to feed areas where there is shortage of food supply. In some countries like South Sudan, there is a huge but largely unrealized agricultural potential. More than 70 percent of its total land area is suitable for crop production but less than four percent of the total land area is currently cultivated. Kenya, Ethiopia, Uganda, Nigeria are agricultural countries that have surplus areas, ‘production hubs’ for critical staple and food commodities. (See Annex VIII, IX and X) Famines result when food is available but some groups cannot access it. “Say No to Famine” would reach populations already affected by famine or at risk, increase the supply of food across the region from countries (or regions within a country such as Kenya, Nigeria or Uganda) that have significant production capacities and excess food can supply to drought prone countries (or regions) where there is acute food shortage. The South Sudan example also highlights the urgent need for the step-up of efforts to enhance the security situation on the ground in order to allow the country to exploit its agricultural potential.

1.2.5. “Say No to Famine” is a framework for short, medium and long term development interventions with a total estimated value of UA 838.77 million (approximately USD 1.14 billion). It is a framework from which specific/individual projects will be prepared to cater for identified short, medium and long term interventions. With an estimated USD 1 billion acute funding gap that is expected to widen to over USD 4 billion by summer 2017, the African Development Bank’s convening power, potential to pool internal and external resources as well as the institution’s ability to facilitate a tapping of thus far un-deployed resources is needed more than ever. It is important to reiterate that the Bank will maximize the utilization of its internally available resources while complementing ongoing resource mobilization campaigns through a very strong focus on additionality.

1.3 Lessons Learned from Similar Bank Interventions

1.3.1. The proposed response has benefited from the lessons learnt from previous Bank emergency response interventions, including the 2008 Africa Food Crisis Response, 2011 Drought in the Horn of Africa Intervention and the 2014 response to the Ebola Outbreak. Over the years, the Bank has also responded to flood and drought crises across the continent through the Special Relief Fund. Some of the pertinent lessons for the design and implementation of the proposed current response include the following:

- **Rapid mobilization of Human and Financial Resources:** Large-scale, long-duration incidents demand more resources – personnel, equipment, supplies, commodities, specialized capabilities – than any agency or government can keep on hand, so these resources must be obtained rapidly when a disaster occurs. Prompt access to funding and a timely response to early warnings by partner agencies is critical. In the case of Ebola, the Bank was one of the first MDBs and development partners to provide support to Ebola affected countries resulting in the rapid containment of the Ebola outbreak.
- **Multi-Partner Engagement and Coordination:** Multi-partner engagement and coordination is key for an effective, efficient and comprehensive large-scale emergency response. These incidents also involve a multitude of development agencies, each of which

must direct its own resources. As a result, agency- and/or function-specific command structures proliferate. During the Ebola crisis, the interface between agencies and donor governments was clearly delineated and when governments took charge of the response, there was a rapid turnaround of the epidemic.

- **Gender-sensitive approach:** Failing to address gender, humanitarian responses risk inadvertently making the situation of those affected by crises even worse by increasing Gender-based violence, excluding women from life-saving services and decision-making processes. Therefore, it is essential in ensuring that the differentiated needs of men, women, boys and girls are effectively met. A number of studies have shown that when a humanitarian response enhances women in food systems, there are both immediate and long-term benefits in terms of nutrition.
- **Building Community Resilience:** Community resilience was vital in containing the Ebola Epidemic. This was achieved by building community trust of the public health system including recruiting the support and oversight by local formal and informal community leaders.
- **Information Sharing between Government and Civil Society:** Building and holding public trust by the government and health personnel is the foundation for all Ebola control efforts. This was achieved through very intensive communication with the public where epidemic status reports were issued through press statements on a daily basis. It has proven crucial to maintain close coordination and mutual information sharing with involved governments on the resources applied.
- **Access to Affected Areas and Communications:** Timely access to areas and populations in need is key for ensuring rapid response and containment of the crisis. This can be achieved through acceptance of donor interventions by all communities. Systems of command, control, and coordination are predicated on being able to communicate. Partners need to have the willingness to agree to a shared system, a commitment to operate using this system, and the discipline to use it correctly.

1.3.2. The response builds on the Drought Resilience Sustainable Livelihood Support Programme (DRSLP) (see Annex VII for the projects under DRSLP), which aims at addressing the underlying causes of vulnerability in drought-prone areas, with particular emphasis on pastoralists and agro-pastoralists to promote disaster risk reduction, ecosystem rehabilitation and sustainable livelihood base transformational and developmental practices. DRSLP was to ensure that the necessary infrastructure to reduce and minimize the recurrent drought in the region are in place. Implementation of the DRSLP has faced initial start-up delays due to various factors⁸. However, the physical implementation has now started in most of the countries in earnest and will be accelerated. One of the key lessons from the DRSLP include the need to enhance the capacity and the role of IGAD for overall coordination of the program while countries should hasten the country specific implementation arrangements. The Bank is launching in close collaboration with the IGAD Secretariat and the concerned countries, a Mid-Term Review of the DRSLP to revisit the projects' components and implementations modalities and put in place urgent and concrete measures to accelerate its implementation particularly in Somalia and Ethiopia.

⁸ Factors including the limited capacity of the member countries and IGAD as implementation agencies, the institutional changes in Kenya following the implementation of the devolved government system, the US-imposed sanctions which did not permit transfer of funds to some countries

II. “SAY NO TO FAMINE” DESCRIPTION

2.1 Overview of the Response

2.1.1 **Based on current trends, the likelihood of famine is expected to increase in the coming months if the April-to-June rains are below average⁹.** The response is part of a concerted effort with Governments and other development partners to make drought related famine a thing of the past. Countries that focus on investing in their agricultural sectors decrease their vulnerability during times of volatility and crisis. Investment strategies include alleviating/improving transportation networks, distribution, and value chain bottlenecks, promoting sound market-based principles for agricultural sector development and regional trade, encouraging private investment, and undertaking appropriate public investments and use of new agricultural technologies. To address the roots causes of the present crisis, the proposed response would i) address immediate humanitarian needs, especially in terms of food assistance and logistical support to get food from where it is available to where it is needed; ii) strengthen production hubs with agro input supplies for increased agricultural productivity and distribution; and iii) support relevant Government institutions to set up sustainable food systems, early warning systems and systemic resilience to offset climate related disasters in the future.

2.1.2 **The development objectives of the “Say No to Famine” response are to strengthen links between the production, distribution and consumption hubs of the food systems in the affected regions, leading to increased system-wide efficiency.** The interventions will be in three major parts of the food system: consumption hubs where food is required; key production hubs, where food is produced; and critical distribution hubs that connect food supply to consumers. In areas of emergency and famine, food assistance will be provided. Actors in production hubs will be provided access to production inputs, which will increase food production and focus on supplying nutritious food. The actors in the distribution hubs will improve the distribution efficiency of food from the production hubs to the consumption hubs. The medium to long-term response would support the improvement of market signals and incentives to boost resilience in the food systems across the region.

2.1.3 **The Bank’s response is part of a wider effort by Government, development partners and private sector actors, i.e. the ‘Alliance to End Famine’.** Cognizant of the fact that the Bank is limited in terms of its competencies dealing with relief operations and humanitarian assistance, the response is to be coordinated with numerous development partners’ and Governments’ efforts on ground. The Bank will team up with humanitarian agencies, development partners and non-governmental organizations (local and international), including UN-OCHA, WFP, FAO, UNHCR, UNICEF, CIAT, CARE International, Oxfam, Red Cross Societies, Save the Children, and World Vision, amongst others to implement the humanitarian segment of the support. By fostering synergies among the Bank, DFIs and relief agencies, greater and immediate impact will be achieved. An ‘Alliance to End Famine’ is a platform to be built on partnerships with Government, development partners and private sector actors. Alongside internal mechanisms for resource mobilization, the Bank will widen its reach to external donors for emergency aid sourcing.

2.1.4 **The Framework document has been prepared by a Bank-wide Working Group reinforced by broad consultations within the Bank.** The proposed response is based on assessments by humanitarian agencies such as UN-OCHA, WFP, UN agencies such as FAO, research agencies such as CIAT, and other nationally based humanitarian agencies. The Report builds on the expertise of all the departments in the Bank building on the lessons that it learnt on coordination for previous Emergency responses. In addition, it has been informed by the Report of the High Level Panel, “Investing in Africa’s Future”, within the framework of promoting agriculture infrastructure including water resources management, increasing

⁹ USAID Horn of Africa- Complex Emergency Fact Sheet #1, February 3, 2017.

smallholder farmers' productivity with a greater linkage to private sector investments, and working with partners.

2.2 Target Area and Population

2.2.1. “Say No to Famine” will target the most severely affected countries in the Horn of Africa (Somalia and South Sudan) and other drought stricken areas of Kenya, Ethiopia, Nigeria and Uganda. In terms of population, an estimated number of more than half of the population of Somalia (6.2 million) and more than 40% of the population of South Sudan (5.5 million) is severely food and nutrition insecure and require urgent humanitarian assistance or need support to avert crisis. The population affected in North-Eastern and Coastal Kenya, Northern Uganda, South-East Ethiopia is close to 4 million, for North East of Nigeria, more than 5.8 million people face extreme food and nutrition deficits. As the situation continues to deteriorate and the number of Internally Displaced Families grows, there is a possibility that more people will enter into the vulnerability bracket with dire need for humanitarian emergency assistance and sustenance of livelihoods.

2.2.2. For the short-term responses, there are two distinct target groups: (i) people who are already affected by the current emergency. For those in the first group, i.e. those already affected by starvation, support for food assistance would be targeted only to those areas where markets are not accessible and food cannot be procured. The focus will be on women, children and the elderly, who urgently need immediate food assistance to address malnutrition.

2.2.3. For the medium term response, the response would target people that are at risk of being affected as well as smallholder farmers in production hubs with a specific focus on women and youth. The target would be Internally Displaced Families. Smallholder farmers located in identified production zones, who have access to land and a source of water to enable them produce and sell their produce. In such cases, priority would be given to youth and women-headed households. For the growing number of refugees to neighbouring countries, target beneficiaries will be selected among the Host Families. “Say No to Famine” will empower women by making them the key beneficiaries and improve access to food by households, particularly the children.

2.3 Components - “Say No to Famine”

2.3.1. The Bank’s Short Term Emergency Response

Short term Response. In the consumption hubs, the first activity would be to clearly define and identify the target group between those that are already affected and those that are at the risk of being affected. For those people already affected, resources would be channeled for food distribution as they are at imminent risk of famine/starvation.

