

PURCHASE FOR PROGRESS TECHNICAL REVIEW PANEL
Summary Report
Arusha, Tanzania – June 2012

The Fourth Technical Review Panel meeting (TRP) meeting, bringing together 9 experts on agricultural economics, market development and M&E who have served in an advisory capacity to WFP since the start of P4P, was convened in Arusha, Tanzania, from June 10th – 14th 2013. The TRP is an independent, unremunerated group of experts that meets annually to discuss the progress of P4P implementation and offer WFP their guidance and advice on a range of implementation and M&E issues presented to them for input. The TRP members are also consulted on an ad-hoc basis throughout the year as need arises. TRP members are drawn from the following organizations: African Union, Catholic Relief Services, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA), International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Intermon-Oxfam (Spain), International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD), Michigan State University and World Bank.

The 2012 meeting was facilitated by Ms Laura Melo, P4P Regional Programme Advisor for Central America. Other participants included representatives from the Government of Tanzania, implementing partners, private traders, smallholder farmers and farmers' organization (FO) representatives who joined the TRP in discussions during the first two days of the meeting. The TRP members, together with the other invited participants, spent Day 1 of the meeting visiting two cooperatives that have been participating in P4P for at least 3 years.

I. Objectives of the 4th Annual Technical Review Panel meeting

P4P was designed as an evidence-based learning pilot. In order to effectively advocate the adoption of lessons learned through the implementation of P4P, WFP must therefore show how its procurement

...“the real value of P4P’s contribution is lessons and learning for policy designs, for governments and partners wanting to implement pro-smallholder public procurement...” TRP 2011

has enhanced market opportunities and incomes for smallholder farmers. Since the start of P4P, the TRP has urged WFP to pay particular attention to providing scientific evidence of the role of P4P in enhancing market opportunities and incomes for smallholder farmers, thus enabling WFP and its partners to more effectively advocate for the adoption of lessons learned through the implementation of P4P.

This fourth TRP meeting provided a focused opportunity for the TRP members to engage with the data being collected and analysed through the implementation of the P4P monitoring system. Given the limited time available for discussion, WFP and AERC opted to present a general overview of:

- The quality and range of quantitative data emerging from the P4P surveys;
- Examples of pilot countries where collected data was considered to be of high quality;
- Some of the challenges recurring in general throughout the datasets specifically those relating to measurement challenges in determining income of smallholder farmers, small sample sizes, questions as to the comparability of control and treatment groups in some pilot countries, etc.;

- The type of indicators that are possible to elicit from the P4P FO and farmer household datasets;
- The analytical approaches adopted by AERC to date to compute indicators of FO and smallholder farmer capacity development and how the results are being interpreted.

In order to illustrate the above issues more precisely, some preliminary analysis of the Mali data set was presented to provide some context to the TRP's discussion. It should therefore be noted that the summary discussion and subsequent recommendations of the TRP reproduced below arise in part but not wholly from a study of the Mali data set. Similarly, the comments raised by the TRP with regard to P4P implementation issues are informed by a wider set of information made available to the TRP during the meeting, and therefore based on more than the field visits undertaken to the Tanzania FOs on Day 1 of the meeting.

On the final day of the meeting, the TRP members were invited to provide their observations/guidance on:

1. Best approaches to analysing and reporting on the available P4P data; and
2. Implementation challenges and opportunities to address during the remaining 2 years of the pilot.

II. TRP deliberations

The four day meeting afforded the TRP the opportunity to discuss a range of issues related to implementation and M&E with the invited partners and WFP staff. On the final two days of the meeting, only WFP and AERC staff remained in the meeting which focused on the specific M&E issues noted above. The summary below provides a flavour of the discussions over the four days, and lays the basis for the recommendations offered by the TRP at the close of the meeting.

1. Lessons on partnerships and capacity building of FOs

P4P has made tremendous progress in bringing together partners around the FOs. However, the number of partnerships is large (over 220 across the 20 pilot countries). There is need to be clear on what value each of these partnerships brings. WFP would benefit from conducting an analysis of the supply side partnerships to understand those that have been most/least successful and the reasons for this. P4P should also share what it has identified as the critical capacities that farmers' organisations require to profitably access markets, the types of training necessary to achieve this and which of the P4P service providers have been most successful in supporting the capacity development efforts.

