

**FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT OF ETHIOPIA
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE**



**ETHIOPIA'S AGRICULTURAL SECTOR POLICY AND
INVESTMENT FRAMEWORK (PIF) 2010–2020
THIRD ANNUAL REVIEW**

**By
Tadesse Kuma Worako¹**

**June 2014
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia**

¹ The author is highly indebted to the professional support given by all partners during this review process.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
I. OVERVIEW OF PIF REVIEW	I
II. SECTORAL BACKGROUND	I
III. REVIEW OF PIF INVESTMENT AND FINANCE	3
PIF Investment	3
Sources of Finance	4
Spending on Flagship Projects	5
Implementation of New Alliance Framework	5
Monitoring and Evaluation	6
IV. REVIEW OF RED&FS SYSTEM	6
Paris Declaration and REDFS	6
Progress in Implementation of Work Plans	10
Executive Committee	10
Technical Committees	10
Task Force	11
Broader Platform	13
Cross-Pillar Task Force	14
Implementation of Recommendation in the 1st and 2nd PIF Reviews	14
Need for the PIF Review	16
Highlights of Key Challenges	16
V. ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS	17
REFERENCES	22
APPENDICES	21

ABBREVIATIONS

AG	Agricultural Growth
AGP	Agricultural Growth Programme
ATA	Agricultural Transformation Agency
BSC	Balanced Score Card
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CPP	Country Programming Paper
CPTF	Cross-pillar Task Force
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DAG	Development Assistance Group
DPs	Development Partners
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRMFS	Disaster Risk Management and Food Security
EIAR	Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research
ETB	Ethiopian Birr
ExCom	Executive Committee
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FDRE	Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GoE	Government of Ethiopia
GTP	Growth and Transformation Plan
HABP	Household Asset Building Programme
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
LOI	Letter of Intent
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MCLTF	Mixed Crop-Livestock Systems Task Force
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MDTF	Multi-Donor Trust Fund
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
MoFED	Ministry of Finance and Economic Development
MoI	Ministry of Industry
MoT	Ministry of Trade
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
PASDEP	Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End Poverty
PIF	Policy and Investment Framework
PPD	Planning and Programming Directorate (of MoA)
PRTF	PIF Review Task Force
PSDTF	Private Sector Development Task Force
PSNP	Productive Safety Net Programme
RED&FS SWG	Rural Economic Development and Food Sector Working Group
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
SLMP	Sustainable Land Management Programme
SO	Strategic Objective
TC	Technical Committee

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The annual PIF Retreat was held on 27-28 June 2014 in Debre Zeit. More than 65 participants drawn from the Government and Development Partners (DPs) attended the retreat. The review included extensive consultations and a series of discussions, namely presentation of an initial report from the PIF review consultant, preliminary report on PIF investment performance by ATA, and followed with a number of sector presentations on key strategic issues² (see Appendix 1). During the retreat, four working groups were formed based on the existing Technical Committee structure (Agriculture Growth, Livestock, SLM, and DRMFS) and were asked to address four questions³. The output of the working groups was discussed in plenary (see Appendix 2). The following core issues and recommendations emanated from both consultants' review report and from the Retreat consultation.

Recommendation No. I: Further strengthening RED&FS system

There was general consensus that RED&FS system is a working structure cited as an exemplary structure not only for Ethiopia but also for other African countries. Its importance and contribution was highly appreciated by all Government and Development Partners. It has begun to lay the foundations for sustainable progress in agriculture and rural development by engaging all stakeholders, building partnerships and trust, providing a roadmap for progressively increasing government responsibility for financing the investment framework; and coordinating and aligning resources from development partners. However, there are number of areas that need improvements to increase the effectiveness of the RED&FS system. These include:

- Further strengthen the leadership support and guidance to make RED&FS system more effective and efficient to maintain and solidify the momentum of gains made in the past years;
- Lack of adequate data and information is one of the serious challenges to undertake progress assessment against targets and update policies based on evidence for future development of the sector. In light of this, there is strong need to build capacity of Planning and Program Directorate (PPD) of the Federal Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) and enable the Directorate to formulate development plans, prioritize investments, design and coordinate projects, monitor and evaluate progress, assess the potential outcomes and impact, and foster knowledge management. There is belief by all stakeholders that PPD should be developed as a center of excellence/brain hub of the MoA. In this regard, ReSAKKS would add value in supporting the PDD.
- Improve M&E system to reduce the current fragmented approach, and to measure results from the PIF perspective and the sector as a whole;

² Nine issue papers were presented namely on: synergies between flagship programmes, drought resilience, SLM up-scaling, nutrition, New Alliance progress, CRGE integration into PIF, rationalization of veterinary services, gender and agriculture, and strengthening knowledge support to agriculture.

³ What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current PIF for your TC? What are the 4 priority strategic issues for your TC to address leading to the PIF revision and how to align with GTP2 and CAADP? What does your TC see as the key steps required for the revision of the PIF? How to ensure synergy and linkages are built across TCs within a cohesive PIF? How to engage wider stakeholders in the PIF revision: who to engage and how?

- Increase harmonization and alignment between flagship programmes including best practice, and the harmonization of remuneration, per diems and other incentives, and harmonization of finance through adopting basket funding approach;
- Further strengthen the RED&FS Secretariat to discharge its responsibilities effectively;
- Increase funding for PIF investment and improve spending in the flagship programmes⁴; and
- Strengthen the cross-pillar task force to institute clear mechanisms for the sharing of lessons learned, and tap in the opportunity to build cross-pillar synergy starting with areas of common geographical overlap.

Next Steps: Mandate a joint MOA-DP group to forge mechanisms to strengthen effective support and guidance from leadership, solidify PPD, and harmonize the flagship programmes starting with areas of geographic overlap and use the results to inform the design and implementation of the next generation PSNP, AGP and SLMP.

Recommendation No. 2: Alignment of PIF II with GTP II

There was overall consensus about the need to ensure that the PIF is fully aligned with the GTP II to ensure the PIF is a direct reflection of the government priorities and to avoid any possible duplication. While the GTP II elaborates the overall objectives for the country including the agricultural sector, the PIF should then build on these overarching objectives in greater details. In this regard, a number of issues were identified for follow up including determining the process of consultation and engagement for the PIF review and revision, and the connection between the PIF review process and the GTP II formulation. A further suggestion was made as regards the importance on how RED&FS could best contribute to this consultation process in terms of facilitating the best outcomes and building on the wealth of shared implementation experience to date.

There was also broad consensus about the need to undertake **comprehensive review of current PIF and Roadmap**, especially in light of the national policy changes since the original PIF was drafted. It was noted that the review process has already begun with the initiation of the PIF investment analysis undertaken with the support of ATA that was presented at the Retreat. The analysis led to a rigorous discussion and pointed to a theme throughout the Retreat: the need for more evidence based learning to know what the outcomes of the PIF are, and to make the necessary adjustments moving forward. While doing so, the comprehensive review of PIF should as much as possible give weight to the inclusion of gender, CRGE, drought resilience, nutrition, the New Alliance and livestock and pastoralism in its entirety.

Regarding PIF ownership that was pointed out during the discussion, His Excellency Ato Sileshi Getahun, State Minister for Natural Resource Management in his concluding remark commented that the PIF was originally developed by MoA working closely with DPs and owned by MOA. The PIF is a living

⁴ Slow spending mainly account for divergent financial management and procurement processes and procedures required by different partners affected efficiency & effectiveness, timely completion and settlements. This again coupled with Lack of adequate financial management capacity at lower level (i.e., woreda) implementing bodies.

document that can be reviewed and updated. Above all, the PIF is in tandem with African CAADP program indigenised for Ethiopia. RED&FS is an important and integral part of MoA that aligns and coordinates investments and activities in the sector.

Next Steps: Clarify how PIF relates to GTP II including the proper sequencing of the PIF review and develop a clear consultation process for the development of PIF objectives stemming from GTP II. The role of RED&FS and how it can add value to this PIF review process further need to be defined including date for launching review process.

Recommendation No. 3: Others

Other recommendations included:

- 1) Nutrition and gender should be mainstreamed and considered under all TCs in all planning and progress review process.
- 2) Clear representation of CSOs in the RED&FS structure and institutionalization of system required to solidify their role to track their contribution and participation using existing umbrella structure.