2.3.1.1 Food Distribution targeted to already affected people at the risk of famine/starvation. Food distribution would be directed to Somalia South Sudan and North-East Nigeria. Separate requests for Emergency Relief Assistance from the Special Relief Fund for both countries valued at 1 million USD each have recently been approved by the Board. Additional SRF resources might be accessed, subject to availability and according to SRF guidelines. The governments of South Sudan and Somalia would have to submit requests to the Bank for Emergency Relief Assistance prior to preparation and administration of the assistance. In the long term, post-crisis, providing food distribution will not strengthen the food system and may even weaken the local economy. Hence, food distribution will be targeted specifically to people who are already at imminent risk of famine/starvation. The activities of “Say No to Famine” will prioritize women and children’s safe and secure access to aid as well as their registration for food ration. In this

regard, priority will be given to female-headed families, pregnant and breastfeeding mothers, families with under 10 year old children and provide higher quantities to polygamous households.

2.3.1.2 Awareness Building on Diverse Diets and Nutrition. Based on a situational understanding of who is affected by food insecurity, the severity and magnitude of the problem, the causes of the food insecurity, community vulnerability to adverse shocks and trends, risk of future food insecurity, and current programs and humanitarian actions in the target populations; the response would develop and disseminate nutrition education and promotion communication targeted at influencing behavior and focused on improving the adoption of diverse diets. Complementary diet and nutrition training would be provided to households, specifically targeting women. The response would include baseline and nutrition surveillance to monitor progress.

2.3.2. The Medium to Long Term Response: Investments for Sustainable Food Systems

Medium term productivity and distribution interventions: Provide support to improve production and distribution systems to stabilize food production and food systems. For the medium term, a focus will need to be on interventions that have direct impact on addressing cyclical drought, including building early response systems in anticipation of to future shocks and stresses.

2.3.2.1. Registration of Farmers within the production hubs. Activities will support efforts of mobilizing and registering farmers (women and men) within the production hubs, each according to the country context. In addition, farmers will also be supported to form organizations or agri-business platforms. There is a need to e-register the farmers as they re-establish their farms and smallholdings, in order that they begin to support themselves again. The necessary types of agro inputs can be determined from the farming data captured during registration. Activities will generate and regularly update the electronic database of producers.

2.3.2.2 Strengthen farm inputs access through E-wallet. Following digital registration of women and men farmers, farmers would be supported access to nutrient-rich food varieties, other improved farm inputs through the e-wallet system. Activities will also support establishment of a viable inputs distribution systems of the target commodities and ensure equitable access to both genders. This will involve development and updating of an input production and supply plan for the various agricultural products with clear understanding of the demand (seasonal and annual) relative to the target areas for production. Activities will also entail supporting public and private sector partnerships to generate certified and quality declared inputs, seed multiplication farm/groups for sustainable supply of premium inputs to other farmers would be established. Inputs (fertilizers, drought resistant varieties of crops,, improved livestock breeds, herbicides) would be provided in collaboration with private input dealers to increase production and productivity Agro-dealer input networks would be strengthened improve their connection to farmers, suppliers and financial services.

2.3.2.3 Capacity building and Extension for enhanced productivity. The Bank would provide capacity building trainings for the farmers in the use of best agronomic practices, application of agro- inputs and farmer group development (trust building and strengthening). Targeted producers would be identified and enlisted, specifically women and youth, for building and increasing their production capacity. Youth entrepreneurs (mechanization and spray-teams) would be trained to establish haulage business in connection with land preparation and agro-chemical spraying.

2.3.2.4 Logistics, Postharvest Commodity Aggregation and Reserve in Distribution Hubs. It is apparent that governments do not have the budget to operate their strategic reserves, nor does it have the capacity to manage the stock under strict collateral management principles. In many cases, the logistics

infrastructure is simply not available. In the Aggregation and Distribution Hubs, activities would support farmers and other value chain intermediaries to improve post-harvest handling, processing and storage. To offset the high loss (up to 16% of total cereals produced in East Africa) due to poor postharvest storage practices, high moisture content leading to growth of molds and toxins etc. and grain drying and bagging and best practice storage solutions would be promoted. Activities would support commodity aggregation systems and logistics, strengthen linkages between producers, distributors and consumers.¹⁰

2.3.2.5 Nutrition Surveillance System (NSS). Support would be provided for a country-level nutrition dashboard that tracks progress towards achieving nutrition goals, supported by a NSS for the entire region. The NSS will map the malnutrition hotspots using a comprehensive food security, vulnerability, gender, markets and nutrition assessment. An early warning system and nutrition dashboards will use big data analysis tools to mine current and/or generate new contextual information for nutrition risk analysis, with the dual objective to monitor the nutritional status of populations at risks and guide the decision processes for both financial and policy responses.

2.3.2.6 Sovereign Disaster Risk Instruments and early response to future famines and food insecurity (Africa Risk Capacity). A comprehensive financing package to support the African Risk Capacity (ARC), addressing the central issue of unavailability of insurance for natural disaster would be prepared. ARC is a specialised treaty based agency of the African Union (AU) that provides Sovereign Disaster Risk Solutions (SDRS) to its Member States through a risk management and resilience-building platform to manage natural disaster risk and adapt to climate change. ARC brings together four critical elements for African governments and their partners: (i) Early Warning; (ii) Contingency Planning; (iii) Climate Risk Insurance; (iv) Climate Adaptation Finance. This comprehensive approach provides governments with access to immediate funds for early and planned responses to assist vulnerable populations in the event of weather shocks and addressing risks in a timely manner. The drought response will be complemented through government and bank initiatives to facilitate the build-up of climate resilient economies by:

- i) Stimulating insurance premium payment by providing the required financing to the RMCs during an initial period, allowing the countries to build internal financial capacity for national ownership of climate finance.
- ii) Supporting the ARC Agency to enable it to carry out its activities consisting of building climate responses and accompanying the execution of contingency plan in RMCs.
- iii) Supporting RMCs in the establishment of National Climate Funds, designed to collect sources of funds and direct them toward climate change activities.

2.3.3. Building Long-term Resilient and Sustainable Food Systems in line with the Bank's High 5s, particularly the Feed Africa Strategy.

Building long-term sustainability and resilience of food systems: Transition from crisis management to a food system, which is resilient, efficient and sustainable.

¹⁰ Nigeria has over 1.5 Million MT of modern storage facilities, which have been operated at below 0.25% over the past 10 years. Most of these facilities are increasingly wearing out due to lack of use and maintenance. While the assets in Nigeria are currently being privatized, this process has remained inconclusive since the past four years. Similarly, Kenya has over 1.8 Million MT in storage capacity under the National Cereals and Produce Board which is also highly underutilized. There have been several moves to unbundle NCPB into a regulator and an operator, then privatize the operator but this also has not seen the light of the day.

2.3.3.1 Value Chain Development for Increased Incomes. In order to address the identified challenges and develop the value chains in the ASALs in the medium and long-term, comprehensive programs would be developed applying all the Enablers identified under the Say No to Famine Framework. The primary goal of programs would be to help achieve food and nutrition security, enhance drought resilience and improve sustainable livelihoods of all people in a sustainable manner through value chain development. In order to accelerate value chain development in food insecure contexts, the Bank's structural approach includes understanding opportunities and challenges of in primary production, primary and secondary processing. Especially important is the provision of water for both human and animal use, development of adequate infrastructure and services for value chain development, specifically of the livestock value chain, by improving productivity and providing market opportunities including for small livestock owned by women. Moving from pastoralism to value chain animal production will invariably lead to the exit of the livestock sector by some, as a necessity. Future programs should envisage off-farm employment opportunities for those leaving the sector.

2.3.3.2 Climate Resilience Development. Through ClimDev Special Fund (CDSF), climate-resilient development programs that mainstream climate change information at all levels in Africa will be prepared; and institutional capacities of national and sub regional bodies to formulate and implement effective climate-sensitive policies will be enhanced through: (i) Generation, wide dissemination and use of reliable and high quality climate information for development in Africa; (ii) Capacity enhancement of policy makers and policy support institutions through the generation of quality analysis and evidence on climate change and its implications for Africa, for use in development planning and actions; and (iii) Implementation of pilot adaptation practices that demonstrate the value of mainstreaming climate information in development planning and practices.

2.3.3.3 Increasing private sector investment into agriculture and transforming the sector from subsistence into business-oriented operations, is enshrined in the vision of the Bank's new Say No to Famine Framework. The Bank's approach under the High 5s is to scale up private sector interventions in the agriculture space, through (i) crowding in and leveraging large corporates with strong technical and financial capacity; (ii) equity investment anchors; (iii) strategic partnership with large commodity traders; (iv) risk mitigation including through the Affirmative Finance Action for Women in Africa (AFAWA); and (v) scaling up the establishment of Warehouse Receipt Financing and Agricultural Commodity Exchanges. A compendium of companies in priority value chains being put together will provide a full picture of existing private sector investment that the Bank can support to become successful under Say No to Famine and by doing so encourage new investments. This will be particularly relevant to support private sector interventions that seek to develop skills while promoting greater economic inclusion and resilience in the rural communities especially among youth and women.

2.3.3.4 Risk Sharing Facilities to unlock commercial lending for agriculture. The Bank will create new financial instruments to unlock the economic potential in agriculture, lessen the risks of lending to agriculture, and develop new and more appropriate public and private sector financial products, which can in turn mobilize much needed private sector financing. Some of these instruments includes, the establishment of a risk sharing facility that guarantees loans to the agriculture sector, supporting deepening and broadening of agricultural insurance markets, etc. The Uganda Agriculture Value Chain Programme is an example of a project with a risk sharing facility to support the deployment of different risk sharing instruments to promote lending to difference segments of value chains.

2.3.4. Capacity Building and Policy Advice for Agricultural Governance and Trade: Building and strengthening national systems' capacity for providing the required public goods necessary for sustainable agriculture development. The role of Ministries of Agriculture Development should increasingly be focused on providing the necessary public goods as a prerequisite for sustainable

agricultural development, to provide the right policy environment and facilitate the private sector. To achieve sustained and broad-based agriculture and economic development, these challenges/constraints must be addressed. The Bank will support RMCs, especially the Ministries of Agriculture to improve national policy and regulatory environment on the following:

- Strengthen the Ministries capacity to design appropriate policies, capacity for project design and implementation, monitoring and evaluation capacity;
- Strengthen national institutions to provide up-to-date extension services and information on location-specific appropriate sustainable intensification technologies;
- Strengthen Agricultural Training Units in the respective ministries with related requisite tools which can undertake needs assessment to reinforce capacity building at decentralised levels in the RMCs, increased capacity for statistical data base management and improved monitoring and evaluation of agriculture support at the community level, as well as developing and managing Early Warning Systems especially for climate change mitigation and adaptation as well as natural disasters;
- Strengthen the ministries capacity to develop and implement gender sensitive strategies addressing women's gender-specific challenges and vulnerabilities in agriculture.

