**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 institutions  Decision of the institutions  Transport Observatories Reports  Decision | **Risk:** Lack of political will  Capacity 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 report  Decision by the institution  Report 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 reform  Advocacy 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)