I. OVERVIEW OF PIF REVIEW

The Agricultural Policy and Investment Framework (PIF) annual review is a joint Government and Development Partners (DPs) exercise aimed at assessing the effectiveness of implementation of the PIF against the PIF roadmap/annual work plan as the key framework of assessment. In addition, it may be necessary to review the RED&FS SWG structure in light of the dynamic and emerging issues and the growing need to strengthen harmonization across RED&FS flagship programmes. There is always general concern among stakeholders about the way that the RED&FS system is working; what has been achieved and what is missing. The overall objective of the review exercise is to take stock of PIF implementation, identify, discuss and take action on constraints within the sector that will ultimately strengthen effectiveness of resource use and eventually ensure the food and nutrition security of the nation.

This summary note is intended to stimulate and support debate on the future of the PIF and the RED&FS system at the 3rd Annual Review retreat held in 27th and 28th June 2014. This draft Report includes the (1) sector background, rationale of PIF and its priority investment areas (2) RED&FS system and its performance, (3) progresses made towards implementation of TCs and TFs work plan for 2013/2014; and (4) progress in the implementation of recommendations made in the 1st and 2nd PIF Review. The last Section deals with areas of concern and possible recommendations to improve the future implementation of PIF.

This review is based on close consultation with key stakeholders selected from the Government (MoA) and DPs which have been engaged in the process of PIF implementation at different levels. The issue papers prepared as background to the 3rd PIF review are also heavily used as source documents. Progress reports from Technical Committees (TCs) and Task Forces (TFs), minutes and secondary data from the RED&FS Secretariat are also used to enrich the review. In addition, discussions were also held with the envisaged future potential partners⁵.

II. SECTORAL BACKGROUND

Agriculture is the way of life for millions of Ethiopians who make their livelihoods from it. Cognizant of this fact, the Ethiopian Government (GoE) has formulated a consistent set of policies and strategies for agriculture and rural development, prioritizing the promotion of food security and poverty alleviation at the center of all national development policy initiatives. The importance of agriculture is well communicated and internalized from top leaders to bottom tiers of administrative and political structure.

Accordingly, since the mid-1990s, the government has adopted a long-term development initiative called Agricultural Development Led Industrialization (ADLI). It is comprehensive national development framework which puts prior importance for agricultural sector growth in the short and medium terms as driver for envisaged long-term industrialization of the economy. To accelerate progress, the government

5. Discussion with ReSAKSS Africa wide and ReSAKSS-East and Central Africa coordinators

has exerted tremendous efforts on human capacity building, expanding infrastructure, liberalizing the economy, building institutions, and decentralizing political and financial administration to lower tiers of government.

It further synchronized the national development initiative with AU's regional initiative called Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) framework. The GoE formulated one national, comprehensive, broad, harmonized and aligned development strategy called the Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), enacted in 2010 which is Ethiopia's guiding food security plan, designed to achieve 8% annual growth in agricultural productivity. PIF was later synchronized with Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP). This is Ethiopia's national development plan (multi-sectoral plan) for the period 2011-2015. It calls for Ethiopia to be a middle income country by 2025. In effect, GTP has overtaken all earlier plan including PIF.

The PIF provides a ten year strategic framework (2010-2020) identifying high level Strategic Objectives (SOs) and Priority Investment Areas for agricultural development, estimates of financing needs and a designed implementation road-map. It outlines an overall development vision, supported by a set of strategic objectives and expected outcomes. The PIF vision and strategic framework are also consistent with the goals and targets set forth in Ethiopia's Five Year Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP) – the country's new development master plan covering the period 2011-2015.

Consistent with priority of the GoE, the rationale behind PIF is to increase productivity in smallholder agriculture by directing more investment in agriculture through mobilizing resources from multiple sources. PIF also seeks to enable smallholder farmers to graduate from purely subsistence farming to more market oriented high value commercial production. PIF also places sustainable natural resource management practices at the center of its intervention in order to halt current environmental degradation and curb the danger of climate change. In addition to long term development intervention, it protects those smallholders who face food shortfalls and shocks to meet household food needs and provide support to vulnerable groups through the ongoing social safety net programmes.

In sum, the overall objective of the PIF is to contribute to Ethiopia's achievement of middle income status by 2025. The Development Objective aims to “sustainably increase rural incomes and national food security”. This objective embodies the concepts of producing more, selling more, nurturing the environment, eliminating hunger and protecting the vulnerable against shocks. All of these are reflected in various national policy instruments, and are expressed in terms of five main themes (including the recent livestock sector development). All thematic areas have their Strategic Objective as depicted below (Table I).

Table I: PIF thematic areas, SOs and Corresponding RED&FS Pillars and Flagship Programmes

Thematic Area	PIF Strategic Objective (SOs)		RED&FS Technical Committee/Pillar	Flagship Programmes	Number of Task Forces (TFs)
Productivity and Production growth	SO1:	Achieve a sustainable increase in agricultural productivity and production.	Agricultural Growth	AGP	4 TFs
Rural Commercialization	SO2:	Accelerate agricultural commercialization and agro-industrial development.			
Natural Resource Management	SO3:	Reduce degradation and improve productivity of natural resources.	Sustainable Land Management	SLMP LALUD EP	5 TFs
Disaster Risk Management and Food Security	SO4:	Achieve universal food security and protect vulnerable households from natural disasters.	Disaster Risk Management and Food Security	PSNP HABP	5 TFs
Livestock Sector Development	SO5:	Promote livestock production, productivity, value, to improve livelihood of farming households	Livestock Sector Development		2 TFs

Source: RED&FS, 2014

III. REVIEW OF PIF INVESTMENT AND FINANCE

For sub-Saharan Africa, agricultural growth is more likely to be pro-poor than is industrial growth (Diao et al. 2012; Mogues and Bennin 2012). Agricultural productivity in many African countries still lags far behind that of the rest of the world. This is not because of lack of productive potential but rather due to lack adequate investment on proper technologies, improved agricultural inputs, marketing, and water resources management. Understanding this bottleneck, CAADP initiated a strong platform for policy and partnership in agriculture sector development through directing more investment for agricultural sector development⁶. The programme emphasizes broad planning and collaboration in implementation among government, donors, the private sector, and non-profit and research organizations. CAADP also embodies the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) principles of mutual accountability, country ownership, inclusiveness, benchmarking, peer review and mutual learning (IFPRI, 2010).

PIF Investment

Accordingly, Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework was formulated as a roadmap for ten years and identified priority areas for investment that will drive Ethiopia's agricultural growth and transformation. PIF estimates the financing needs to be committed by the Government and Development Partners during 2010-2020 at USD 15.5 billion. Sixty percent of the finance is expected to be contributed by the Government and the rest by DPs and others. Indeed, this is subject to revision depending on the Government's tax revenue growth, emerging demand from stakeholders, and unforeseen changes in the priority areas of investment, which could affect availability of fund.

⁶ CAADP requires participating countries to allocate 10% of their national budgets to agriculture and food security, and targets an annual agricultural growth of 6%.

Table 2: PIF financing plan assuming 6% per annum GDP growth (USD millions)

Strategic Objectives	Ongoing & incremental investment need	
	Million USD	% share
SO1: Productivity and Production improvement, including irrigation	7,251	46.4
SO2: Rural Commercialization	995	6.4
SO3: Natural Resource Management	2,975	19.2
SO4: Disaster Risk Management and Food Security	3,107	20
Contingency	1,172	7.6
Total estimated investment	15,499	100

However, the 2nd Review of PIF had noted concern that the earlier planned estimate on PIF financial need may have under-estimated the magnitude of investment required to ensure 8% agricultural growth. The initial planned PIF investment estimate (i.e., 15.5-18 billion USD) is likely to generate to 6% growth. This is satisfactory by all standards but falls short of the amount required to achieve the GTP target. The revised estimate indicates, USD 23 billion investment is need over ten years to meet 8% growth of agriculture sector growth which is also consistent with other sectoral growth plans (see PIF Review II, 2013 for more detail). The major suggestion from 2nd PIF review consultants was the need to accelerate investment in the remaining years of PIF implementation in order to attain intended outcomes stipulated in the GTP.

Sources of Finance

The major sources of PIF finance include the federal and regional governments, development partners, beneficiary communities, and the private sector. The GOE & DPs have demonstrated a strong commitment by allocation of a substantial proportion of their budget to priority investment areas. The Government has on average allocated 18% of its total annual expenditure on agriculture since 2004; since long before the initiation of PIF. The DPs since launching of the programme in late 2010 have contributed about 3.8 billion USD (RED&FS Secretariat, 2014). Out of this, 1.18 billion (32%) was directed to Agricultural Growth; 0.24 billion (6%) for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and 2.34 billion (62%) for Disaster Risk Management and Food Security Programme (DRMFS). This distribution of investment funds is inconsistent with initial plans where the AG programme forseen to take major share (i.e., 52.8%), and followed by SLM and DRMFS.