2.3.5. The Alliance to End Famine in Africa – Strengthening Partnerships and Coordination

2.3.5.1 AFDB is the leading development financier and trusted partner of choice for its RMCs. AFDB shows its commitment to the affected member countries by taking decisive actions and through leading resource mobilization efforts. At the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016, the AfDB, jointly with other multilateral development banks and humanitarian partners, agreed on a new way of working together in view of the record numbers of people requiring life-saving assistance and funding drastically short of meeting those needs. Forging key alliances with like-minded development partners, such as the World Bank, EU, DFID, KFW, ARC and the United Nations (e.g. FAO, UNHCR and World Food Program), will help meet the goal to end famine. This is also an opportunity for the Bank to liaise with non-traditional donors with a development mandate such as the Abu Dhabi Fund for Development and other foundations.

2.3.5.2 The Alliance to End Famine in Africa would be the platform to deliver systemic, scalable and impactful solutions to eliminate famine and food insecurity, prioritizing countries and regions that are most vulnerable. The magnitude of the situation calls for scaled up action and coordination at national and regional levels. This will entail coordination in terms of collaborating with the humanitarian agencies to extend their outreach and channeling resources to them. Through its country offices, the Bank will design comprehensive and multidimensional relationship-based coordination plans with humanitarian agencies, UN Agencies and non-governmental organizations; CGIAR centres like CIAT and NIGOs Oxfam, Save the Children, WFP, UNHCR, World Vision and UNICEF, regional institutions, for example. This will bolster the Bank's capacity to support immediate impacts and to adapt to changing circumstances. The Alliance to End Famine will be a part of aid coordination efforts at the country level and actively cooperate with global coordination initiatives by connecting with multi-lateral, bi-lateral and non-traditional development partners working on the continent.

2.4 Type of Response

2.4.1. The “Say No to Famine” response is a framework that combines regional, multinational, multilateral and country level-instruments relief assistance for the short term; and grants and loans for the medium and long term interventions. The execution of the Framework will be through a number

projects executed through various humanitarian agencies **with** which the Bank already has Memoranda of Understanding or a cooperation framework, including but not limited to WFP and UNHCR.

2.4.2. Short-term interventions to respond to the crisis is central to the Bank’s leadership. This would be achieved through (i) utilization of savings from recently completed operations and restructuring of ongoing operations - all sectors and (ii) utilizing the Transition Support Facility to receive the mobilized resources.

2.4.3. The medium term interventions around boosting production capacity will be carried out through mainstreaming these activities in the ongoing agricultural projects in the portfolio. Slow disbursing operations -all sectors - part of the resources to be reconfigured and planned project activities in agriculture and water projects specifically to drought and famine response interventions would be carried out. In Kenya, the implementation of the Small Scale Irrigation and Value Chain project will be accelerated to boost agriculture productivity and food security mainly in in the drought prone Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASAL). In Uganda, the highest recipient of the South Sudan refugees, the Bank will seek to boost agriculture production by fast tracking the implementation of the Farm Income Enhancement and Forest Conservation Project, the Markets and Agriculture Trade Improvement Program, the Community Agricultural Infrastructure Improvement Program and the Uganda- Lakes Edward & Albert Integrated Fisheries & Water Resources Management Project. This will ensure not only national self-sufficiency but will also cater for the neighboring countries in the region as well as the refugees.

2.4.4. For the longer term, the Bank is fast tracking a number of new projects in Kenya, Uganda and Somalia to include a climate response. These include a number of projects related to the “Say No to Famine” initiative, namely the Kocholia Irrigation Development and Watershed Management Project (Kenya), the ENABLE Youth Kenya, the Irrigated Green Zone (Kenya), the Thwake Multipurpose Dam – Phase II (Kenya), the Agricultural Value Chain Development Programme (Uganda), and proposed water projects in Somalia¹¹. For these projects, new head-rooms created to add new operations for quick processing - including operations being designed – e.g. Uganda AVCP under processing and Kenya ENABLE Youth to be fast tracked.

2.4.5. Making financing available for the short-term interventions to respond to the crisis is central to the Bank’s leadership. This would be achieved through (i) utilization of savings from recently completed or ongoing operations - all sectors and (ii) utilizing the Transition Support Facility to receive the mobilized resources.

2.5 Costs, Financing Arrangements and Resource Mobilization

2.5.1. Costs of Immediate Response: The cost of the immediate response including food basket, food vouchers, distribution, Cost of Registration, Map production hubs & flows and design and piloting of nutrition education & promotion for improved diets, sensitization of Gender Based Violence and Gender activities, provision of feed for livestock for Female Headed-Households is based on the resource envelopes available (see Annex I and II).

2.5.2. Costs of Medium Term Response: The cost of the medium term response to the ongoing programs including the purchase of high quality seed and inputs including linking farmers to agro-dealers and private sector, organization of farmers for mass production along agri-business platforms and upscale good agricultural technologies & practices through agriculture extension using agents, ICT and media, Aggregation and Distribution Centre support, premiums for Disaster Risk Solutions, Programming

¹¹ For example: Rehab. Kismayo and Baidoa Water Supply - Phase I; Rehab. Dolow, Garowe and Qardo Water Supply - Phase II; Rehab. Jowhar Off-Stream Water Storage - Phase I; Rehab. Jowhar Off-Stream Water Storage - Phase II; Repair Afgoye well-fields and water pipeline to Mogadishu.

& validation, implementation, monitoring of Nutrition Surveillance System and ICT hardware for of nutrition early warning system as well as Livestock Packages for Women is based on the resource envelopes available (see Annex I and II).

2.5.3. Mobilizing Internal Bank Resources: For the response framework, the Bank envisions to make available more than USD 1.1 billion in terms of funding from a restructuring of its existing lending portfolio from internal resources and from ADF-14 resources (see Annex I). Funds would be made available through the following possible actions:

- i) Utilizing the Transition Support Facility (TSF) to receive the mobilized resources
- ii) Savings from recently completed or ongoing operations - all sectors (in consultation with the respective countries)
- iii) Slow disbursing on-gong operations -all sectors - part of the resources to be reconfigured (no cancellations envisaged). The bulk of the Say No to Famine resources will come from this source, but with consent from the respective countries.
- iv) Re-committing planned project activities in agriculture and water projects specifically to drought and famine response interventions
- v) New head-rooms created to add new operations for accelerated processing - including operations being designed – e.g. Uganda AVCP (under processing) and Kenya ENABLE Youth to be fast tracked for early implementation.
- vi) Utilization of AFD-14 Regional Envelope resources for Somalia and South Sudan for qualifying regional operations.

It is important to note, however, that ADF 14 resources targeted for Bank interventions in this framework document will only be utilized only upon the effectiveness of ADF 14 (coming into force) and upon identification and preparation of individual project proposals for approval by the Bank Board.

2.5.4. Somalia Infrastructure Fund. Following the establishment of the AfDB Multi-partner Somalia Infrastructure Fund (SIF), commitments have been received from DFID (GBP 1.5m), the Islamic Development Bank (USD 10m), and Italy (EUR 1.5m). In order to mobilize additional resources for the Fund and important projects related to building longer-term resilience, a resource mobilization strategy has been agreed upon by relevant Bank departments comprising RDGE, RDTS, FIRM, PGCL and FIFC. The Bank intends to work closely with the Authorities to implement this strategy. This will include holding meetings with donor representatives in Nairobi and Mogadishu, targeted approaches to headquarters of potential donors and other funds (e.g. Abu Dhabi Fund for Development), and a series of presentations at key meetings during the course of 2017, which will culminate in a Somalia Infrastructure Pledging Event.

2.6 Catalyzing External Donor Resources - ‘Alliance to End Famine’

2.6.1 The Alliance would build and leverage on strategic partnerships with corporate philanthropic organizations. The Bank’s recent participation in the Global Philanthropic Forum in Morocco late last year is a testament to the new approach to diversify and expand resource mobilization efforts. This approach has seeded relationships with over three dozen charitable foundations to which further discussions can be held around contributing to the Bank’s wider efforts to ensure food security, sustainability and resilience going forward. Rockefeller Foundation, Equity Bank Foundation and several others have already expressed interest in supporting the Bank’s Say No to Famine Framework, and at least

10 technical cooperation funds and co-financing vehicles such as the African Water Facility (AWF) and the Agriculture Fast Track fund count agriculture or water in their top priorities. This creates scope for collaboration within the context of the Bank's Feed Africa Strategy, especially in the medium to long term intervention.

2.6.2 The 'Alliance to End Famine in Africa' would coordinate and promote the efforts of other actors who can more swiftly and efficiently raise, receive, accept, and disburse funding. The Bank will take a multi-pronged, innovative approach to mobilize additional resources non-conventional sources through private sector clients that have resources complementing the normal channels of emergency aid funding. This proved a success during the Ebola crisis where business leaders convened to discuss the critical role private sector could play in their commitment to solutions during a time of crisis by drawing on their knowledge for the creation of medium and long-term solutions.¹² In the short-term, the AfDB can collaborate with private sector entities to raise financial contributions or in-kind donations of goods and services. Service industries, hotels, airlines, leading financial institutions, mobile phone operators, telecoms, etc. can all contribute to the effort. (See Potential private sector collaborators are listed in Annex VI)

2.6.3 The "Say No to Famine" campaign will require distinctive approaches to leveraging resources in order to reach the 1 billion humanitarian relief target. One example is to replicate and scale existing initiatives such as the loose change collection program of UNICEF that has been a successful crowdfunding vehicle for over 30 years.¹³ Google, Facebook, twitter, LinkedIn, Amazon, Baidu, Alipay etc. with 'easy to donate links' on their platforms via special accounts opened by World Food Program/selected Implementing Agency (agreements need to be reached with IAs to ascertain that they have sufficient capacity to deliver with the additional funding and agreements have to be reached regarding their own overheads, i.e. renunciation of typical admin charges to maximize impact on the ground). Resources will need to be pooled by means of crowdsourcing, creating on-line pledging platforms, mobile donations and leveraging commercial and private financial pledges. It is vital to seek as many channels of support as possible and transform humanitarian aid into long-term development assistance.

2.6.4 Africa's High Net Worth Individuals (HNWIs) and celebrities. The Bank could look towards doing joint TV ads and preparing other promotional material to raise awareness in various media for immediate impact and public giving. In addition to the celebrities listed above, there is also a role for African champions who are political actors.

