



7th Meeting of the Africa Partnership Forum
Moscow, Russia
26-27 October 2006

Cover Note for the APF Progress Reports

1. This note describes the approach taken in the three African Partnership Forum Progress Reports - on infrastructure, HIV/AIDs and agriculture. The objective of these reports is;
 - To give a broad assessment of progress made in each of these areas;
 - To focus particularly on bottlenecks and next steps; and
 - To present this information in as clear and accessible a format as possible.
2. The three papers follow a common format. A short 'overview' section contains:
 - An opening synopsis, designed to set the report in a context of commitments and targets from Africa and development partners, and to summarise the main messages;
 - A "scorecard" of progress against a small selection of *key monitoring issues*. This scorecard uses the 'traffic lights' system which has been widely used to score progress against the MDGs;
 - A summary section describing (in matrix form) the key successes, bottlenecks, next steps and responsibilities under each of the *key monitoring issues*;
 - Information on results, using maps and graphs.
3. The 'overview' is followed by an Annex providing a fuller assessment of each of the *key monitoring issues*:
 - Identifying for each of these a small number of indicators and providing an assessment of progress and bottlenecks. We have tried to keep to around 12 indicators in total;
 - And followed by key references e.g. the main relevant international declarations or communiqués in this area.

This document briefly describes the approach taken in the three APF Progress Reports on infrastructure, HIV/AIDs and agriculture. These papers will be discussed on Thursday, 26 October starting at 10:00.

4. We have used the following definitions for the 'traffic lights';
Red - little or no progress being made
Amber - significant movement in the right direction, but more to be done
Green - on track: good progress being made

5. We should add 4 further points:
 - In order to keep the texts to a manageable length, we have inevitably had to be very selective - 4 to 6 key issues with an average of 12 underpinning indicators;
 - There have been some real problems in finding data. Improving the database and developing monitoring systems are both top priorities;
 - Against this background there is inevitably a degree of subjectivity in the scores, and therefore room for debate. With that caveat, we nonetheless think that the 'scorecard' approach is a useful one;
 - We have taken advice from experts in each of these areas, and in particular from colleagues in the NEPAD Secretariat, and owe thanks to all for their inputs. But the responsibility for the assessments, and for any errors and omissions, rests fully with the APF Support Unit.

6. Participants are invited to express their views on the following points:
 - Is the assessment of progress in each paper broadly right?
 - What are the most effective ways of following up discussion – in order to ensure that action is taken?
 - Is the reporting format -- which has been designed by the Support Unit specifically for the APF -- a useful one?