A total of 22 development partners accounted for a large share of donor funding. The AG was financed by a multi-donor fund which accounted for 38.3%, followed by USAID, EKN, CIDA, and DFID/UK which contributed 13.4%, 11.5%, 11.0%, 8.2% of the funding respectively. The rest of the donors contributed between 0.5% and 4% of the total funds to the programme. The SLM was largely supported by the multi-donor fund, followed by MoA, WFP and DFID. Similarly, DRMFS is highly dependent on the Multi-Donor Trust Fund which accounted for 85.8% of total funding. When we consider the amount of resource generated over 2010-2014, it is 3.8 billion or 25% of initial plan mainly from the DPs side. The government spending on the other hand also substantially increased over the same period.

The GoE has shown clear dedication in promoting sustainable, broad based agricultural sector production and productivity. In witness, the Government has increased public spending on agriculture increased from Birr 7.3 billion in 2005/06 to Birr 31.7 billion in 2013/14 (MoFED, 2013/14). Public spending on agriculture as share of total Government budget accounted for 18 percent on average for period 2005-2013/14. Out of this, 71 percent was directed to capital investment and the remaining 29 percent allocated for recurrent expenditure, implying more attention was given by the Federal Government for financing investment projects on agriculture vis-a-vis recurrent expenses.

Spending on Flagship Projects

The implementation of flagship projects supported priorities investments identified in the PIF, namely Agricultural Growth Programme, Sustainable Land Management Programme, and Productive Safety Net Programme. These programmes have attracted substantial portion of funding commitments from GoE and the DPs. As some of evidence on fund utilization indicate, slow spending is become a challenge facing these programmes. For instance, out of 0.41 billion USD allocated for AGP over 2010/11 – 2013/14 period, burn-rate remained below 60%. Similarly, DRMFS has got 2.1 billion over the same period and its spending remained below 70%. As depicted during discussion with key informants, his low burn-rate attribute to complex procedures required to fund disbursement, procurement and reporting. The requirements are different among different DPs and this has adversely affected efficiency & effectiveness of resources use; timely settlement of advances; predictability and smooth resources flow to implementers; timely and periodic reporting.

In addition to this, delays in disbursement have resulted in a substantial amount of funds remain unused or expire in the three of flagship programmes. The amount of expired funds is estimated to be about 111 million USD from three programmes (RED&FS Secretariat, 2014). Despite visible success in mobilizing substantial resources for implementing the envisaged PIF programmes, spending has remained slow because of lack of implementation capacity at different layers of administrative chain from Federal to woreda level and complexity of procedures. It is, therefore, one of important area of concern that needs the attention of Government and its partners on how to improve current utilization rate.

Implementation of New Alliance Framework

The New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition was launched in 2012 under the US G8 Presidency as a joint initiative between African leaders, the private sector, and donors to accelerate responsible investment in African agriculture and to lift 50 million people out of poverty by 2022. In Ethiopia it aims to lift 2.9 million smallholders from poverty by 2022 by increasing private sector participation and access to market by removing policy and institutional barriers. Towards this end, the government has signed 15 policy commitments identified for improvement. Fourteen private sector partners have outlined their investment plans by signing “Letters of Intent (LOI)”. The aggregate spending is estimated to be USD \$1.52 billion.

In terms progress, out of the 15 commitments made by the Government one is completed fully; 4 are in good progress; 7 have made some progress and 2 have made no progress. Out of the 14 private companies that signed LOI, 3 have completed their investment; 4 registered good progress; 5 showed some progress and 2 have attained no progress. From the \$1.52 billion committed resources from 9 partners, 932.3

million or 82.9% is disbursed till June 2014 which is more or less on track with its initial plan (New Alliance progress review, 2014).

A private sector development Task Force (PSDTF) under the Agricultural Growth Pillar of RED&FS was given the responsibility of monitoring implementation of the New Alliance initiatives. However, there is a felt need for more leadership guidance and support from PSDTF. Besides this, the erection of a strong M&E system for tracking progress in relation to Government policy reform as committed, donor fund disbursement, and private sector investment as agreed is highly desirable. Aligning the New Alliance review system with the annual PIF review is another area of concern for improved performance.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Development of a robust M&E system for the agricultural sector is a priority engagement for the MoA. The Planning and Programming Directorate is responsible for both the development of strategic plans as well as monitoring and evaluating progress. The primary functions of a typical M&E is to generate objective evidence on progress; facilitate lessons learning, adaptation and performance improvement; and to enhance accountability to stakeholders. However, M&E system in the MOA/PIF is highly fragmented and in many cases is limited to project level. As a result, it is very difficult to gauge how much the investment at aggregate level on PIF has contributed to the overall agricultural sector growth; what success stories prevailed and what gaps exist. Hence, putting in place a working M&E system by strengthening PPD is an equally important intervention to investment plans in all projects and programmes.

IV. REVIEW OF RED&FS SYSTEM

PIF has an institutional framework established to co-ordinate implementation of identified thematic policy areas. The Rural Economic Development and Food Security (RED&FS) Sector Working Group (SWG) organizational setup embraces GoE-Donor Platform, an Executive Committee (EXCOM) and Technical Committees (TCs) namely: Agricultural Growth, Sustainable Land Management, Disaster Risk Management and Food Security and (iv) Livestock Sector that later introduced as fourth technical committee after the Government appointment of a new State Minister for livestock sector.

This coordinated effort by the GoE together with its DPs has facilitated the attainment of high and steady agricultural growth, on average 10% per annum over the last decade. According to official statistics from CSA, total cereals production respectively grew from 9 million tons to 22.7 million tons between 2004 and 2013/14. This, together with other multiple interventions, induced the national food poverty head count to drop from 42% in 1999/00 to 29% in 2010/11 (MoFED, 2011). Despite this progress, Ethiopian agriculture is characterized by low input and low output. That is, inadequate dynamics is registered in commercialization; productivity still remains at low levels and there is limited supply response to increased demand in the market.

Paris Declaration and REDFS

In line with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness principles of local ownership, improved donor coordination, results-based approach, and mutual accountability, the Rural Economic Development and

Food Security (RED&FS) Sector Working Group (SWG) was formally established in April 2008 with the following mandates:

- Share information on GoE policies, strategies, and programmes based on national development plan objectives and targets (e.g., as set forth in the GTP and PIF);
- Review sector level plan implementation status and other ongoing efforts of the GoE and requirements of the sector;
- Coordinate, facilitate and harmonize efforts of various development partners supporting the sector; and
- Interact with and mobilize partners to provide additional support, so as to achieve national and Millennium Development Goals.

Accordingly, since its establishment, the RED&FS has brought together GoE and DPs to jointly act to support the sector performance. The RED&FS is an exceptionally robust and active mechanism, with professional staff funded from two trust funds administered by the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) and the World Bank (WB). There are 22 bilateral and multilateral development agencies⁷ providing assistance to rural economic development and food security sectors in Ethiopia. RED&FS system over the past two years, has provided leadership to Ethiopia's CAADP process. To operationalize its mandate, the RED&FS established the office of RED&FS Secretariat and four multi-stakeholder Technical Committees (TCs) to help govern efforts under four "Pillars" stated above (see Appendix Figure I).

RED&FS is supported by the secretariat based in MOA. The objective of the secretariat is to strengthen linkages among the TCs and to meet the information and communication needs of the SWG. Its core functions are knowledge management, networking and coordination, communication and programme support. The secretariat is staffed by a MoA coordinator, an M&E specialist and a Donor coordinator. On the basis of recommendations from the 2nd PIF Review, the secretariat office was recommended to be strengthened and accordingly four dedicated professionals were proposed to be hired (one for each TC). However, only 2 positions were approved by the RED&FS Executive Committee and the process of recruitment has been slow. Even these are still not in place. In the meantime, some TCs have started to hire their own technical experts to support tasks in their specific thematic areas. The slow recruitment process has thus resulted in delay for timely support to be rendered for the TCs and TFs.

As transpired during key stakeholder discussions, interviewees largely and uniformly appreciated RED&FS's importance and its contributions since establishment in the context of the following reasons:

- i. Increased understanding between the Government and DPs in terms of development planning initiatives, reviewing progresses, and challenges;

⁷ These include: African Development Bank, Austria, Canada, European Union, FAO, Finland, France, Germany, IFAD, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, UNDP, United Kingdom, United States, World Bank and World Food Program.