2.7 Key Performance Indicators

2.7.1 The response's performance indicators are outlined in the Results Management Framework at three levels: Impact, Outcome and Output.

- *Impact indicators* relate to the magnitude of vulnerability to drought and famine in Somalia and South Sudan and those populations who are food insecure and needing additional nutritional supplementation. Food security reports from the WFP Famine early warning surveillance indicate the population and livestock most at risk to drought. Additionally hotspot analysis from vulnerability mapping will help relief partners to target the most

¹² For example, Cargill donated 10,000 metric tons of rice valued at USD \$ 5 million and cash contribution of USD \$100,000 to CARE and the World Food Programme (WFP) for Horn of Africa hunger relief. Citi Foundation committed USD \$100,000 to support WFP and the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) and has established a donation site for Citi employees and partners to contribute to WFP. The Coca-Cola Foundation donated USD \$1.4 million (Ksh. 134 million) to the Red Cross societies in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia to provide food, water, sanitation, and healthcare services assistance.¹² The Bank can use its convening power to match and catalyze additional impact dollars from such foundations.

¹³ See: <https://www.unicefusa.org/supporters/organizations/companies/american-airlines/change-good>

severely affected human and animal populations with assistance. The key indicators with baselines are :

- Food security index in targeted areas¹⁴
 - Populations at immediate risk of food insecurity (WFP)¹⁵
 - Number of malnourished children below the age of five¹⁶
 - Number of pregnant and lactating women¹⁷
- *Outcome indicators* are to measure increased productivity capacity particularly in food surplus regions of Kenya, Ethiopia and Uganda should benefit from the roll out of the E-Wallet platform as an indicator of the uptake of food and commodity trading in production hubs. Key performance indicators include :
- Increased productivity and capacity to produce in the target countries
 - Implementation capacity to carry out contingency plans for climate and social related disasters, shocks and stressors
 - No of new programs and projects developed with contingency planning and response to drought and famine in vulnerable countries (gender sensitive).
 - No of cross border protocols established to increase movement of food and agricultural inputs (seeds, fertilizer)
 - Amount mobilised through the Alliance for outreach
- *Output indicators*: see RMF for complete list
- Volume in tons of emergency supplies reaching populations at risk
 - No. of beneficiaries reached with emergency food relief (of which women
 - Number and percentage of women and men whose livelihood is restored following a humanitarian disaster

III. FEASIBILITY OF THE RESPONSE

3.1 Economic and Financial Performance

3.1.1 It is anticipated that the Bank's intervention will result into positive economic and financial impacts on the affected countries and region as whole. It is, however, difficult to quantify the specific impacts, however, overall the dire humanitarian crisis will be averted and a conducive environment for economic development and growth will be created. The medium term and long-term interventions will have

¹⁴ Food security index in targeted areas (Somalia: 2.9 million, South Sudan: 4.9 million, Nigeria 4.7 million, Kenya: 2.6 million, Ethiopia: 5.6 million - Total: 20.7 million)

¹⁵ Populations at immediate risk of food insecurity (Somalia: 3.3 million, South Sudan: 2.6 million, Nigeria: 700,000, Uganda: 700,000 -Total: 7.3 million)

¹⁶ Number of malnourished children below the age of five (From 363,000 to below 10,000 in Somalia, From 276,000 to below 10,000 in South Sudan)

¹⁷ Number of pregnant and lactating women (PLW) (South Sudan, 1 out of 4 PLW are malnourished and in Ethiopia nearly 1.8 million. In South Sudan, 62.5% cases treated for malnutrition are girls.

more impact on the economies of the affected countries, particularly in terms of arresting the fall in the GDP growth rate, which could fall below the 3% threshold projected for Sub-Saharan Africa. Some of the drought-affected countries are among the fastest growing in Africa, with Ethiopia leading the group with a GDP growth rate of 7.3% in 2016 and Kenya 6.4%.

3.1.2 Agricultural performance coupled with the improvement of infrastructure has a strong influence on economic growth, levels of employment, demand for other goods, food security, and overall poverty reduction in the drought stricken countries. The agricultural potential in most of the affected countries has yet to be fully exploited; with vast amounts of arable land that are not yet under cultivation. Pastoralist communities and the livestock on which they rely—despite their significant contributions to national economies and to the maintenance of ecosystems—remain socially, economically, and marginalized.

3.2 Environmental and Social impacts

3.2.1. The component involving “Response to the Humanitarian crisis in Somalia and South Sudan” can be categorized as a Category 3 operation which will not require prior environmental and social safeguards due diligence prior to approval.

3.2.2. The components involving “Medium to Long term Feed Africa Strategies for Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria and Uganda” can be categorized as Category 2 based on two broad sub-divisions (a) Medium term activities will be incorporated into ongoing programs and projects with contingency planning and response to drought and famine in vulnerable countries (gender sensitive) and (b) Long term activities will be incorporated into new programmes and projects involving “Long-term sustainability of climate resilient, nutrition sensitive value chain development programs” and “building value chain development projects promoting Food Security and Climate Resilience”. New programs developed will be subjected to Strategic Environment and Social Assessment (SESA) to better understand their environmental and social implications along the Value Chain Development Programs and evaluate the potential environmental and social implications of the strategies that the Bank will pursue under these two initiatives. At this stage, it is not clear when the “Long term Feed Africa Strategies for Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria and Uganda” will commence to enable such a SESA to be conducted as part of the component support.

3.2.3. In view of the above, the component under (3.2.1) above can proceed without further need for environmental and social safeguards due diligence. A SESA is a condition precedent for the implementation of new programs.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Implementation Arrangements and Procurement

4.1.1 Implementation Modalities for Short Term Response: The Bank Country Offices with the support of an on the ground research partner like CIAT (International Center for Tropical Agriculture) can provide support on nutrition awareness and nutrition surveillance systems, provide support to AFDB projects on which value chain commodities are required, their production hubs, volumes, and how the value chain best delivers food to the consumption hubs. Mapping of both internal and external commodity value chains will provide the needed signals to inform consumption and production.

4.1.1.1 Food Distribution to Already Affected People at the Risk of Famine/Starvation. The activities under short-term response will be implemented by UN Organizations, development and relief-based institutions, the private sector, NGOs and civil society. A list of potential humanitarian agencies and NGOs can be found in Annex V. The delivery of these activities will be as flexible as possible, especially with the

new (streamlined) Bank procurement procedures. UN Organizations and NGOs on the ground will receive mobilized funds directly from the Bank and will be responsible for overall coordination and management (monitoring and supervision) of food distribution. The local Country Offices would ensure the quality of the implementation; prepare the inception, midterm and final financial and technical reports of the project activities. The Bank would carry out intermittent supervision jointly.

4.1.1.2 Awareness Building on Diverse Diets and Nutrition. Implementation would focus on enhancing access to and utilization of diverse, safe and nutritious foods in the crisis areas.¹⁸ Nutrition education actions will focus on providing information through appropriate communications strategies such as information campaigns and dietary advice in health service settings; improving nutrition skills that enable consumers to act on the information provided; and ensuring an enabling food environment by influencing production diversity, use of micronutrient sprinkles, and proper linkages between production hubs and consumption hubs.

4.1.2 Implementation Modalities for Medium term food system interventions

4.1.2.1 Registration of Farmers within the production hubs. The same method of registration platform used for registering the target groups in the consumption hubs can be used for the registration of farmers in the production hubs for both genders. The registration process should include information about their occupation, in order to identify farmers. This would be in addition to demographic information (for example, name, age, sex, position in household, number of members of household, town/word/area of residence, etc.). Ideally, some of the registrars would be recruited from amongst the target population, enabling them to gain new skills. The activities as part of the response will as much as possible ensure an equal representation of women and men among them.

4.1.2.2 Strengthen access to inputs through E-wallet. E-wallet transfers vary according to country contexts and may build on already existing platforms. Android tablets are the best option as they can be operated off grid entirely (beyond the reach of mobile phone networks and power supplies). The registration data is gathered from the registrar's tablets, and carried to an area where there is some form of network coverage. At this point, the data is uploaded to a cloud-based server, where it is duplicated and stored. The data remains on the tablet until the tablet receives confirmation that it has been received at the server, and the tablet will periodically re-send the data until it receives that confirmation. The server will then match all of the registration records against criteria, and generate funds transmission messages aimed at beneficiaries who qualify. The beneficiary would be issued with a special card that would enable him access or receive the information. At regular intervals, a reconciliation process would be carried out, using the built-in reporting functions, and reimbursement payments can be made to the participating market vendors. This could be in cash or via direct bank or mobile money transfer.4.1.2.3 The Bank can register market traders to accept the funds the beneficiaries have received to expedite the drought response. These traders need a mobile phone and the appropriate app to accept payments. All the beneficiary needs to do is to tap their card to the vendor's mobile phone to pay. This can happen off-grid. Each farmer would have presents his/her card and redeems his/her vouchers. Details of redemptions are then forwarded to the server, as before, and a subsequent reporting and reconciliation process results in the agro-dealers being reimbursed.

4.1.2.3 Capacity building and Extension. Training on improved agricultural practices will be provided to producers who will be identified by staff at state and local government levels in collaboration with implementing agencies. On the ground, organizations can promote robust extension models using local agents, media, and ICT to improve access to nutrient-rich crop varieties, other improved farm inputs, agronomic practices, mechanization, irrigation and climate services in the production hubs. Implementation

¹⁸ Regional organizations, like the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) already have experience.

will also include participatory training to mainstream climate smart agriculture, enhancing the resilience of farmers (women and men).

4.1.2.4 Postharvest Commodity Aggregation and Reserve in Distribution Hubs. Implementation includes public private partnership agreements on food storage and creating access to markets for farmers, operations of National storage facilities for safe keep of strategic food stock, training and capacity building of these entities. Private sector could manage storage facilities and aggregation systems to preserve excess stock and make available for regional sales to balance food supply in deficit countries. Efforts can be made with private sector companies to support storage (for inputs and outputs), aggregation and processing for grain etc., so that it can become a distribution point over time.

4.1.2.5 African Risk Capacity (ARC). Implementation will be carried by the African Risk Capacity's two entities: 1) ARC Agency for technical assistance to countries in 4 main areas: (i) understanding of weather index based transfer products; (ii) computing analysis of risk exposure; (iii) assessment of the associated insurance premiums and expected applicable pay-outs; and (iv) preparation of contingency plans, 2) ARC Insurance Company Limited (ARC Ltd) that issues parametric weather insurance policies to governments operating on mutual insurance principles. In normal circumstances, ARC assists its Member States to develop contingency plans that would be implemented to assist households affected by a disaster. ARC's expertise will be leveraged to assist AFDB assess the robustness of a response plan submitted by the identified stakeholders around some key activities aiming at helping farming and pastoral households to survive and recover from the prevailing situation.