Based on the engagement with farmers' organizations (FOs) to date, a further expected output by the end of the pilot phase will be for P4P to have developed a typology of FOs which outlines:

- The strengths and weaknesses of the different types of FOs;
- The appropriate capacity development package that meets the needs of each FO type;
- The procurement options that best suit the different typologies of FOs.

The above information is necessary to guide the selection of the most appropriate procurement modality to employ at each stage of the FOs capacity development

and to appropriately tailor training and other investments to the characteristics of the FO over the development phase,

2. Investment in market infrastructure

Storage is critical to the long term market aspirations of FOs. Across the pilot countries, WFP has made various contributions to improve the storage capacity of FOs from construction of new facilities, to rehabilitation of existing facilities.

In Tanzania, P4P has assisted Savings and Credit Cooperatives (SACCOs) to rehabilitate and equip village warehouses. To date, a total of 19 village level aggregation warehouses have been rehabilitated collectively, with the community providing labour and the District Council and WFP providing technical support and materials. All the warehouses have been equipped with weighing scales, generators, stitching machines, fumigation sheets and other key items to guarantee the proper maintenance of the produce. The warehouses now meet the minimum standards required to register under the Warehouse Licensing Board (WLB), which is a requirement to operate a Warehouse Receipt System (WRS). During the field visits to the SACCOs, TRP members were able to see two of the rehabilitated warehouses.

TRP members noted the importance of storage facilities in general to support marketing efforts of FOs, but highlighted the following as areas for P4P to pay particular attention to:

- Do all the members of the FO (including women) have equitable access to the storage infrastructure and is elite capture being avoided? Some of the factors likely to limit access for some FO members include: location and therefore distance the farmer needs to travel to reach the warehouse, capacity of the warehouse and how well the stocks are managed in storage.
- There is a cost to establishing and maintaining warehouse facilities and this must be well defined and communities made aware of their responsibilities to maintain the infrastructure, in order to avoid the warehouses falling into disuse as happened in the past. The TRP indicated that a warehouse storing less than 800 metric tonnes, it is unlikely to generate sufficient revenue to meet the maintenance costs of the facility.

3. Contract performance

According to a presentation by the Rome-based P4P Coordination Unit, the level of defaults presented globally in P4P remains high at 20 - 25%. The TRP noted that from their assessment of the consolidated procurement reports, the defaults appear to be driven largely by farmers dissatisfaction with the price offered by WFP. This happens for a number of reasons:

- Long period between initial price offer and contract agreement and actual collection of the commodity by WFP, during which time market prices may rise above what was offered. In all WFP contracts, with the exception of the Forward Delivery Contract (FDC), there is no room for price negotiation after signature. FOs have difficulty convincing their members to still sell to WFP at a price lower than what the market may be offering at collection time.
- WFP's long payment procedures are not encouraging to farmers because they rely on quick payment for their crops to meet their livelihood needs. WFP noted that while there do continue to be some delays, in most cases, payment to FOs are being made in as little as 3 days. However, the length of time taken by the

farmers to aggregate the commodities has a large role to play in the perceived lengthy period taken to pay for stock.

Overall, the view of the TRP was that the rigidity of the WFP contracts (which do not allow for a change in price once signed), coupled with price volatility have had a negative impact on the ability and willingness of FOs to meet their obligations as suppliers to WFP as their members are not willing to accept lower prices than what the market is able to pay at the time of uplift.

4. Pricing mechanisms

The question of how prices are determined by various actors including private traders, WFP and by national strategic reserves has been a challenge since the beginning of P4P. The rationale for the determination of the price (for quality meeting WFP standards) that is paid to the farmers in recognition of the quality of supply to WFP should be evaluated as well as the extent to which P4P has succeeded in applying WFP's continuing policy of not paying market prices above import parity.

On a related issue, some members of the TRP expressed surprise that neither farmers visited in Tanzania nor their representative who participated in the first two days of the TRP meeting, mentioned the importance of market and weather information, which are critical pieces of data that would assist farmers in making their production and marketing decisions.