- ii. Improved communication and operation;
- iii. Increased resource mobilization in pursuit of Government identified development goals;
- iv. Improved harmonization and alignment of support for the sector;
- v. Enhanced Aid Effectiveness in line with Paris Declaration; and`
- vi. Now DPs are more responsive to government requests for technical and financial assistance.

Areas of concern: RED&FS is one of the typical platforms and durable structures that have brought effective donor-Government collaboration in Ethiopia. However, there is a growing feeling on both sides that it needs to be re-invented and re-vitalized. There are a number of justifications advanced by stakeholders during discussions with key informants. Some of these include:

- Role of leadership in the PIF process is not as strong as expected. Since the 2nd PIF review, all TCs are chaired by state ministers of the respective sub-sectors. The level of coordination between TCs has only improved in some of the TCs and TFs. However, there are unresolved concerns in some areas.
- Government representatives are too busy to engage fully in RED&FS processes, which have evolved to become very demanding, especially of senior decision makers. Due to their busy schedules, absenteeism of the government representatives is a common problem area for the implementation of RED&FS;
- Postponing or re-scheduling of meetings of TCs/TFs has to some extent posed questions on priority government has attached to PIF issues and platforms;
- Low turnout rate is linked to short notice call for meetings. Failure of prior circulation of minutes and other relevant documents has been adversely affecting effective dialogue on meeting agendas;
- The ExCom meeting is the highest level forum of the RED&FS structure and is expected to deal with strategic policy issues and act as a platform for in-depth dialogue in order to build a common understanding on core successes and challenges. However, the largest share of these meeting time is devoted to hearing progress reports of TCs rather than dialogue on strategic policy issues;
- Annual work plan formulation process and extent of engagement of all members of TCs/TFs in terms of identification of strategic issues and pressing development needs foster participation and ownership. This is mainly because quality of planning process is the stepping stone for later implementation and establishing a common wavelength.

To sum up, leadership is a critical ingredient and need to be improved. “Everything rises and falls on leadership.” Leadership matters because no one and nothing comes to success without it. All the recent success and economic progress of the nation could not have been achieved without effective leadership. To sustain the current momentum of progress in the agriculture sector, continued and insightful leadership guidance and support is needed.

The Planning and Programming Directorate (PPD) is perceived as a potential brain center for MoA and a core structure which should play an indispensable role as center of excellence towards formulation of

development plans, prioritizing investments, designing and coordinating projects, monitoring and evaluation of progresses, assessing the potential outcomes and impact of interventions. Besides, this Directorate is also responsible for coordinating other Directorates in the Ministry.

The Ministry has a large number of Directorates with numerous subdivisions to implement several planned activities under their jurisdiction. The relation with other line Ministries and regional Bureaus of Agriculture (BoA) also needs PPD's active coordinating role. In addition, knowledge management, capacity building, monitoring and evaluation, data gathering and interpretation, analysis and dissemination among others require effective role of PPD at the ministry level.

There are 23 major projects under implementation in the four RED&FS flagship programmes. Currently there are also more than 100 projects under the RED&FS structure located in different regions. Their progress in implementation needs continuous follow-up. However, aside from fragmented M&E at the project level, there is no comprehensive M&E System under PPD. To fulfill these responsibilities, PPD should be a vibrant, capable, and effective Directorate authorized to take actions on these issues as an integral part of its jurisdiction.

However, PPD lacks human, financial, and technical capacities and the motivations to execute the huge responsibilities. ATA and other partners are providing some institutional support by hiring technical experts to work for PPD on a temporary basis. This approach might be good to fill gaps in immediate support needed but does not seem to be sustainable unless in-house capability is developed.

Strengthening PPD is largely related with strengthening RED&FS. When PPD is equipped with adequate capacity, many of the current problems that the RED&FS faces would be resolved with time. For instance, currently there is no clear evidence on progresses of PIF funding commitments made by DPs, government, and other actors. The extent of making decision on the basis of evidences is also constrained by lack capacity at PPD.

There are studies completed on how to build capacity of PPD by CIAFS/USAID, FAO, SaKSS and ATA, which the MoA can take advantage in order to set clear and guiding principles on how to hire, motivate, retain, promote and related packages for professional work at PPD. It is also important to draw lessons from the experiences of other line ministries such as the Ministry of Health (MoH).

Increased PPD capacity entails the following benefits:

- Priorities of investment at macro, *meso* and micro levels will be known
- It will be possible to know over time who is doing what and the outputs and outcomes from implementation
- Evidence based policy making will be enhanced
- New policy options could be explored and communicated
- Commitments and progress by the Government and donors can be closely assessed;
- More data and information on the sector could be collected, analyzed and used.

In sum, there is a strong need to put in place a vibrant PPD with threshold levels of human capacity, financial and working facilities. An incentive package for the professionals in the PPD should also be crafted.

Progress in Implementation of Work Plans

The RED&FS is built on four sector pillars led by a dedicated Technical Committee⁸, chaired by the State Ministers and co-chaired by DPs. TCs are responsible to advance policy, formulate work plan, review progress, and carry out specific assignments within their thematic areas. There are numerous Task Forces (TFs) and Working Groups (WGs) entrusted with specific focal areas within the sector. All technical committees and Sub-Groups produce annual Work Plans that describe the aspirations and activities for the group and specific year. These Work Plans are approved and vetted by the overseeing Executive Committee. Its progress is reviewed every two months in each TCs and on quarterly basis at ExCom level.

Executive Committee

According to its TOR, the ExCom is supposed to meet at least once per three months (quarterly) under the chair of the Federal Minister of Agriculture. However, for 2013/14, three ExCom meetings were held and the minutes are on file. The EXCOM accomplished 75% of its planned meetings. If we consider the 3rd PIF retreat as part of its meetings, then we can say it has met four times meetings as planned.

ExCOM meeting is the highest level gathering designed to have formal insights and information exchange on progress and implementation. However, it has limited time to have detailed dialogues on important strategic issues with key government and donor representatives and pin down areas of improvement.

Technical Committees

Despite considerable differences in regularity of meetings (see Table 3), since the recommendation by 2nd PIF Review, all TCs are chaired by State Ministers and/or their designates when they could not make it. In the later case, when TCs meeting are chaired by designates who do not have the authority and jurisdiction to make strategic decisions, progress is impaired because the proposed decisions needs to be communicated later to State Ministers to get their consent. Besides, debates on agenda and core issues may suffer from lack of authority and vitality in the absence of the incumbent state ministers.

SLM performed better compared to other TCs (4 times out of six) and DRMFS had only one time (1st Nov. 2013) which is the lowest. They planned to have meeting on January, February and March 2014 but none of them were realized. This low frequency of meetings has an implication on extent of communication and vitality and devotion attached to PIF assignments. In broad term, therefore, regularity of meeting of TCs and TFs and leadership support and guidance needs further improvement.

⁸These are: Agricultural Growth (AG TC), Sustainable Land Management (SLM TC), Disaster Risk Management and Food Security (DRMFS TC) and most recently Livestock (LS TC).

Table 3: The number of expected and actualized meetings.

TCs	Frequency of meeting	# of expected meetings	# of meetings realized	% accomplished	Remarks
AG TC	Bi-monthly	6	3	50%	Meetings of flagship programmes have received greater attention
SLM TC	Bi-monthly	6	4	67%	
DRMFS TC	Bi-monthly	6	1	17%	
LS TC	Bi-monthly	6	3	50%	

Source: RED&FS Secretariat documentation, 2014

Task Force

(i). **Implementation under AG TC:** The TC followed a more participatory process during its work plan formulation to make the plan more realistic and feasible with clear priority. It created four new Task Forces. As stated in AG TC work plan for 2013/14 (July 2013 – June 2014), they identified three core tasks to be accomplished (i.e., completing “Common Intervention Framework”, one data analysis on the AG portfolio investment, and planned to organize meeting to share findings of AG MTR). However, only AG pillar data analysis exercise was done to show ODA flows. The implementation status of other planned activities is not reported clearly.

PSDTF - It has made considerable progress towards its work plan implementation (i.e., implementation of G8 New Alliance is progressing well and its progress review completed); development partners for newly established Ethiopia Agricultural Land Investment Agency (EALIA) were identified and are working together. However, out of 197 vacant positions some are occupied, has obtained separate office and fully operational since July 2014. As depicted by EALIA professional, the government has transferred about 2.2 million hectares of land for private investors but little is known about their progress and operational status. PSDTF has planned to conduct “Status Review Assessment” of these private commercial farms but was not realized due to lack of internal capacity. M&E system is also missing to track performance of private farmers. USAID has completed the construction of four warehouses, totaling 20,000 MT in Metema, Dansha, Humera and Abrhajira. Eight to ten more are planned for 2014/15.