4.1.2.6 Nutrition Surveillance System (NSS): A NSS will be set up in the different countries to provide data for the analysis of the food and nutrition situation on a continuous basis. Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) would be used to collect key information in near-real time on nutrition and markets will be linked to big data analysis tools and machine learning algorithms that provide targeted early warning information on nutrition risk analysis and market distribution. Regional Organisations like CIAT, already have these skills.

4.1.3 Procurement Arrangements: Procurement of goods and works and the acquisition of consulting services, financed by the Bank for the projects emanating from this Framework, will be carried out in accordance with the "*Procurement Policy for Bank Group Funded Operations*", dated October 2015 and following the provisions stated in the Financing Agreement. Three procurement systems comprising of Procurement Methods and Procedures (PMPs) may be used for the different transactions under the project and, each category of procurement (Goods, Works, Non-Consulting Services, and Consulting Services) for projects financed by the Bank under this framework. These are: (i) Borrower's Procurement Systems (BPS) procurement methods and procedures; (ii) the Bank's PMPs; or (iii) third party PMPs. Considering that specific projects and activities are yet to be defined, project procurement risk assessments will be undertaken for the specific projects and the output will inform the decisions on the procurement regimes (BPS, Bank or Third party) and the PMPs to be used for specific transactions or groups of similar transactions under the project on a case by case basis.

4.2 Monitoring and Evaluation Arrangements

4.2.1. The Results Management Framework will constitute the basis for monitoring of the results of the response on the ground. The primary responsibility for M&E will be our implementing partners that provide us with quarterly reports on the humanitarian assistance efforts that have been supported. High priority will be placed on data disaggregation by age, sex and diversity to ensure that protection and assistance activities respond to the different concerns and risks of women and men of all ages and background. For the medium to longer-term, the respective project teams with support from relevant Country Offices and the Agriculture and Agribusiness Department would undertake reporting on

implementation and progress. The Nutrition Surveillance Systems will report progress on nutritional status in the affected communities over the long run.

4.2.2. Immediate efforts will be monitored in addition to the results. “Say No to Famine” would collate M&E findings through the following reports:

- An inception report will be prepared by the implementing partners, including baseline nutrition status, detailed lists of food and inputs to be purchased and a detailed work plan, as well as a plan of distribution with timing of activities and selection of beneficiaries.
- All implementing partners will provide quarterly updates and regular situation reports, which would be collated.
- A mid-term progress report on the short term humanitarian assistance with contributions from partners will be consolidated and presented by the AFDB Country Offices. This progress report will provide information on the quality and quantity of food items and agricultural inputs provided to beneficiaries and the number of food insecure people supported.
- Intermittent supervision would be carried out jointly by AFDB Country Office and Government agencies.
- All reports would be shared among the partners in the Alliance to End Famine in Africa.

4.2.3. Potential problems in implementation will be identified to allow corrective action. Progress reports will be developed on a quarterly basis with Regional and Sector Directors and shared on a regular basis with the Board of Directors.

4.3 Governance

4.3.1. To ensure governance principles in times of disasters are upheld effectively, the Central and Local Governments in the respective countries will be directly involved in the planning and execution of humanitarian assistance supported through the Bank. It is notable that, most African countries espouse decentralized implementation of humanitarian aid, but devolution of authority to lower administrative levels has been limited. Disaster and humanitarian aid mechanisms suffer from similar governance weaknesses as development interventions, particularly in terms of low compliance and enforcement of policies, laws, regulations, standards and codes. With the “Say No to Famine” response, local communities will be informed and involved from the outset the kind of interventions that will be undertaken and what their role will be in the entire exercise.

4.3.2. National Disaster Management Frameworks are coordination mechanism are to coordinate the interests and activities of various stakeholders. In times of disasters, inter-country cooperation and coordination, clear lines of responsibilities within the disaster management system and communications systems for informing stakeholders about potential hazards and for harmonizing their responsibilities are required. The “Say No to Famine” efforts will abide to national disaster frameworks. Development partner efforts would be made to together with senior technical experts and policy and decision makers from relevant ministries dealing with drought mitigation, response, and recovery in Member States to ensure coordinated action that addresses the current drought, as well as, strengthen the building of resilience against climate extremes.

4.4 Sustainability

4.4.1. “Say No to Famine” is a framework for different levels of interventions to address the fundamental challenges that lead to cyclical famine. The response is to build sustainable and resilient food systems, strengthening links between the production, distribution and consumption hubs of the food systems. Particularly through increasing production in areas with agricultural potential and allowing for cross border trade and market linkages, availability of food would not be a challenge and revenue can be generated based on trade within the region.

4.4.2. The ‘Alliance to End Famine’ would be part of a longer-term engagement and dialogue to bring together Government and partners towards ending drought emergencies including Commitment to Sustainable Solutions on drought mitigation and response. This dialogue would build the foundations of longer-term recovery planning, national and cross-border mitigation, response and recovery actions to the current and projected drought situations. This would build on the cross border efforts already being made by the UNDP, IGAD, and Governments¹⁹.

4.4.3. The local governments and communities in will be involved from the outset to ensure general consensus and buy-in on the identified projects. The local communities will be sensitized of and training provided on and the implementation approaches and modalities. By so doing, a sense of ownership will be instilled in the minds of the target group, local governments and civil society, thus increase the chances for the sustainability of the initiatives. The capacity of Local Governments and communities in the affected countries will be enhanced to better manage and cope with future disasters as they build safety nets and desired life skills for disaster management.

4.4.4. Building a growth through building resilience will ensure sustainability of growth. Addressing these sources of vulnerability and building resilience is critical to maintain solid growth rates and sustain the progress made so far in reducing poverty and achieving sustainable development goals. Relative calm and reduced vulnerability also helps to spur Foreign Direct Investments, which have fallen significantly in almost all of the drought affected countries. It is anticipated that investments through the Say No to Famine value chains will spur economic growth and contribute immensely to the GDPs of the affected countries.

4.5 Potential Risks and Mitigation Measures

4.5.1. Violent conflicts do not allow for humanitarian assistance, development partners and NGOs to work in those regions. The current conflict pattern of the region is complex involving several actors within and across the borders. Border porosity and ethnic fluidity makes conflicts spill over from one country to another within the region. There is a risk that the complex conflict pattern will make any intervention difficult to implement.

4.5.2. The implementation of interventions/projects emanating from the Framework, especially in the short term will be confronted with several risks. Risk associated with implementation may include that the response will often occur in situations where public finance management is not at the level desired (e.g. in some of the fragile states such as Somalia). This risk will be mitigated by fiduciary requirements to be carried out by the implementing partner for humanitarian assistance and closer supervision of the control environment and frequent audits to ensure that resources are well spent for the purposes intended.

¹⁹ One such effort includes the Cross-Border Integrated Programme for Sustainable Peace and Socio-Economic Transformation.

4.6 Knowledge Building

4.6.1. The response will facilitate knowledge of improvement and strengthening of Disaster Risk Reduction and Risk Management Systems in the affected countries. Through Africa Risk Capacity (ARC) initiatives, there would be better country level knowledge on (i) Early Warning; (ii) Contingency Planning; (iii) Climate Risk Insurance; and (iv) Climate Adaptation Finance. This knowledge, government staff will enhance their skills for pre-emergency level drought response planning and execution. ARC would use *Africa Risk View*²⁰ software to analyze seasonal rainfall performance and estimate its impact on crop production and ultimately estimate impact on the vulnerable population that is directly dependent on Agriculture.

4.6.2. Country-level nutrition dashboards and a Nutrition Surveillance System (NSS) would provide data on and track progress towards achieving overall nutrition goals. The NSS would provide data for the analysis of the food and nutrition situation on a continuous basis. The goal of the system will be to reinforce collaboration across sectors, contribute to decision making on the response activities, and reinforce the monitoring and evaluation of food and nutrition activities across the region.

4.6.3. Through partnership, Bank will learn from development partners on humanitarian and development assistance to drought areas. The Bank will benefit from coordinating with other development partners and humanitarian agencies, recording good practices for application in future humanitarian interventions. . The best practices will be disseminated within the Bank for application in similar interventions in future.

V. LEGAL INSTRUMENTS AND AUTHORITY

5 Legal instruments –

5.1 For the medium and long term interventions, the Bank will enter into a grant agreement or a loan agreement with the designated Regional Member Country in accordance with applicable policies. The legal instruments to be applied will depend on the type of intervention and the applicable policies. In the short term, where UN Agencies or other implementing agencies are used, the Bank will enter into a tripartite funding and implementation agreement with the Recipient country and the implementing agency. For the medium and long term interventions, the Bank will enter into a grant agreement or a loan agreement with the Regional Member Country (RMC) in accordance with applicable policies. For restructured projects, the Bank may amend existing financing agreements in order to accommodate activities under the Framework.

5.2 Compliance with Bank Policies

- (i) The short term, medium term and long term interventions will be undertaken in compliance with the applicable Bank policies, including the following:
 - a) The Strategic and Operational Framework for Regional Operations;
 - b) The Bank Group Policy on Portfolio Review and Restructuring;
 - c) The Revised Policy Guidelines and Procedures for Emergency Assistance for activities financed out of the Special Relief Fund;
 - d) The Bank Group Policy on Utilization of Loans Savings; and

²⁰ *Africa Risk View* is a modelling platform that is applicable to the entire continent and has default parameters that can be customized to a specific country.

- e) The Streamlining of Procedures for Approval Process by the Boards of Directors
- (ii) In undertaking any restructuring or use of Loan/grant savings from on-going or slow-disbursing projects, the Bank will work in close consultation with the concerned RMCs and procure their consent where it is required by the applicable policies and financing agreement so as to ensure smooth implementation of the Framework.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6. Conclusions

6.1 “Say No to Famine” is the Bank’s framework to decrease exposure of vulnerable populations to chronic hunger and malnutrition. While there will undoubtedly be droughts in the future on the continent, the Framework seeks to establish a mechanism that ensures that droughts do not directly lead to famines in Africa. The Bank will provide and leverage resources to build sustainable and resilient food systems, strengthen links between the food production, distribution and consumption hubs, to facilitate access and availability of food in line with SDG2. “Say No to Famine” will build an Alliance for Ending Famine in Africa as a platform for innovative resource mobilization and partnership coordination for greater impact. The Bank’s response builds on good practices from past emergency response experiences, such as the 2008 and 2011 food crisis and the more recently on the 2013 Ebola response.