5. Markets beyond WFP

It is important that smallholder farmers develop the capacity to access markets beyond WFP. This includes both public and private markets. Two specific issues were discussed in this regard:

- National Strategic Reserves as a market opportunity for smallholder farmers

There are increasing efforts in P4P pilot countries, to link smallholder farmers to public procurement opportunities offered by national governments, and in particular to national strategic reserves.

Example from Tanzania:

WFP Tanzania reported that they will shortly be signing a MoU with the Government of Tanzania to purchase from National Food Reserve Agency (NFRA), in order to leverage an opportunity for smallholder farmers. Over the past 8 months, WFP Tanzania purchased 100,000 mt of non-GMO maize from NFRA. WFP is requesting NFRA to guarantee that at least 10% of purchases for the reserve will be from smallholder farmers. A challenge that smallholder farmers face is the need for advance financing in the absence of which they prefer to sell to traders who pay them cash immediately. WFP is working with NFRA and other partners to see how this aspect can be addressed. One option may be for WFP together with NFRA to co-manage the warehouses, so that WFP can take receipt of the goods as they enter into the NFRA warehouses, thus enabling WFP to make immediate payment. This would enhance reliability of supplies, while still maintaining a market

opportunity for smallholder farmers to supply to NFRA. There are also prospects to use WFP's corporate advance financing facility to buy even greater volumes from NFRA.

While the TRP recognised that linking smallholder farmers to the market offered by the national strategic reserves provides an opportunity to take the P4P approaches to scale, WFP was advised to exercise caution and first undertake a careful assessment of the pros and cons of linking smallholder farmers to the market offered by government's strategic reserve, on a case by case basis taking into account the following:

- i. Governments use reserves in one of two ways: to stabilize prices or for emergencies. Reserves that are used to stabilize prices inevitably create market distortions. In the view of the TRP, the price stabilization process (presented by Tanzania's NFRA during the TRP workshop) was viewed as having the potential to create a price distortion in the market.
- ii. The use of WFP resources to support government programs with potentially very large and controversial impacts on markets and with major questions regarding the distribution of their benefits needs to be carefully considered.
- iii. WFP should set clear objectives for procuring from or encouraging smallholder farmer sales to strategic reserves and outline the specific mechanisms that will be used to achieve those objectives.

- Quality demands of other markets

WFP can assist farmers in building their understanding of other buyers in the country and their requirements. While farmers know the high quality standards demanded by WFP, they are often unaware of others in the market with a demand for quality and over and above this, what are the actual quality demands of these other buyers. WFP needs to work on understanding the demand for quality in each of the pilot countries and ensure that this knowledge is built into the training of FOs. There is otherwise the risk that FOs develop a capacity to achieve quality that has little value beyond the WFP market.

6. Return on investment/cost-benefit analysis

WFP needs to facilitate a return on investment (ROI) study, in order to allow for an objective analysis of the economic and social rate of return of the P4P investments.

The study should draw a clear distinction between:

- What is directly paid for by P4P (e.g. training paid by WFP whether delivered by WFP or partners, investments such as storage, equipment paid for by WFP etc.)
- Training/investments by partners which were catalysed by P4P (but which are done with partners' resources)
- Training/investments which were happening regardless of P4P and to which P4P linked/joined to leverage the existing partners' interventions

Information note:

P4P and the Procurement division of WFP have commissioned a study on the impact of WFP's regular Local and Regional Procurement (LRP) at national and household levels, that will also inform the cost-benefit analysis. A final report is expected from Michigan State University (MSU) by mid-2013. The findings will contribute to the assessment of costs and benefits of WFP's regular LRP activities.

WFP was encouraged to consider seeking the support of an economist from the FAO Investment Centre to carry out this exercise including the identification of other data requirements.