There is a high probability for expansion of New Alliance Framework. Strong leadership is required from the PSDTF and from higher levels if the New Alliance is to regain momentum. Progress in DPs commitments is rolling somehow as planned. Private investment on areas depicted in their LOI is not moving as intended. Besides, the extent of financial support by development partners for LOI policy commitments is not clear to know about realized amount of support.

The Research and Technology TF under AG lacks the resources and capacity to discharge its responsibilities. Separation of Research and Technology TF from Extension and Capacity building TF is not well received because research cannot stand alone without extension; that is, they are two sides of the same coin. Hence, it is important to revisit the rationale for the separation of research from extension TFs.

Research and technology and Extension and capacity building TFs need more financial and technical support to live up their duties and responsibilities;

Input/output and Finance TF has already put in place 'Rural Financial Service Strategy' and discussion is tabled on how to coordinate/integrate the initiative with AGP. Besides, draft study document on fertilizer supply chain and draft seed regulation have been prepared and commented on by stakeholders. It appears that both have reached the approval stage.

There are some challenges facing the TF including: kick starting up some of the TF have proven difficult; also there is no coordination mechanism between flagship programmes (AGP) and pillars have some level of confusion that there is therefore a strong need for leadership intervention.

(ii). **Implementation under SLM TC** has carried out several planned tasks effectively. Some of these include: solicitation of funds for phase II SLMP from different sources; comprehensive capacity building manual is in progress to harmonize capacity building efforts; preparations of harmonized Monitoring and Evaluation system is in progress; formulation of capacity Development Strategy is underway. In addition, documentation of SLM best practice is well advancing. As part of land use and administration, areal photo acquisition is in progress; cadastral survey which started under SLMPI is finalized with the help of HHGPS; and local level land use planning is under preparation in Amhara and Tigray regions. This TC has made exemplary progresses. Some of the challenges faced include delay in budget release; discrepancy between regional activity plan and allocated budget; limited participation of Small scale Irrigation (SSI) TF members on regular meetings and lack of participation of some of the TF members.

(iii). **Implementation under DRMFS TC:** The jurisdiction of DRMFS is to provide coordinated, efficient, well-aligned and results-oriented interventions in the areas of food security and disaster risk management to achieve households' food security and enhance resilience to shocks through the optimal use of donor resources on policies, actions and programmes that have the highest impact and are reasonably achievable in a medium-term timeframe. Towards this end, it has designed its work plans and has been implementing.

As progress reports of **DRMFS TC** indicate, the Disaster Risk Management Policy is finalized and endorsed by the council of the ministers; printing of the document is completed and will be disseminated for stakeholders shortly. A multi- agency needs assessment has been conducted; the formulation process of the next generation of PSNP/HABP is progressing well; the annual DRM conference has been covered as per the plan and completed successfully. PSNP household's impact evaluation study has been finalized and the impact evaluation report has been distributed to the regions. PSNP Graduation Prediction System (GPS) has been introduced in the four major regions, training on the GPS tools has been provided to the regions, and regions cascaded the training on GPS down to the woreda level.

However, it is discovered that PSNP consumes almost half of the RED&FS resources of a year (i.e., about 2 billion) at the cost of or cannibalizing all other activities of DRMFS. It is therefore pertinent to think of how to balance resource distribution between food aid and development interventions in the future.

(iv). **Implementation under Livestock TC:** This is the youngest TC established in response to recommendation of the 2nd PIF review. The TC aims to foster alignment of donor assistance; develop a platform for knowledge sharing and learning; improve M&E system to understand progresses in implementation of donor government programmes and projects; support refinement of regulatory framework to stimulate private engagement in the livestock sector development; enhance regional interaction; and develop guidelines and best practices for livestock sector development. This TC has made considerable move towards implementation of the aforementioned engagements.

Two TFs under LS TC have formulated their annual work plans and made considerable efforts towards their realization. Some of the achievements include: TOR for the TC was finalized and approved; formulation of Livestock Sector Master Plan is on progress (sector analysis has been completed); two proclamations were passed by GoE⁹; Country Program paper (CPP) is being finalized; development of resilience related M&E activities are in progress; and also mapping and alignment of all investments with the RED&FS is in progress.

Some of the recommended actions include: strengthening of collaboration between Pastoral TF and SLM/DRM TC on NRM/Water and pastoral DRM/EWS; rationalization of private and public roles in the LS sector development; enhancing private actors engagement in the process of programme implementation through improved policy actions; harmonization of sector financing through establishing "Basket Funding" approach; and most of the research work is outsourced to external consultants commonly in all TCs, contributing little for building internal capacity. As a result, outputs lacks ownership. Hence it is important to nurture internal capacity by engaging own staff to work in tandem with the consultants.

Broader Platform

The platform designed to exchange information on progress, reflect on emerging issues and also gather inputs and insights from stakeholders not directly represented in the RED&FS SWG structure, including Civil Society Organizations, Non-Governmental Organizations, farmers' and women's associations among others. As stated in the TOR, it is envisaged to be held twice a year. Accordingly, only one meeting was held. Besides, it has low turnout; these meetings are supposed to be attended by government representatives to share policy directions and also respond to some policy related questions that may arise on the discussion process. However, this did not happened fully as expected. Hence, it is pertinent to improve participation of broader spectrum of stakeholder and leadership at all levels to foster ownership and dialogue.

Currently, Ethiopia has more than 3000¹⁰ CSOs and NGOs registered and engaged in several economic and social development activities at different levels. Based on feedback we obtained from discussions with

⁹ . Proclamations on live animal and hides and skins marketing were passed

¹⁰ According to Ethiopia Civil Society Agency, in 2013/14 fiscal year 62, 53, 117, 1969, 123, 368 and 343 CSOs were registered under Adoption, Consortium, Ethiopian Charity, Ethiopian Resident Charity, Ethiopian Resident Society, Ethiopian Society, and Foreign charity groups.

key informants, there are more than 1000 NGOs engaged in activities related with Natural Resource Management and spend large amount of resources on annual basis that is not accounted for because of lack of data and information. A study by Consortium of Christian Relief and Development Association (2011) on contribution of 298 members of the consortium (20% registered CSOs in 2011), indicated that in aggregate they spent 10.9 billion Birr in economic and social activities. If it would be properly aggregated, the total amount of funds spent by those CSOs engaged in activities related with agriculture and rural development is found to be substantial. A large number of CSOs also cater their services for communities at grassroots level.

CSOs and NGOs are also organized under different umbrella organizations or associations like in Consortium of Christian Relief and Development Association (CCRDA), Non-State Actors Coalition (NSAC), Poverty Action Network for Ethiopia (PANE), Sustainable Land Use Forum (SLUF), and Network for Ethiopian Women, and others. The Agency for Civil Society Organizations has recently established also Federal Charity and Society Forum (FCSF) to coordinate CSOs and it is compulsory requirement to be registered under FCSF for all CSOs that have renewed their membership. CSOs have organized structure in one way or another which may need further refinement and restructuring. In general, it is important to craft a strategy for the involvement of CSOs and NGOs in the RED&FS structure and account for resources spent in rural and agricultural development and pin down their contributions.

Cross-Pillar Task Force

Cross-Sector Task Force, comprising the TC and ExCom Co-Chairs was established following the recommendation by the 2nd PIF review. Its TOR was developed by RED&FS secretariat and is chaired by the Director of PPD. The mandate of the Cross-Pillar Task Force is to engage in broad dialogue on cross sectoral issues and produce common consensual recommendations of mitigation of implementation issues. The outcomes will be presented for review and approval of the RED&FS Executive Committee. However, there was only one meeting since its establishment to realize the intended purpose and objectives. Given its importance, there is a strong need to strengthen this TF.

Implementation of Recommendation in the 1st and 2nd PIF Reviews

Since PIF's inception in December 2010, the RED&FS has commissioned two annual reviews. The review processes have provided the opportunity to assess progress on PIF implementation and also to identify constraints and bottlenecks that have inhibited progress and recommended issues to be improved. Accordingly, there were several recommendations forwarded by the Review teams to improve performance of PIF implementation in the upcoming years.