6.2 The proposed response spells out the immediate, medium and longer term support to the designated RMCs:

- (i) Immediately, through an emergency response, address the humanitarian needs specifically for South Sudan and Somalia, in terms of food assistance and logistical support to get food from where it is available to where it is needed;
- (ii) In the medium term through ongoing and planned projects, build sustainable and resilient food systems that facilitate access to economically viable and nutritious food products for the affected populations and build resilience against cyclical food security challenges and drought; and,
- (iii) Longer term support through the implementation of the Bank’s High 5s with support to relevant Government institutions to set up an enabling environment for commodity value chain development with embedded climate resilience actions, gender empowerment and engagement of the private sector.

6.3 The Bank’s framework envisions making available UA 838.77 million (approximately USD 1.14 billion) to support the following Regional Member Countries in the short, medium and long term: Somalia, South Sudan, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria and Uganda. In the short term, from the Emergency Assistance Grant and Transition Support Facility (TSF) and a restructuring of its existing lending portfolio by reallocating funds from cancelled and slow disbursing operations, recommitting activities to specific drought and famine interventions. In the medium to long term, applying new head-rooms. Alongside internal mechanisms for resource mobilization, the Bank must widen its reach and use its convening power to external donors and tap the many channels of support available to leverage emergency aid.

6.4 The Boards of Directors are hereby requested to:

- (i) Approve the Say No to Famine Framework;
- (ii) Approve the utilization of an amount not exceeding Eleven Million, Eight Hundred and Ninety Thousand Units of Account (UA 11,890,000) by the Federal Republic of Nigeria, corresponding to the unused resources from Nigeria's ADF-13 Performance-Based Allocation, to be provided in the form of a loan to the Federal Republic of Nigeria, to finance short term humanitarian assistance under the Framework. The specific proposal for the utilization of the resources will be submitted to the Board for consideration on a lapse-of-time basis for decision within seven (7) days;
- (iii) Approve the restructuring of on-going slow disbursing projects in the Horn of Africa (Ethiopia, South Sudan, Somalia and Kenya) as listed in Annex II B of the Framework for the financing of short term humanitarian interventions under the Framework in accordance with the applicable policies;
- (iv) Approve the use of loan and grant savings in projects in the Horn of Africa (Ethiopia, South Sudan, Somalia and Kenya) as listed in Annex II B of the Framework maybe utilized for short term humanitarian interventions under the Framework in accordance with the applicable policies;
- (v) Approve the submission of specific proposals for financing short term humanitarian interventions under the Framework for consideration by the Board(s) on a lapse-of-time basis for decision within seven (7) days:
- (vi) Take note that Specific proposals for financing medium-term and long-term interventions shall be submitted to the Board(s) for consideration on a formal basis; and
- (vii) Take note that Management shall to submit to the Boards, on an annual basis, a status report on the implementation of the Framework.

ANNEXES:

Annex I: Tables of Internal Resource Mobilization (Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan and Uganda)

Table 1 - Overview

| Country | Immediate Support | | Funding Source | Medium/Long term support | | Funding Source |
|-------------------------------------|---|---------------|--|--------------------------|----------------|---|
| | (UA million) | (USD million) | | (UA million) | (USD million) | |
| Ethiopia | 2.83 | 3.83 | Project Savings & Restructuring UA 2.27m ADF Loan UA 0.25m ADF Grant UA0.31m ADF Loan | 50.00 | 67.69 | Project IOP UA50m ADF |
| Kenya | 2.74 | 3.71 | Project Savings UA 2m ADF Loan UA0.74 SRF | 281.89 | 381.65 | Project IOP UA96.7m ADF UA185.19m ADB |
| Nigeria | 11.89 | 16.10 | UA 11.89m unused ADF-13 allocation | 246.70 | 334 | Restructuring UA 246.70m |
| Somalia | 26.74 | 36.20 | UA 10m TSF Pillar I (unallocated, ADF 14) UA15 ADF-14 Regional Envelope UA0.74m SRF UA1m Project Restructuring TSF Pillar 3 | 74.74 | 101.19 | Project IOP UA74.74m ADF |
| South Sudan | 32.24 | 43.65 | UA 10m TSF Pillar I (unallocated) ADF 14 UA15 ADF-14 Regional Envelope UA0.74 SRF UA6.5m Project Restructuring TSF Pillar 1 | 34.00 | 46.03 | Project IOP UA34m ADF |
| Uganda | none | none | N/A | 75.00 | 101.54 | Project IOP UA75m ADF |
| Total | 76.44 | 103.50 | | 762.33 | 1032.11 | |
| Grand Total Say No to Famine | UA838.77 Approximately \$1135.60 | | | | | |

Annex II: Details Internal Resource Mobilization (Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, South Sudan and Uganda)

A. Immediate 1 - Emergency Assistance Grant and TSF (ADF14) resources

| Country | Item | Amount (UAm) | Amount (USDm) |
|-------------|---|--------------|---------------|
| Kenya | Emergency Assistance Grant, Special Relief Fund | 0.74 | 1.00 |
| Somalia | TSF resources (ADF-14), Pillar 1 (unallocated) | 10.00 | 13.54 |
| Somalia | Emergency Assistance Grant, Special Relief Fund | 0.74 | 1.00 |
| Somalia | ADF-14 Regional Envelope | 15.00 | 20.31 |
| South Sudan | TSF resources (ADF-14), Pillar 1 (unallocated) | 10.00 | 13.54 |
| South Sudan | Emergency Assistance Grant, Special Relief Fund | 0.74 | 1.00 |
| South Sudan | ADF-14 Regional Envelope | 15.00 | 20.31 |
| | Total | 52.22 | 70.70 |

NB:

Since the Transition Support Facility (TSF) resources (under all three pillars) are part of the ADF Financing Framework, utilization of TSF resources under ADF-14 will be subject to the effectiveness of the ADF-14 replenishment and countries preparing separate project proposals for approval by the Board of Directors.

B. Immediate 2- Savings on recently completed/ongoing projects or redeployment from slow disbursing projects proposed for restructuring

| Country | Title | Amount available (UAm) | Amount available (USDm) | Source (Instrument) | Completion Date | Current Status |
|-------------|--|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Ethiopia | Electricity Transmission Systems Improvement Project | 2.27 | 3.079 | ADF Loan (restruc.) | 30-Apr-17 | Ongoing |
| Ethiopia | Electricity Transmission Systems Improvement Project | 0.25 | 0.337 | ADF Grant (restruc.) | 30-Apr-17 | Ongoing |
| Ethiopia | Rural Electrification Project Ii | 0.31 | 0.416 | ADF Loan (savings) | 31-Dec-16 | Completed |
| Kenya | Small Med Towns Water Supply & Waste Wat | 2.00 | 2.71 | ADF Loan (savings) | 30-Dec-16 | Completed |
| Somalia | Institutional Support to Financial Governance | 1.00 | 1.35 | TSF Pilar 3(restruc.) | 31-Dec-17 | Ongoing |
| South Sudan | Technical Assistance for the Development of the Transport Sector | 6.50 | 8.79 | TSF pillar 1(restruc.) | 31-Dec-17 | Ongoing |
| | Total | 12.33 | 16.68 | | | |

C. Medium term/Long Term - Project in the IOP to advance to respond to the drought

| Country | Title | ADB (UAm) | ADF | Total Bank Financing (UAm) | Total Bank Financing (USDm) | Co-fin | Co- financier |
|----------------|--|----------------------|---------------|---|--|---------------|--------------------------|
| Ethiopia | One Water, Sanitation and Hygiene National Program (sector budget support) | | 50.00 | 50.00 | 67.69 | 6.00 | TF |
| Kenya | Kocholia Irrigation Development And Watershed Management | | 30.00 | 30.00 | 40.62 | 18.52 | Korea |
| Kenya | Thwake - Additional Financing | 185.19 | | 185.19 | 250.72 | | |
| Kenya | Youth Agro-Business Project | | 36.70 | 36.70 | 49.69 | | |
| Kenya | Irrigated Green Zones | | 30.00 | 30.00 | 40.62 | | |
| Somalia | Building longer term resilience projects in the Somalia Infrastructure Fund (SIF) pipeline | | 52.24 | 52.24 | 70.73 | | |
| Somalia | Say no to Famine or any other project supporting long term resilience(Using all or part of ADF 14) | | 22.50 | 22.50 | 30.46 | | |
| South Sudan | Say no to Famine or any other project supporting long term resilience(Using all or part of ADF 14) | | 34.00 | 34.00 | 46.03 | | |
| Uganda | Uganda Agricultural Value Chain Development Programme (AVCP) | | 75.00 | 75.00 | 101.54 | | |
| | TOTAL | 185.19 | 330.44 | 515.63 | 698.11 | 24.52 | |

NB: Utilization of ADF 14 Resources will only be subject to the effectiveness of the ADF resources and countries preparing separate project proposals for approval by the Bank Board.

Annex III: Details Internal Resource Mobilization (Nigeria)

As a response to the headroom challenges, the Nigeria portfolio is being restructured to free up funds to finance projects particularly in the IPP projects. Nigeria's contribution to the fund will only significantly be effective in the medium to long term as it involves no new money. Nigeria is able to repackage existing projects targeting livelihood improvements in the North East in water and sanitation, irrigation and agriculture sectors. The total amount of projects underway in the region amounts to some **\$334 million (medium to long term)**. The process of repackaging involves negotiations and the buy-in from the federal and state governments and those consultations already in progress. In addition, Nigeria did not sign on to the Lake Chad Basin development project (PRODEBALT) in 2015-2016. As a result, the **ADF-13 allocation of UA 11.89 million (immediate response)** allocated to support this program have been unutilized. Consultations have already been launched with the authorities about withdrawal of these funds, or allocating them to recently approved projects in the northeast. These funds are potentially available for capture to the famine response following the successful dialogue with the government of Nigeria.

Proposed Restructuring of Projects in Nigeria

The recovery and stabilization needs for the agriculture and irrigation sector in line with the "Buhari Plan" includes: ensuring food and nutrition security in the short term through food assistance; to achieve both food security and sustainable agricultural livelihoods in the medium term; to create jobs and regenerate wealth in the region; and to rebuild damaged/destroyed infrastructures and re-establish or strengthen service delivery channels.

The Bank is already providing Nutrition emergency support to Borno State. The ongoing Rural Water and Sanitation Programme in Yobe State will be restructured to include irrigation and livelihood support and enhanced resilience to climate change especially in the most drought prone desert areas of the State. The Bank's recently approved "Integrated Basic Services Delivery and Livelihood Empowerment Program" which includes reconstruction of cattle and fish markets, household food security and agricultural livelihood economic reintegration, expansion of social registry to cover all the States in North East Nigeria to facilitate rehabilitation of selected irrigation infrastructure will be fast tracked. The Agricultural Transformation (ATASP.1) will be fast tracked and restructured to be able to provide support to North East Nigeria. (ATASP.1 does not cover the north-east region, but covers some of the neighboring States of North West, which could serve as food production centers and food supply to the affected northeast region.