7. Enabling environment

The TRP observed that while P4P has done a lot in the areas of procurement and capacity development, so far, less has been done to address the enabling environment. The TRP members identified four areas of relevance to the smooth operation of P4P where they believe WFP brings sufficient experience and authority to bring about meaningful dialogue and advocacy:

- Quality - The TRP once again (as was their recommendation in 2011), encouraged WFP to work with the government and private sector in each pilot country to build a quality consciousness and adherence to quality standards, for the benefit of both consumers and farmers.
- Market information - The TRP would like to see WFP collaborate with FEWS NET and others to collect and report market prices. Some of the lessons learned by WFP's VAM unit using new technology (West Africa and ODK SMS price data transmission systems) could be relevant with packages adapted to suit P4P's needs.
- Facilitating appropriate changes in the legal frameworks governing the operation of FOs in countries where this has proved a hindrance to the functioning of the FOs.
- Engaging in policy discussions and advocating for pro-smallholder public procurement

8. Ensuring availability of credible evidence of impact

The TRP acknowledged the importance of the technical support being provided by the African Economic Research Consortium and noted that this has considerably bolstered WFP's capacity to improve on the quality of its P4P data collection and reporting. The TRP however cautioned AERC and P4P to maintain stringent standards of data collection and analysis until the end of the pilot as the ability to demonstrate the benefits of this initiative will depend on the availability of high quality data captured throughout the lifespan of the project.

III. TRP recommendations

The TRP expressed their appreciation to WFP and AERC for the openness exhibited in the sharing of data and information and in the discussion throughout the meeting, and offered the following specific recommendations to help move the P4P programme towards conclusion in December 2013.

..."(P4P) is a complex initiative and this meeting has provided us with a unique opportunity to look at the project from the inside and at great depth. The project has generated a lot of data and it will be a huge undertaking to analyse it. It is critical to establish the learning priorities and with the necessary investment and attention in its analysis, you will be able to make a very strong case to governments and donors for local procurement as a development tool".....Shaun Ferris – CRS. TRP member.

The specific recommendations of the TRP are presented below:

Partnership and capacity building:

- Develop a typology of farmer organizations and identify the appropriate capacity building package that meets the needs of each FO type
- Focus on describing in detail the 1-2 specific promising procurement options, that best suit specific types of FO's
- Provide enhanced support to improve both volume and quality of production of smallholder farmers, together with supply side partners:
- Continue addressing sustainability of support and partnerships and outline hand over protocols with for example Feed the Future projects or others. This should include an analysis of P4P's partnerships to date, (how many, how is it done, and externalities)

Contract performance and pricing mechanisms:

- Review pricing and payment procedures and evaluate:
 - a. the extent to which P4P has succeeded in applying WFP's continuing policy of paying market prices not above import parity, and
 - b. how to institute advance procedures that minimize payment delays for farmers while not exposing WFP to undue risk of default (non-delivery of product after partial payment)
- Define defaults (develop more in-depth classification of the reasons of default - quality, low production, alternative formal sales, and explain value, and evaluate what to do with serial defaulters).

Markets beyond WFP

- Develop a policy paper on the use of LRP and P4P in support of grain buying activities of government strategic reserve agencies as in the view of the TRP, top-level institutional guidance is needed to support WFP country offices in making the right decisions in this regard.

- Clarify, institutional mechanism WFP believes most appropriate, regarding the role that P4P plays in shaping and strengthening government school feeding programs.
- Clarify a strategy for engaging with Traders to build sustainability.
- Accelerate actions that work on longer term Government procurement plans e.g. school feeding.

Cost benefit analysis

- Conduct a feasibility analysis, including a cost-benefit analysis and Economic Rate of Return for promising procurement options. It is recommended that a specialist (such as an economist from the FAO Investment Centre) is hired for this cost-benefit analysis first to identify the specific data needs and subsequently to carry out the analysis. This will require access to detailed WFP cost data

Enabling environment

- Select a few key policy areas that WFP can engage in together with the government, donors and other stakeholders. The following are considered most relevant:
 - ✓ High-light the importance of quality standards for market development. Consider focusing on issues that can be achieved within the next 2-3 years, (such as moisture content in wholesale markets).
 - ✓ Advocate for the provision/improvement of market information (systems).
 - ✓ Advocate for Legal Framework for Rural Producer Organizations (RPOs) in countries where legal issues hinder RPO formation and/or functions.
 - ✓ Accelerate discussions with Governments on longer term public procurement policies and opportunities to link smallholder farmers and their organizations with national programmes social safety net programmes such as school feeding as well as prisons/hospital/army procurement.