Table 4 outlines the recommendations and status of implementation. The GoE has taken actions to realize most of recommendations from the 1st and 2nd PIF reviews. Some of recommendations are however complex by their nature and need detailed work and time. For instance, the issue of harmonization cuts across several TCs finances, capacity building, remuneration and incentive packages. As a result, progress towards realization of this recommendation leaves much to be done.

Table 4: Recommendations from 1st and 2nd PIF Review and actions

Recommendations from 1st and 2nd PIF review	Status of Implementation	Remark
Recommendations from 1st PIF Rev.		
i. Establish Cross-pillar Task Force to harmonize activities among different TCs and ministries	The CPTF was established and its TOR developed and had one meeting.	Needs to be strengthened and convene meetings as planned
ii. smoothening complexity/rigidity of procurement and fund disbursement procedures	Not much has been done	Needs to be realized as recommended
iii. Integrate and mainstream agricultural aspects of the CRGE into the PIF	Considerable progress has been made , its TF established under SLM	Needs to be strengthened
Recommendations from 2nd PIF Rev.	Status of Implementation	Remark
i. Establish livestock and pastoral TC	This has been done; State Minister appointed; 2 TFs were established & making progress	More support is needed
ii. Make the RED&FS Process More Efficient and Effective (i.e., TCs need to be chaired by State Ministers)	Since 2nd review all TCs are chaired by Sate Ministers Hiring of 2 staff is on progress	Needs to be realized
iii. Mainstream the RED&FS process within MoA	It is more integrated - since TCs are chaired by the State Minister	Needs to be strengthened and consolidated
iv. Actions agreed by ExCOM to be incorporated in the MoA's annual work plan	There is some progress from the Government side (included in the BSC)but nothing is known from the DPs side	
v. Revise and update PIF and also synchronize PIF II with GTP II	To be conducted during next year	More work needs to be done

Source: developed by consultant using information From RED&FS Secretariat

In general, there have been positive steps towards implementation of most of the recommendations of PIF Review I and 2. But some have not moved forward. The enhanced leadership involvement is indispensable to move forward and implement recommendations fully and guide the overall implementation process.

Need for the PIF Review

As part of exercise to understand the need for PIF review, the TC working groups were asked during the Retreat to express their TCs perception on the key steps required for the revision of the PIF. The TC working groups emphasized the need for stakeholder consultation while ensuring adequate time to address specific technical process such as finalizing the ongoing SLMP II, DRM policy, PSNP II, Livestock Master Plan and M&E framework. All the TCs working group underlined the need for harmonisation of PIF revision with GTP II in order to have unified major areas of interventions. That is, PIF need to elaborate the overall development objectives stated in GTP II for the sector.

During the discussion, the AG group underscored the need to first determine what the PIF is for, who will own it, and how to ensure it is worth the time and effort required. The SLM working group suggested that CRGE should be mainstreamed in to the PIF and the non-formal Climate Task Force should be merged with ongoing formal Climate Task Force. The Livestock TC group underlined the need to finalize and incorporate the livestock development master plan and the CPP into the PIF. In addition, a flagship programme recommended as it has been done for others. The DRMFSS group emphasized the need to mainstream nutrition in the PIF as well as strengthening linkages with the next generation PSNP.

By way of concluding remark, His Excellency Ato Sileshi Getahun, State Minister for Natural Resource Management commented that the PIF was originally developed by MoA working closely with DPs and owned by MOA. The PIF is a productive and living document that can be reviewed and updated in the process of implementation. Above all, the PIF is in tandem with African CAADP programme indigenised for Ethiopia. RED&FS is an important framework that aligns and coordinates investments and activities in the sector.

Highlights of Key Challenges

On the basis of earlier discussions, the following key challenges were identified from the general RED&FS functioning and PIF investment and financing. The future success also depends on extent to which these challenges are addressed and managed.

Regarding PIF Investment and Financing:

- **Lack of data:** All the nine Regional Governments together with their partners (i.e., NGOs/CSOs, farmer groups, private sector, etc) generate and spend considerable amount of resources on agriculture which in aggregate might be even more than the Federal Government spending. However, due to lack of information and data it was not possible to account for this in the report.
- **Low spending:** owing to capacity limitation and in the implementing agencies at federal and regional levels, as well as due complexity of requirements for fund use and reporting by funding agencies has resulted in significant implementation delays and slow utilization of resources.
- **Inconsistency between planned and actual spending:** The Agricultural Growth Programme placed high priority at the planning stage and was expected to receive the largest share of investment

funding. However, in terms of actual spending, the lion's share of funding has been directed to DRMFS.

Regarding RED&FS system it is noted that:

- Sustained engagement of leadership and guidance, both from donor and government was not as strong as expected;
- Capacity constraint at different levels of government structure was an obstacle to speed of PIF implementation
- Resource limitation - mobilization of financial resources was not sufficient to finance both PIF and RED&FS Structure
- Commitment of some of partners in meeting their promises of funding has been below expectation
- availability of data and information at different levels
- Lack of strong M&E system apparent across sector;
- Participation of NGOs and CSOs in the RED&FS Structure has been limited;
- Coordination at different levels found to be weak; and
- Due to low salary and incentive packages, staff turnover has been high.

V. ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Ethiopian economy has registered double digit economic growth on average during the last one decade. The momentum of this growth trajectory ought to be maintained in the years ahead in order to ensure the envisaged target of being middle income country by 2025. This in turn heavily requires ensuring food and nutrition security of its citizens by improving current food production and productivity, sustainable natural resource management, and protecting vulnerable groups from shocks. The role of PIF and RED&FS structure beyond any doubt will remain to be one of the most important arrangements to realize Ethiopia's development aspirations.

PIF is making an important contribution in mobilizing Government and DPs resources and directing investments on the four strategic areas that are expected to improve the lives of rural people. In general, it has begun to lay the foundations for sustainability by engaging all stakeholders, building partnerships and trust, and providing a roadmap for progressively increasing government responsibility for financing the investment framework; coordinating and aligning resources from development partners. Although implementation is confronted with some difficulties, it could still be cited as exemplary structure not only for Ethiopia but also for other African countries. From the above review process, this report identifies some key issues need due attention to maintain and speed up the momentum of current progress and recommends associated intervention.

I) Further Strengthen RED&FS System through solidifying leadership support and guidance.

It is highly recommended that RED&FS needs to be further strengthened to make the implementation process more efficient and effective as per the ensuring suggestion.

- The presence and chairing of important meetings like ExCom meeting, broad platform and annual PIF reviews by top leaders of the sector has great significance for building common understanding, trust and shared views by all stakeholders. Presence of leader and his/her voice makes a difference. Agreements made in front of a leader is differs from that made in his/her absence. Indeed, Ethiopia is an exemplary country in terms of leadership dedication. This culture needs to be maintained and embraced to sustain current momentum of agricultural sector transformation.
- The room for dialogue on strategic issues needs to be improved – this could be done by (1) improving communication and coordination of meeting that may save more time for dialogue and (2) organizing separate meeting for high level ExCOM members where (I) EXCOM chair, co –chairs; TCs chairs, and RED&FS secretariat discusses on more detailed issues informally and frequently – on progresses and challenges and possible measures.
- Planning processes need to be more participatory and result oriented. Besides, as much as possible stick to the meeting calendar set by RED&FS: frequent rescheduling of meeting (at TCs, TFs, WGs levels) may disrupt planned activities of other stakeholders and undermines confidence in the whole process. Short notice based meeting arrangement also does not provide enough time preparation. It is also important to circulate minutes, documents and agendas as early as possible to improve the quality of discussions in the meeting.

Building capacity of PPD:

This is equal to building the brain center of MoA. PPD needs to have human, financial and technical capacity that enable it to discharge responsibilities independently by own staff; current support by affiliated institutions might have contribution from short term perspectives. But from long term view PPD need to stand independently by itself. Strengthening PPD indeed needs an incentive package employees, salary and related benefits in order to retain qualified professionals. This requires a more detailed assessment

The following four sub-teams are proposed to be in the PPD structure: (1) Knowledge Management team, (2) Capacity building team, (3) Planning and M&E team, and (4) Data collection, compiling, validation, analysis and dissemination team

Building comprehensive M&E system: The current M&E is fragmented - mainly at the project level that there is need to be harmonized at least at TC level to provide aggregate information at national level using selected indicators to know broader picture.

