**Results Framework for Pillar A - Integration, Connectivity and Cohesion**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective/Outcome** |  **Indicators**  | **Means of verification** | **Risks and Mitigation** |
| **Promote effective policy and strategy formulation and implementation for corridor development at country and regional levels** | Continental Free Trade Agreements (CFTA) indicators |  | **Risk:** No downstream implementation of strategies**Mitigation:** partnership with development partners |
| **Intermediate outcome** | **Indicators** | **Means of Verification** | **Risks and Mitigation** |
| 1. Consensus built on the strategic orientations for integrated corridor development
2. Consensus built on strategic orientations for performance based corridor development plans
 | * One REC having adopted a holistic and multimodal approach in planning and executing integrated corridor development
* One REC having adopted strategies for performance-based corridor development
 | RECs, Countries and Corridor decisions | **Risk:** SSATP resources will be too limited to fund application of concept of integrated corridor development.**Mitigation:** Partnership with development partners; careful targeting of RECs/countries based on commitment and readiness**Risk:** Lack of inclusive policy dialogue on corridor performance**Mitigation:** Activities related to objective 2 |
| **Outputs** | **Indicators** | **Means of Verification** | **Risks and Mitigation** |
| 1. Assessment of corridor development approaches in Africa/review of REC/corridor strategic development plans
2. Preparation of technical notes on knowledge gaps, assessment and dissemination of experience and good practices and promotion of integrated corridor development and performance-based corridor development
3. Program to promote integrated corridor development and performance-based corridor development
 | * Assessment of strategic plans in RECs and corridor authorities carried out
* Case study of integrated corridor development in Africa
* Review of international good practices
* Stakeholders’ meetings having taken place to advocate integrated corridor development and performance-based corridor development approaches
 | SSATP Publications and progress reports |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective/Outcome** | **Indicators** | **Means of verification** | **Risks and Mitigation** |
| **Develop capacity among institutions[[1]](#footnote-1) for inclusive policy dialogue on regional integration** | One institution meeting capacity criteria (must be sustainable, inclusive, and have monitoring and diagnosis tools) | Institution Charters | **Risk:** Formal existence but no real means for implementation**Mitigation:** capacity building |
| **Intermediate outcome** | **Indicators** | **Means of verification** | **Risks and Mitigation** |
| 1. Capacity building to ensure that institutions are:
* sustainable,
* inclusive, and
* have adequate monitoring and diagnosis tools
1. Continental framework for cooperation in place through the REC TCC
 | * Capacity development plan prepared in one institution including financing framework with composition of institution reflecting diversity of stakeholders (control agencies / logistics operators, traders / agricultural producers, CSO)
* Indicators on corridor performance published
* One institution has agreed to host the REC TCC
 | Budget of the institutionsDecision of the institutionsTransport Observatories ReportsDecision | **Risk:** Lack of political willCapacity of the Governments to contribute to institutions**Mitigation:** Advocacy |
| **Outputs** | **Indicators** | **Means of verification** | **Risks and Mitigation** |
| 1. Capacity review of regional integration institutions, including funding needs and ways to involve stakeholders
2. Assistance for establishment and expansion of Transport Observatories
3. Support to regional coordination mechanism
 | * Capacity review and capacity development plan approved by one institution with funding framework for the institution identified and strategies prepared to engage, involve and inform stakeholders
* Two Regional Economic Communities with unit created with corridor performance monitoring responsibility
* 2 REC TCC meetings per year during four years
 | Study reportDecision by the institutionReport from RECs/corridor authorities |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective/Outcome** | **Indicators** | **Means of verification** | **Risks and Mitigation** |
| **Promote efficient logistics services** | Decrease of total logistic cost on selected corridors | Data collected by Transport Observatories | **Risk:** Increase in input costs may distort the results**Mitigation:** adjust with evolution of prices |
| **Intermediate outcome** | **Indicators** | **Means of verification** | **Risks and Mitigation** |
| Regulatory framework in place per type of logistic service:* Trucking services
* C&F
* Terminal operators
* Rural logistics
* Railways
* Inland waterways
* Control agencies (Customs)
* Single Windows
 | Number of countries having adopted revised regulatory framework | RECs / Countries gazettes | **Risk:** Reluctance of operators / agencies to revise regulatory framework**Mitigation:** Political economy analysis assessing willingness / identifying champions to initiate reformAdvocacy work on the cost of inaction |
| **Outputs** | **Indicators** | **Means of verification** | **Risks and Mitigation** |
| For each type of logistics service, a case study:1. Analysis of the problems
2. Preparation of reform scenarios and review of options
3. Quantification of the cost of inaction
4. Political Economy analysis
5. Assessment of capacity development / training needs for operators
 | Three case studies carried out. Each case study covers: * Analysis of the problems
* Preparation of reform scenarios and review of options
* Quantification of the cost of inaction
* Political Economy analysis
* Assessment of capacity development/training needs for operators
 | Decisions from RECs/countries |  |

1. 3 Institutions refer to RECs, Corridor authority, National Facilitation Committees (aligned on a corridor), Industry associations (national or regional federations [↑](#footnote-ref-1)