Evidence of impact

- Reduce impact analysis from 7 to 4 countries
- Confirm the comparability of control and treatment groups for the selected impact assessment countries, and where needed and/or possible increase the sample size of the control groups
- Use more secondary data, where possible to supplement P4P data and as appropriate, add retrospective questions to capture information that has been lost or was not obtained at baseline and during follow-up surveys
- Clearly identify the P4P impact pathways
- At the level of smallholder farmers, place concerted effort on the measurement of income change as a key indicator
- For FOs, evidence of their improved performance over time could focus on indicators such as:
 - ✓ Sales per member
 - ✓ Capacity of storage??
- AERC should carefully describe the process they used to ensure proper matching of panel households across survey years, and present the results in terms of %

immediately matched, % requiring data cleaning to match, and % that remain unmatchable after data cleaning

- AERC should develop a set of systematic metrics of data quality for key original and computed variables. Without specifying a full list (AERC should use its expertise to decide which variables should be included in this list) the TRP provided the following illustrative list:
 - ✓ Within the WFP-P4P data sets, compare means and medians of income to those for expenditure.
 - ✓ Compare both to the most recently available national data, with the comparison properly interpreted in light of the universe that is being represented in the WFP-P4P sample
 - ✓ Present means, medians, standard deviations, and outlier analysis for other for 10-12 other variables (original and computed) of over-riding importance to the analysis
 - ✓ Within households in each data set, examine the consistency over years of variables that should be relatively stable (land size, household size, potentially others)
 - ✓ Present the share of missing values for all original variables and describe the imputation process (if any) they used to fill-in any of these
 - ✓ Do the same for key computed variables
- Carry out more qualitative surveys (of both participating and non-participating FOs) to supplement the quantitative data

Priorities for next TRP meeting:

The TRP made the following requests to the P4P team to:

- Provide TRC with more data in advance of the meeting (at least one month)
- Focus the meetings on key issues and consider eliminating the field trip.
- Provide more TRP / P4P meeting time with small group sessions
- Limit presentations and focus on the story and the evidence that is being developed
- More TRP / P4P meeting time
- Develop small group sessions.
- Propose interim meetings on key topics, specifically related to results

Responding to the TRP requests, the P4P Unit confirmed that the fifth TRP meeting will take place in Rome from 25th to 28th February. The meeting will focus principally on reviewing the data available for impact assessment and the emerging story based on detailed analyses. Invited observers will include AERC and WFP staff as well as selected researchers in agriculture and market development from universities in the AERC network, the US and regions where P4P is operational. The TRP will be asked to make recommendations as appropriate, on further analyses and/or statistical modelling procedures to consider based on the data and analyses that will be presented by AERC.

Potentially, a sixth TRP meeting will be held either towards the end of 2013, or early in 2014 to solicit the TRP's input into the design of the final P4P evaluation which will be undertaken by an external party (yet to be identified) beginning January 2014.