Harmonization

Lack of harmonization or application of divergent financial management and procurement processes and procedures by different DPs has affected efficiency and effectiveness of resources use. Besides, timely settlement of advances, predictability and smooth resources flow of resources to implementers, timely and periodic reporting, and smooth stakeholder collaboration and absorptive capacity building has remained

among one of core challenges. Hence harmonization is indispensable action needs collaboration of the Government and DPs joint action.

(a) Harmonization of finance:

Develop basket funding approach or MDTF which could harmonization of finance under each RED&FS pillar. There are several projects financed by different partners with multiple fund management system. For instance, SLMP is funded by six donors, Livestock Sector Development Programmes are financed by more than four donors as well PSNP, HABP and others also financed by large number of donors. A basket funding approach enables the government and donor to have equal power, ease administrative complications from disbursement, more transparency in fund management, allow to know its beneficiary, spending for overhead and capital. This indeed need detailed analysis and understanding of both government and development partners.

(b) Harmonization and alignment between flagship programmes:

Currently the three flagship programmes of MoA (i.e., AGP, SLMP, and PSNP) are preparing to enter into their 2nd new phase of implementation which, in all cases, involves geographic expansions. With the recently approved SLMP expansion, the AGP and SLMP will overlap in 27 woredas. Similarly, there will be potential geographic overlap between SLMP and PSNP/HABP in next phase due to envisaged expansion. Thus there is need for coordination in order to avoid duplication and resource wastage. There is a need to assess possibilities for greater coordination at woreda levels by developing joint implementation structure and exploring possibility of introducing joint planning and review process.

(c) Harmonization of remuneration, per diem and other incentive package

This institutional drawback has remained a key operational challenge due to lack of harmonization within and between flagship programmes within the MoA. This should be addressed with due attention.

Further strengthening RED&FS secretariat

- The secretariat needs four dedicated staff for each TCs (under REDFS) to follow up progress of TCs work plan; render technical support; compile and document information; organize meetings; take minutes and circulate, undertake preliminary analysis, share best practices, and other matters as appropriate. Although the process of hiring two out of four has started long ago, they are not in place. This needs an urgent action.
- Efforts should be exerted to replenish MDTF/Spanish fund for supporting REDFS to discharge its responsibility as required; any delay could create uncertainty and may end up in a loss of institutional memories; and
- It is also desirable to equip the RED&FS Secretariat with minimum working facilities to enable the office to cater their services more effectively.

II) Alignment PIF with GTP II:

There was overall consensus on the need to ascertain the PIF is fully aligned with the GTP II in order to ensure the PIF is a direct reflection of GoE priorities and avoid any possible duplication of efforts. While the GTP II elaborates the overall objectives for the country including the agricultural sector, the PIF should then elaborate these overarching objectives in greater details. A number of issues were identified for follow-up including determining the process of consultation and engagement for the PIF review and revision, and the connection between the PIF review process and the GTP II formulation. RED&FS expected to contribute to this consultation process in terms of facilitating the best outcomes and building on the wealth of shared implementation experience that it has developed till to date.

Comprehensive Review of current PIF:

There was a common understanding about the need to review and evaluate the current PIF, especially in light of the national policy changes since the original PIF was drafted. While doing so, the comprehensive review of PIF should as much as possible give weight to the inclusion of gender, CRGE, drought resilience, nutrition, the New Alliance and livestock and pastoralism in its entirety.

III) Other Important issues noted during Retreat

The meeting underscored that nutrition - should be mainstreamed under all TCs: Despite recent improvements, the level of chronic under nutrition (stunting) of children under five years of age stands at 44.4% (representing over 6 million children). This entails immense negative effect on the future health and mental ability of country's population. Food security cannot stand alone without nutrition security. Thus it is highly important that PIF II should consider issue of nutrition in a more detail in its next phase. Nutrition also needs to be mainstreamed in all TCs rather than being limited to PSNP program.

Gender Mainstreaming

It is widely recognized that women are the backbone of sub-Saharan Africa's rural and agriculture economies. The Agriculture Sector PIF (2010-2020) stipulated that 25 per cent of all smallholder farming families are female headed by women¹¹ (widowed - 60 per cent or divorced - 12.4 per cent) Hence it is strongly recommended that the issue of gender should as much as possible be mainstreamed in all TCs and as well be considered in the Cross-Pillar Task Force.

¹¹ Single women (never married, divorced and separated) are also more likely to be landless as the norm is for women to gain access to land by virtue of marriage. World Bank (2009). Ethiopia Unleashing the Potential of Ethiopian Women Trends and Options for Economic Empowerment

Best practice

Best practice is an issue cross cuts all the sectors; should not be specific to SLM. Other TCs like AG, DRMF and LS also have best practice to be shared and up scaled. Thus, best practice should be re-organized and developed at sectoral level; we have to avoid fragmented approach. The coordination of all best practices in one center needs an umbrella structure which identified best practices from different TCs compile and share.

Representation of CSOs in the RED&FS structure is required to be improved either using existing umbrella structure or by forging an appropriate institutional set-up.

REFERENCES

- Agricultural Transformation Agency (2013). Ethiopia: G-8 New Alliance 2013 Country-Level Progress Review. Draft April 24, 2013
- Diao, X; J. Thurlow; S. Benin; and S. Fan (2012). Strategies and Priorities for African Agriculture: Economy Wide Perspectives from Country Studies. Washington, DC: IFPRI.
- Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. Various years. Agricultural Sample Survey-Report on Area and Production of Major Crops (Private Peasant Holdings, Meher Season) (2004 to 2013). Central Statistical Authority, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (2012). Growth and Transformation Plan (2010/11-2014/15): Annual Progress Report for F.Y (2010/11). Ministry of Finance and Economic Development. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- FDRE, Ministry Of Agriculture (MoA).(2012). First Annual Review: Agricultural Policy And Investment Framework (PIF) Implementation. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- FDRE, Ministry Of Agriculture (MoA).(2013). Second Annual Review: Agricultural Policy And Investment Framework (PIF) Implementation. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- FDRE, Ministry Of Agriculture (MoA) (2013). Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy And Investment Framework (PIF) 2010-2020. Second Annual PIF Review. Addis Ababa, May-June 2013
- Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (2010a). Growth and Transformation Plan (2010/11-2014/15), Volume I-Main Text. Ministry of Finance and Economic Development. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (2013). EFY 2005 GTP Annual Performance Report. Ministry of Agriculture, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Grow Africa (2013). Agricultural partnerships take root across Africa. 2nd Annual Report on private-sector investment in support of country-led transformations in African agriculture 2013-2014.
- Mogues T., and S. Benin (2012). Public Expenditure for Agriculture and Rural Development in Africa. Abingdon, Oxon; New York; Routledge.

APPENDICES

Objectives, outputs and outcomes of the Retreat

The RED&FS Retreat was organized with clear objectives, outputs and outcomes as stated below.

The overall objective of the Retreat was to review progress of RED&FS mechanisms against their annual work plan/roadmap and generate input that could enrich the PIF II and GTP II formulation. It also aims to identify core bottlenecks that limiting its progress and thereby to design ways redressing these issue in a more effective and efficient ways in the coming years to scale-up current momentum of progress. The Retreat

The Retreat's envisaged outcomes was a strong consensus on the way forward at strategic level, including what needs to be done and how to do it with a strong focus on a strengthened RED&FS. The expected final outcome of the gather was to develop updated and clear roadmap for moving forward on the PIF revision and implementation of phase II.

Appendix I: Highlights of the issue papers presented by different Technical Committees (TCs)

Name of TCs	Topics of presentation	Core issues presented	Recommendation
I. AG TC	New Alliance	<p>The team presented that the aim of the New Alliance is mainly to promote private sector engagement in different economic affairs with the support of Government and Donors. Its cooperation framework was signed in September 2012 with the aim to lifting 2.9 million smallholders from poverty by 2022. Accordingly, 15 policy commitments were signed by the government and 14 private sector partners with estimated \$1.520 billion capital signed Letter of Intent (LOI) to investment on input, agro-processing, capacity building, and agricultural implements modernization projects.</p> <p>As presented by the team, performance of the NA in the last two years was reviewed and the following results were reported. Regarding progress in implementing out of the 15 Government commitments, one is fully completed; good progress is made in 4; some progress is made in 7 and no progress is observed in 3 issues. Out of 14 private companies that signed LOI, 3 have been completed successfully, 4 have shown good progress, 3 made some progress and 2 witnessed no progress. Besides, out of planned total resources by DPs, 82 % disbursement was made.</p>	<p>Core recommendations forwarded by team include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish more inclusive multi-stakeholder platforms: including MoA, MoT, MoI, ATA, DPs, CSOs and farmer organisations • A re-design process to revisit policy and investment commitments, including new partners invitation and develop new milestone maps and timelines • A monitoring system for tracking – Government policy reform and donor and private sector disbursement. The introduction of regular reporting on progress and aaligning the review system with the annual PIF Retreat indicated as a relevant approach.