Annex IV: Environmental Vulnerability, Drought and Fragility Assessment

1. Executive Summary

1.1. The Northern Nigeria Regions and most Horn of Africa countries are characterized by large geographical regions that are arid or semi-arid. Fragility in these regions is a combination of environmental factors and spatial marginalization as the regions are often far from capitals, and far from food basket regions. As a result, certain regions can suffer famine even when there is adequate food in the country. Spatial marginalization also affects these regions in others ways, being far from state infrastructure, and there is often a difficulty in bringing in basic services such as water, sanitation, education, and health.

1.2. The environmental fragility experienced in these regions is characterized by degradation resulting from human activities such as changes in land-use patterns, rapid population growth, and climatic changes exacerbate the aridity creating chronic water and pasture shortages, as well as frequent droughts. Land degradation, and changing weather patterns are altering rainfall patters and accelerating drought and desertification. The cycles of drought, infrastructural gaps and economic marginalization of these areas often combine to create food insecurity, induce displacement and sometimes conflict.

2. Introduction

Horn of Africa

2.1. The Horn of Africa region- comprising Somalia, Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan, South Sudan, Eritrea, and Uganda- is one of the most climate-hazard prone and food insecure regions of the world. Beyond land and water resources, the region is facing complex challenges in managing its environmental and renewable natural resources—forests, fish, and the ecosystems on which they depend—in a sustainable way. Forest reserves are diminishing due to use for heating and cooking in poor households resulting in soil erosion, and damages to grazing habitat for livestock is on the increase. In addition, while charcoal is a traditional source of energy and fuel demand for tree cutting as an energy source drastically affects forest reserves and further reduces rainfall exacerbating aridity.

2.2. The result is increased pressure on communities leading to economic and social dislocation, displacement and an increasing incidence of resource-based conflicts. Pastoralists in Somalia, Sudan, and the lowlands of Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda especially susceptible to the negative effects of environmental degradation given decreased access to water and pasture, leading to loss stock and its attendant impacts on livelihoods.

2.3. Indeed a key source instability in arid areas are inter-communal clashes over grazing land and water points among pastoralist as well as with farming communities. Pastoral conflicts between communities straddling the border regions of Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan, Uganda and Somali borders particularly a problem given the increase in small arms and automatic weapons. Communities engage in cattle rustling to restock herds and fight to gain better access to grazing land and water sources, with the increased use of modern weapons increasing insecurity, and leading to high losses of lives.

2.4. Conflict, instability, and food insecurity have contributed to Horn of African countries having one of the highest levels of displacement on the continent. The region had over 2 million refugees and more than 5 million internally displaced people (IDPs), in 2014²¹.

2.5. The socioeconomic impacts of displacement and forced migration due to drought and environmental pressures are significant. Refugee and displaced populations pose significant pressure on weak local and national institutions and place significant strains on national and local governments and host communities. In addition, displaced and refugee populations are frequently the most deprived, vulnerable, and excluded with the attendant costs on human and social capital, economic growth, and poverty reduction.

2.6. Regional countries continue to work hard to address the challenge. Under the aegis of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), regional members have sought to find lasting solutions to the issues of joint economic, social and infrastructure development in key border areas as well as conflict mitigation and resolution. Joint regional commissions also exist to help member states deal with illegal trade and pastoralist issues.

2.7. However, all these initiatives are constrained by resource scarcity both human and financial, lack of adequately trained manpower and also suffer from lack of coordination between sub-regional and national actors. To address the situation, in September 2011 IGAD region established the IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative with the aim of promoting the resilience of vulnerable communities in drought affected areas through regional (cross border) economic development. The Bank has been supporting the initiative through the Drought Resilience Initiative, which covers Somalia, Ethiopia, Sudan, Eritrea and Djibouti.

Nigeria

2.8. Northern Nigeria is characterized by relatively harsh climatic conditions with instances of persistent drought, and marked climatic change changing climate as the arid and semi-arid areas have become becoming drier and desert conditions encroached into what was once productive land.²² The Sahara desert is estimated as advancing Southward at the rate of 0.6km every year with Nigeria losing about 350,000 hectares of land every year to desert encroachment²³. The drought situation has in recent years been worsened by instability and conflict owing to the Boko Haram insurgency leading to massive population displacement in North Eastern frontline States of Borno, Adamawa and Yobe (BAY States). Displacements have also occurred in the Northern States of Bauchi, Gombe, Taraba, Kebbi, Sokoto, Zamfara, Katsina, Kano and Jigawa, The effect is particularly significant within the pastoralist population whose patterns of migration, inter and intra communal conflict have worsened as climatic conditions have deteriorated.

²¹ UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), Eastern Africa: Displaced Populations (as at 31 March 2014), 11 June 2014, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/53a005664.html> [accessed 25 March 2015]

²² Abubakar, L.U and M.A Yamuda: recurrence of drought in Nigeria. Cause, Effects and Mitigation. International Journal of Agriculture and Food Science Technology. ISSN 2249-3050, Vol.4 No.3 (2013) pp.169-180.

²³ Federal Ministry of Environment (2004) Nigerian National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 114.pp

3. Environmental Vulnerability, Drought and Fragility: South Sudan

3.1. For forty-two of the past sixty years, there has been war in Southern Sudan - both before and after the state of South Sudan was created in 2011. The country descended into civil war in 2013, leading to widespread hunger.

3.2. As warring militias continue to fight, vital food being brought in to support the South Sudanese people has been blocked and aid workers have been attacked. In some areas, around 50% of harvests have been destroyed. Severe drought has intensified an already fragile situation.

3.3. Land degradation particularly in the Northern regions, affects livelihoods, increases inter-communal conflict (particularly when cattle die and are replaced through cattle rustling) including competition over water and pastures. The pressures arise from population growth, displacements to allow for oil drilling, climatic change, and disasters such as flooding and the lack of energy sources beyond firewood, which has led to the cutting down of trees and forest cover. Interventions are critical in order to support the improvement of livelihoods, mitigate farmer/pastoralist conflict, and protect water catchment areas and forest cover.

3.4. The southern regions of Equatoria are rich in soil and could easily be breadbaskets for the country. However, a major challenge is the lack of infrastructure in the country, and the difficulty in transporting food from areas where it is plenty to regions where it is less plentiful. In general, South Sudan has inadequate, and in some instances, none of the critical infrastructure needed to provide basic services such as transportation of basic foodstuffs, let alone, health, water, sanitation and education infrastructure. South Sudan has very few hospitals outside state capitals, few schools, and often no water and sanitation infrastructure outside of towns. Four states out of ten have no electrical grid or power supply provided by the government and the country only a few hundred kilometers of paved roads.

3.5. This is particularly a fragility challenge for 80 percent of the population living in rural areas. Lack of roads limits trade, impedes food transportation from the agricultural belt in the mid and southern belt to the northern areas where food insecurity a cyclical challenge. Lack of basic infrastructure also hinders the development of economic opportunities in rural areas and inhibits the growth of the private sector. The inadequate access to infrastructure poses a risk of social and economic marginalization of rural communities, economic inequalities between rural areas and cities such as Juba, as well as between the south and the north creating the basis for many social tensions.

4. Environmental Vulnerability, Drought and Fragility: Somalia

4.1. Somalia is a highly arid country (over 70% arid) and suffers from regular and sometimes persistent drought. These droughts often exacerbate existing communal challenges due to increased competition between pastoralists and farming communities for access to water, land and pasture. Somalia has very limited ground cover, with forested land having been denuded over a period of long standing conflict and as a result of charcoal production being the key sources of income for a variety of actors during the conflict period - from civilians trying to make ends meet to militias and armed groups, and in the subsequent post conflict period for Al-Shabaab (a terrorist group).

4.2. As a result, the land is highly degraded; rainfall is generally low and underground water a valuable resource that is often fought over by clans. Such competitions are likely to become more acute in the face of climate change, as the periods between drought get shorter and the actual length without rainfall longer. In the face of rapidly increasing population and competition for natural resources, these droughts have impact on food security, particularly in the poorer regions.

4.3. To complicate the challenge Somalia suffers from a low infrastructure and human capital base. Over the years, the country's infrastructure and human capital development has been severely constrained by war, violence, and wide spread poverty levels. The significant differences in the levels of economic development among the regions is partly driven by disparities in their infrastructure and human capital investments coupled with asymmetric distribution of resources, productive assets and access to economic activity.

4.4. Consequently, Somalia's social conditions remain grim despite several years of relative stability. Vast areas remain highly insecure, making basic agriculture, trade, and livelihood activities difficult. Years of neglect means there are still many parts of the country, particularly in the south-central regions where there are no basic services.

5. Environmental Vulnerability, Drought and Fragility: Ethiopia

5.1. Ethiopia, like many countries in the Horn of Africa region faces a number of environmental challenges, exacerbated by climate change. Droughts, the most important climate-related hazard affecting Ethiopia, have been occurring with increasing frequency owing to climatic changes giving the country less time to recover before the next event, reducing agricultural yields and exposing millions to food insecurity.

5.2. Drought in Ethiopia tends to affect the most restive regions of the country, namely Oromia and Somali regions. Instability, coupled with frequent droughts and environmental degradation make eking out a livelihood from shrinking plots of productive land increasingly difficult. Furthermore, population growth is exerting tremendous pressure on dwindling land and water resources driving conflict over these vital commodities.

5.3. Pastoralists whose herds have been decimated by drought often struggle to recover and must look for new ways of replenishing herds, a factor that has led to problems of cattle rustling in the border areas between Ethiopia and North Eastern Kenya. Faced with few income options some pastoralists or farming communities sometimes resort to income generating activities that further degrade the environment, such as charcoal production.

5.4. Despite these many challenges, Ethiopia's pastoralists and agro-pastoralists have often managed to cope successfully with their environment. Communities have learned how to manage the variable water supply and how to farm on relatively dry land by embracing water capture. They have developed strategies for sustainable management of crops, changing locations and practices according to the different seasons. Pastoralists sell their excess male livestock and move their herds for maximum utilization of the wet- and dry-season grazing lands, taking advantage of the best conditions available for breeding as well as for locating suitable feed. These strategies, practiced and perfected over generations, enable pastoralists to do more than simply survive in their difficult setting; they enable them to create economic value. The drought resilience response financed by

the African Development Bank supports such initiatives and seeks to make drought-affected communities more resilient.