Annex 1 - Agenda – 4th Technical Review Panel – Arusha, Tanzania

Agenda – 4 th P4P Technical Review Panel – Arusha, Tanzania Ngurdoto Mountain Lodge June 11 th – 14 th 2012 “P4P – What Can The Evidence Tell Us?”		
Objective of meeting: To seek expert guidance from the TRP members on:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The analysis and interpretation of emerging quantitative and qualitative evidence on P4P outcomes 		
Expected outcomes:		
TRP will provide recommendations/guidance on:		
1. How to address P4P data limitations 2. Best approaches to analysing and reporting on the available P4P data		
Monday 11th June 2012		
P4P in action in Tanzania		
(TRP members & observers will be joined for the day by a selection of P4P stakeholders in Tanzania as well as private sector partners)		
Field trip to farmers organisations participating in P4P	All participants	
Group 1: Kware Savings and Credits Cooperative Society (SACCOS)		
Group 2: Mbulumbulu Savings and Credits Cooperative Society (SACCOS)		
Participant notes: Each team to select a spokesperson to gather impressions of the field trip from their colleagues and report back to plenary on Day 2		
08h00: Pick up from Ngurdoto Mountain Lodge for field trips		
19H00: ALL PARTICIPANTS - COCKTAIL AT THE NGURDOTO MOUNTAIN LODGE		
Agenda - 4th P4P Technical Review Panel - Arusha, Tanzania Ngurdoto Mountain Lodge June 11th - 14th 2012 “ P4P - What Can The Evidence Tell Us?” Tuesday 12th June 2012 Moving beyond WFP markets (TRP members & observers will be joined for the day by a selection of P4P stakeholders in Tanzania as well as private sector partners)		
08h00 - 08h15	Registration	All participants
08h15 - 08h35	Welcome to Tanzania and TRP meeting	Richard Ragan - WFP Tanzania Country Director
	Opening remarks	Ken Davies - P4P Global Coordinator
08h35 - 09h00	Introductions - Tour de Table	Facilitator: Clare Mbizule
09h00 - 09h05	Outline of the day's objectives and process	Facilitator: Clare Mbizule
09h05 - 09h45	Report back and discussion of field visits impressions:	Facilitator: Clare

	Representative of Groups 1 and 2 visits (2 x 10 min report back and 20 mins discussion = 40 mins)	Mbizule
09h45 - 10h15	<u>Purpose of the session: The P4P global picture</u> Presented by: Jorge Fanlo - Global update on P4P including a summary of the main P4P approaches being implemented	Facilitator: Martin Kabaluapa
10h15 - 10h35	<u>Purpose of the session: Setting the context of P4P in Tanzania</u> Presented by: Dominique Leclercq - Key features of Tanzania P4P country strategy - progress to date, challenges and future prospects	
10h35- 10h50	District Agriculture and Livestock Development Office - Ministry of Agriculture: Perspectives on opening markets to benefit smallholder farmers	
10h50-11h00	Plenary discussion	
11h00 - 11h30	Coffee break	
11h30 - 12h45	<u>Purpose of the session: Facilitators views on building capacity for market access</u> Panel discussion - 1. FAIDA MALI - empowering cooperative societies for farmers to access markets, 2. RUDI - marketing skills and structures needed for farmers to access markets, 3. MIVARF - synergies between IFAD and WFP to assist farmers to access markets (Each partner has 15 minutes to speak about their support to building marketing capacity for FOs and/or extending their market access)	Facilitator: Laura Melo
Agenda - 4th P4P Technical Review Panel - Arusha, Tanzania Ngurdoto Mountain Lodge June 11th - 14th 2012 "P4P - What Can The Evidence Tell Us?" Tuesday 12th June 2012 Moving beyond WFP markets (TRP members & observers will be joined for the day by a selection of P4P stakeholders in Tanzania as well as private sector partners)		
12h45 - 14h00	Lunch	
14h00 - 15h15	<u>Purpose of the session: Facilitators views on building capacity for market access - challenges and opportunities.</u> 1. Empresa de Comercialização Agrícola Lda (Mozambique), 2. National Food Reserve Agency (Each panelist has 15 minutes to speak about the procurement mechanisms they employ, quantity, quality and packaging requirements, payment terms, opportunities and challenges in buying from smallholder farmers)	Facilitator: Mary-Ellen McGroarty
15h15 - 15h45	Coffee break	
15h45 - 16h15	FO voice : EAFF and USAWA Plenary discussion	Facilitator: Laura Melo
16h15 - 16h30	Summary of the day and close of Day 2	Facilitator: Clare Mbizule
Wednesday 13th June 2012 Testing the evidence		
08h00 - 9h30	AERC: Review of the status of P4P data sets, common quality issues and fixes	Facilitator: Clare Mbizule

	Implications for choice of impact assessment countries Presented by: Julius Mangisoni and Jackline Bonabana	
9h30 - 10h15	P4P Mali in brief: Setting the context for discussing the results. Presented by Isabelle Mballa - Mali P4P Coordinator.	Facilitator: Clare Mbizule
10h15 - 10h35	Summary of available P4P data sources Presented by Douglas Krieger	Facilitator: Clare Mbizule
10h35 - 11h00	Coffee break	
11h00 - 13h00	Mali P4P - What the evidence is telling us about FO capacity building so far (summary of quantitative and qualitative evidence to date) Presented by Douglas Krieger (This is an interactive session during which the results of farmer organization and livelihood surveys will be presented)	Facilitators: Martin Kabaluapa
Wednesday 13th June 2012		
Testing the evidence		
13h00 - 14h00	<i>Lunch</i>	
14h00 - 16h00	TRP perspectives on data quality/validity. TRP suggestions on additional methods of analysis, Presented by TRP members	Facilitator :
16h00 - 16h30	Coffee break	
16h30 - 17h15	TRP suggestions on how to adapt to data limitations Presented by TRP members	Facilitator: Laura Melo
Thursday 14th June 2012		
Charting the way forward		
08h30 - 09h30	TRP recommendations on minimum analytical package for impact and non-impact assessment countries	Facilitator: TRP
09h30 - 10h45	Presentation of P4P learning agenda 2012 - 2013	Facilitator: Clare Mbizule
10h45 - 11h00	Coffee break	
11h00 - 11h45	AERC: Briefing on planned external validation (purpose, expected outcomes and proposal for participants) Presented by Innocent Matshe, Bill Lyarkuwa, Jackline Bonabona (AERC)	Facilitator: Clare Mbizule
11h45 - 12h00	Closing remarks	Ken Davies
12h00- 12h45	Lunch	
13h00	Shuttle departs from Ngurdoto Mountain Lodge for Kilimanjaro International Airport	All participants

Appendix 2 – List of meeting participants

TRP MEMBERS		
1	Mr. Boaz Keizire	African Union (CAADP focal point)
2	Mr. Shaun Ferris	Catholic Relief Services
3	Mr. Shukri Ahmed	Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)
4	Mr. Miguel Garcia	Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture
5	Mr. Francesco Rispoli	International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
6	Dr. Maximo Torero	International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) USA
7	Mr. Dave Tschirley	Michigan State University
8	Mr. Gabriel Pons Cortes	OXFAM
9	Ms. Rikka Rajalahti	World Bank
OBSERVERS		
11	Mr. Charles Walwa	National Food Reserve Agency
12	Mr. Muhoni Leonard	Coordinator, MIVARF
13	Mr. Abel Lyimo	CEO, RUDI
14	Mr Tom Sillayo	Faida, Mali
15	Daniel Girisi	Dunia
16	Franck	USAWA
	Grant Taylor	Empresa de Comercialização Agrícola Lda
		DALDO Arusha
	Shem Mecheo	Trade and Agri-Business for East Africa Farmers Federation (EAFF)
AERC staff		
	Innocent Matshe	AERC
	Julius Mangisoni	AERC
	Dennis Ochieng	AERC
WFP STAFF		
23	Ken Davies	P4P Coordinator
24	Clare Mbizule	P4P Senior Programme Advisor
25	Jorge Fanlo	P4P Senior Programme Advisor
26	Alessia De Caterina	P4P Monitoring and Evaluation Officer
27	Martin Kabaluapa	P4P Programme Advisor
28	Douglas Krieger	Consultant
29	Damien Fontaine	P4P Monitoring and Evaluation Officer
30	Laura Melo	P4P Regional Coordinator Panama - WFP
31	Mary-Ellen McGroarty	Procurement Division HQ
32	Belkacem Machane	Logistics Division HQ
33	Jean-Martin Bauer	VAM unit - HQ

34	Francis Bere	P4P Country Coordinator DRC
35	Isabelle Mballa	P4P Country Coordinator - Mali
36	Ana Touza	P4P Country Coordinator - Honduras
37	Simon Dradri	Senior Policy Officer (seconded to ACTESA)
TANZANIA COUNTRY OFFICE		
38	Richard Ragan	CD Tanzania
39	Dominique Leclercq	P4P Country Coordinator Tanzania
40	Willbroad Karugaba	Senior Programme Assistant
41	Bahre Gessesse	Head of Logistics & Procurement Unit
42	Ana Fernandez	P4P Head of Programme Unit
43	Nambu Muhaya	P4P Administrative Assistant