6. Environmental Vulnerability, Drought and Fragility: Uganda

6.1. The drought that has affected the Horn of Africa region has affected parts of North and Eastern Uganda as well with UNOCHA estimating that at least 640,000 people, half the population of the Karamoja region are facing food insecurity following several seasons without adequate rain. Two districts- Moroto and Kaabong are the most affected. Karamoja like most of the affected regions in the Horn of Africa is an arid area. The region has been increasingly experiencing climate and weather changes including frequent cycles of dry spells.

6.2. The impact of the drought has been a worsening of the endemic poverty in the region with pastoralist families having to sell livestock thus further damaging livelihoods. Another significant impact has been the rise in migration into South Sudan, and Western Kenya in search of wetter regions and pasture. These types of movement have often led to intercommunity clashes in the countries of destination.

6.3. The relatively high rates of poverty and deprivation in the region, and limited social safety nets are the key markers of fragility in the Karamoja region. Although the region had experienced a long standing period of instability, a study jointly carried out by ORTS and EDRE indicated that the fragility in the area could largely be explained not by conflict, but to the historical, spatial, and political marginalization dating back to the colonial times and extreme climatic and environmental conditions obtaining in the region which have in recent times been further exacerbated by climate change leading to regular and severe droughts, accompanied by loss of livestock which are the main source of income and wealth.

6.4. Conflict related factors leading to a higher poverty incidence include cattle rustling and the proliferation of small arms in the sub region, which have in past years created non-conflict related insecurity, making it difficult to sustain developmental activities. Consequently, addressing the environmental and climatic factors that lead to repeated cycles of drought, and mitigating the effects on the community would be critical in addressing the overall fragility of the region.

7. Environmental Vulnerability, Drought and Fragility: Kenya

7.1. Adverse environmental and climatic conditions exert particular risks to agriculture and food security in Kenya. About 80% of total landmass in Kenya are considered arid and semi-arid areas (UNEP, 2009) which are prone to droughts. Changes in rainfall and temperature patterns often have significant impact on agricultural systems and production, and ultimately affect socio-economic conditions of smallholder farmers. In addition, poor agricultural yields over a sustained period create food insecurity, and low incomes, making farmers vulnerable to different forms of social and economic shocks.

7.2. While Kenya has better infrastructure compared to other countries within the East African region, they are not necessarily widespread across the whole country. Disparities in infrastructure base shows that northern counties with semi-arid environments and vast lands have lesser infrastructure compared to the central and southern regions. For agricultural productivity, poor

infrastructure in many counties include lack of adequate roads, lack of reliable meteorological services and irrigation systems – which has led to heavy reliance on rain-fed agricultural practice.

7.3. Kenya Bureau of Statistics (2007) report that about 49% of the rural population is poor – number expected to decline in recent years. Poverty dynamics in Kenya, especially in the agricultural sector, depends on the interplay between human and natural systems. Changes in agricultural (biophysical) ecosystems often have significant impact on the incomes and livelihood systems of the rural populations. Limited access to basic services and social protection systems often contribute to this poverty from individual to county levels. In addition, limited economic opportunities in certain parts of the country manifest in forms of unequal access to productive assets, social and political exclusion, amongst others.

8. Environmental Vulnerability, Drought and Fragility: Nigeria

8.1. The double tragedy of insecurity and famine in North Eastern Nigeria, according to the UN estimates of October 2016, has affected 7 million people, representing over 65% of those affected in the Lake Chad region (Nigeria, Cameroon, Niger and Chad). Borno, Adamawa and Yobe states are the most affected, with about 1.3 million displaced persons in Borno state alone. Those facing acute food insecurity in the region as of January 2017 amount to 5.1 million, of which 3.4 million of the food insecure persons are children under 5 years and would require nutrition assistance. About 1.8 million persons have been displaced, with 78% of IDPs staying with host families, while fewer than 22% are in official and unofficial camps. In addition, more than 187 thousand people have become refugees in Cameroon, Chad and Niger.

8.2. Climate change has had devastating impacts on livelihoods in North East Nigeria as evidenced by the receding Lake Chad, increasing incidences of drought and desert encroachment. The result has been increasing conflict between pastoralist and farmers, reduced yields and loss of livelihoods, especially for the fisher folk.

8.3. North Eastern Nigeria is also spatially distant from many of the breadbasket areas of Nigeria making food transportation expensive and difficult (due to terrain) and particularly so during periods of drought. The situation is further exacerbated by the insecurity occasioned by Boko Haram insurgencies makes it difficult to provide basic services to the local populations as well as those displaced. Coupled with competition for pasture and water, there has been as in many countries facing aridity intergroup conflict, and a high level of marginalization of the region and significant inequality in comparison to States and regions nearer to the centre.

Annex V: Humanitarian Agencies as Implementing Partners

Although the Bank has its traditional resource mobilization partners, these are not always those that are best apt to respond to emergency situations. Thus, partnership efforts must be focalized on those agencies that are best equipped to handle urgent needs and swift, flexible disbursements. Such targeted partnerships would include but are not limited to:

1. Action Against Hunger (www.actionagainsthunger.org) works in Uganda, South Sudan, Ethiopia, Nigeria
2. Gift of the Givers Foundation (www.giftofthegivers.org) works in Sudan, Somalia and Ethiopia
3. Convoy of Hope (www.convoyofhope.org) works in Kenya and Ethiopia
4. CARE (www.careinternational.org.uk) has already set up its East Africa appeal and donation web link up
5. Islamic Relief USA (<http://irusa.org/food-aid/>) works in Ethiopia, Somalia and South Sudan
6. Action Aid (www.actionaid.org.uk) works in Ethiopia, Nigeria, Somaliland, Uganda and has already set up an East Africa appeal and donation web link
7. Global Giving (<https://www.globalgiving.org/projects/east-africa-drought-and-famine-relief-fund/>), a crowdsourcing platform, has already raised £23,000 to date for meeting the needs of the current crisis.
8. Oxfam UK (www.oxfam.org.uk) works in South Sudan, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Uganda, Nigeria

AfDB will coordinate with NGOs, agencies or institutions working on the ground in affected countries, and which possess the requisite capacity and mandate to undertake the implementation of the “Say No to Famine” Response.

Annex VI: Lists of Potential Private Sector Companies to be approached for Awareness and Fundraising Campaign

Lists of Private Sector Companies as Champions for Awareness and Fundraising Campaign

- **Service Industries** - DHL, Fedex and other cargo carriers proved to be effective partners in disaster relief in this way during the Haitian earthquake.²⁴ Similar conversations can be held with the Bank's airline partners such as Emirates Airlines and Air France to, for instance, organize collections onboard relevant flights in and out of Africa or have staff donate air miles in exchange for cash donations.²⁵ International hotels with branches in the affected countries can sponsor employee and guest matching programs whereby it will match any amount provided by hotel guests at checkout, or allow hotel points to be redeemed for cash in support of the disaster relief efforts.
- **Leading financial institutions** to open special account for Say No to Famine campaign so that their clients can smoothly transfers into it (on-transfer to IA with media statement, e.g. 'AfDB-Ecobank partnership for Say NO to Famine campaign secures USD 2m in additional funding from Ecobank clients'). In the banking sector, especially given the Bank's healthy line of credit and trade finance portfolio or equity ownership in banks such as UBA, we can work with our partners to set up a mechanism for requesting donations from the public through a contribution from their customer savings accounts. The Bank can lead in exploring and establishing mechanisms with the private sector to support the fundraising effort.
- **Telecom companies and mobile phone manufacturers** could also be engaged. Besides mobile service providers, the Bank can reach out to prominent African ICT companies to encourage crowdsourcing efforts. Partnering with Telecoms in this way proved successful during the Kenyans for Kenya campaign, which supported the Red Cross in addressing the 2011 Horn of Africa crisis through M-pesa contributions.²⁶ Conversely, the Bank can promote the use of mobile giving such as texting "FOOD" on a certain mobile provider's network to donate USD \$1 from a customer's top up credit to disaster relief efforts. Vodafone's 'JustTextGiving' service is an innovative example.²⁷

²⁴ See <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/11/giving/11FEDEX.html>

²⁵ See recent example of this approach at http://www.essence.com/news/colin-kaepernick-plane-aid-somalia?xid=essence_socialflow_facebook

²⁶ See: <https://www.standardmedia.co.ke/business/article/2000039809/kenyans-for-kenya>

²⁷ See: <https://www.vodafone.co.uk/about-us/just-text-giving/>

Annex VII: Drought Resilience and Sustainable Livelihoods Program in the Horn of Africa

| Borrower / Recipient | Grant / Loan ADF | Project Definition | Total ADF (UA) | Government Contribution (UA) | Total (UA) | Total (USD) |
|---------------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | |
| Djibouti DRSLP-I | Loan & Grant | P-Z1-AAZ-012 | 10.00 | 1.9 | 11.90 | 16.42 |
| Djibouti DRSLP-III | Loan & Grant | P-Z1-AAZ-037 | 11.5 | 1.1 | 12.60 | 17.39 |
| Eritrea II | Loan | P-Z1-AAZ-034 | 5.75 | 0.55 | 6.30 | 8.69 |
| Eritrea II | Grant | P-Z1-AAZ-034 | 5.75 | 0.55 | 6.3 | 8.69 |
| Ethiopia-DRSLP-I | Loan | P-Z1-AAZ-013 | 30 | 8.4 | 38.4 | 52.99 |
| Ethiopia-DRSLP-II | Loan | P-Z1-AAZ-033 | 28.48 | 2.84 | 31.32 | 43.22 |
| Kenya | Loan | P-Z1-AAZ-011 | 37.41 | 4.4 | 41.81 | 57.70 |
| Somalia II | ADF Grant | P-Z1-AAZ-036 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 13.80 |
| Somalia II | Grant TSF | P-Z1-AAZ-036 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 6.90 |
| Sudan II | ADF Grant | P-Z1-AAZ-035 | 10 | 1.8 | 11.8 | 16.28 |
| Sudan II | Grant TSF | P-Z1-AAZ-035 | 10 | 1.8 | 11.8 | 16.28 |
| Sudan III | ADF Grant | P-Z1-A00-015 | 10 | 1.8 | 11.8 | 16.28 |
| IGAD | Grant - RPG | P-Z1-AAZ-014 | 5 | | 5 | 6.90 |
| Total | | | 179.59 | 25.14 | 204.03 | 281.56 |

Annex VIII: Map of Bean Production and Flows (Uganda, South Sudan and Kenya)



Annex IX: Map of Sorghum Production and Flows (Uganda and South Sudan)



Annex X: Map of Maize Production and Flows (Uganda, South Sudan and Kenya)