2. SLM TC	CRGE	<p>The core message of presentation was the need for integration of CRGE into PIF II for the following reasons: (i) it enables to address the vision, targets of the CRGE strategy in harmony with the existing framework; (ii) PIF flagship programmes have immense potential to enhance the scale of Agriculture CRGE implementation.</p> <p>The team also suggested considering an informal climate partners' group to be formalized by discussing with concerned government bodies to work together to bring synergized impact. Climate information utilization, mitigation & adaptation measures, preparation of long term CRGE investment plans would benefit from the joint engagement.</p>	<p>The team recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RED&FS forum should consider establishing a standing technical committee for the CRGE cross-cutting pillar; • With the technical support from partners in the forum, the CRGE Unit in regions and woredas should be further strengthened technically to be able to meet the high expectations set in the CRGE agenda;. • If the ad hoc or informal climate partners' group can be formalized, may avoid duplication of efforts.
	Harmonized Funding for SLMP	<p>This team shared its view on the importance of SLM Up-Scaling and on harmonization of resource use, procurement and reporting procedures. The requirements are different among different DPs and this has adversely affected efficiency & effectiveness of resources use; timely settlement of advances; predictability and smooth resources flow to implementers; timely and quality periodic reporting; smooth stakeholder collaboration and absorptive capacity - need attention in order to improve performance of SLM implementation and up-scaling.</p>	<p>The team suggested that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government and DPs may join their hands in order to improve financial management and for soliciting additional funds; • SLM partners may draw lessons from AGP basket funding approach which has resulted in effective harmonization of financial management and procurement procedures, and reporting.
3. Livestock TF	Drought Resiliency	<p>Draught resilience team identified resilience as the most important issue requiring significant attention of the Government and DPs. Knowing its importance, the GoE developed CPP in line with the IDDRSI framework. The MoA tasked the newly created State Ministry of Livestock Development to co-ordinate and oversee the CPP.</p> <p>The RED-FS in response established "Livestock Technical Committee" as the 4th TC; the pastoral TF sub-group mandated to co-ordinate ASALs resilience efforts. It is anchored alongside the CPP; multiple DP's are supporting the PDRSLP. The GoE has begun its implementation in Afar and Somali regions.</p> <p>The team expressed the need for flexible funding by integrating humanitarian and development interventions funded by multiple donors and agencies.</p>	<p>The team made 4 Key recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The need for institutionalization and harmonization of resilience interventions. Various ministries are implementing different CPP components but co-ordination and harmonization efforts; b) Alignment and harmonization of Drought Resilience Initiatives implementation modalities of various development partners need to be strengthened; c) There is a strong need to develop common resilience measurement framework in a M&E Systems that could clearly articulate investments versus progress; d) Integration of Resilience in the PIF II as one of core issues.

	Privatization of VET services	<p>The team pointed out that disease spread blocked Ethiopia from access to lucrative regional and international markets; it was cause for ban on export trade in 1983, 1997/98, 2000, 2001, 2006, and January 2007. Animal diseases have also public health significance. Of 1415 pathogens affecting human, 56-60 % are of animal origin. Understanding the impact of diseases, the GoE with the support from the development partners and private sector has tried to improve the veterinary services through building infrastructures and developing manpower. However, private VET services are yet minimal;</p> <p>The team noted that given the nature, social , economic and biological principles vet services are broadly classified in to three categories: (i) as public good (Disease surveillance, drug/vaccine quality control, public health , import - export inspection and certification, accreditation and planning for emergencies. On the other hand it has (ii) private good nature like clinical diagnosis and treatment, production and distribution artificial insemination, herd health management and pperforming public roles under sanitary mandate. (iii). It has public – private nature like quarantine food hygiene vaccination and compulsory testing can be catered both by private as well by public.</p>	<p>The team recommended the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Provide strong support for the development and implementation of the policy to progressively rationalize the service. b) Support for awareness campaigns so that each player (including the community) clearly understands the advantages and drawbacks of rationalization; c) Ensure easier access to credit and incentive packages; d) Create enabling legislative environment (establishing statutory body, drug and feed administration and control regulation and compliance procedure)
4. DRMF TC	Nutrition	<p>The nutrition team pointed out the need for making agricultural sector more nutrition sensitive. This is mainly because food security alone could not guarantee nutrition security. In order to attain nutrition security, diversification of food production is among the important measures. This is mainly because under nutrition is major challenge to country's rapid economic development. The team substantiate severity of the problem indicating that stunting of children less than 5 years old stands at 44.4% or more than 6 million children are facing the problem. Underweight is estimated at 28.7% (EDHS, 2011). This has enormous impact on economic growth and poverty reduction implication. Cognizant of the problem, the GoE has embedded nutrition in the GTP and set target to reduce stunting to 20% and underweight by 15% by 2020.</p>	<p>The team recommended the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Capacity building & awareness raising is needed at decision making and implementation level in order to overcome strategic and operationalization challenges; a) Efforts should be fostered to deepen knowledge on effectiveness, inform decision making and scale up ongoing programs to cover wider population; b) Effective monitoring and reporting systems required
5. Cross-Sector Group	Synergies b/n MoA's Flagship Programmes	<p>The aim of creating synergy between flagship programmes is mainly to avoid duplication of efforts. To address the problem of low productivity, marketing, land degradation, and related issues in holistic and interactive manner, the GoE has developed and is implementing three flagship programmes: PSNP, AGP and SLMP. PSNP provides transfers, to help chronically food insecure people. PSNP is currently operating in 319</p>	<p>Key recommendations from the team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Since the 3 flagship programmes are chaired by the respective State Ministers of MoA, their guidance highly important on how to synergize their implementation. To this effect, there is need

		<p>districts. AGP is working in 96 high potential districts with adequate moisture. SLMP works on reducing land degradation, enhance tenure security and improves agricultural productivity of smallholder farmers and work in 177 districts.</p> <p>These flagship programs share the same agro-ecology, do the similar activities and needs. However, these programmes lack synergies and share lessons. AGP and SLMP currently overlap in 27 woredas. This may result in duplication of efforts and wastage of resources. All 3 programs are entering into their next phase of design/implementation and all are planning to expand their coverage as well. Hence, it is important to address this challenges of overlap and duplication in view optimally deploying available resources..</p>	<p>to assess how to harmonize the flagship programs, starting with areas where there is geographic overlap.</p> <p>b) It will be pertinent to explore the possibility of conducting joint planning and review missions for programs operating in the same areas;</p>
	Gender	<p>The team highlighted the vital role of women in agricultural production and labor contribution. For instance, women contribute for 45 to 75% of crop production related labor. Despite the fact, decision making within households on overall farming practices limited for women. There has been efforts by the government to promote role of women in economic, social and political affairs.</p> <p>However, there persists wide gaps which need attention of all development stakeholders. For instance, the PIF and associated flagship programmes have largely failed to institutionalize gender-sensitive approach; institutional arrangements to advance gender equality at different levels are lacking; the current structure in the RED&FS offers limited discussion on gender; it neither has a dedicated TC/ TF nor is it mainstreamed in the existing structures; and PIF progress review reports largely unable to provide information on progress and challenges for women in agriculture.</p>	<p>The team proposed that the MoA and flagship programmes adopt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) standard, harmonized approaches to gender analysis and mainstreaming strategy, b) specific targets and results and the collection and reporting of gender-disaggregated progress, c) staffing with gender officers and invest in gender-related capacity development, and d) the RED&FS need to establish a Gender in Agriculture Task Force with the primary aim of reviewing gender-related progress
6. ReSAKSS	Establishment of SAKSS Node in Ethiopia	<p>The Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (ReSAKSS) team presented mandate, aim and envisaged possibility for collaboration with MoA and how can they support strategic analysis, M&E and knowledge management gaps in the ministry. ReSAKSS was established in 2006 as information and knowledge management initiative with objective is to promote and support effective and sustainable agricultural and rural development in Africa. ReSAKSS provides analytical and knowledge support to</p>	<p>The team recommended to speed up the establishment process of SAKSS node in Ethiopia under MOA/PPD as quick as possible.</p>

	<p>Regional Economic Communities (RECs), governments, donors, other agriculture sector stakeholders.</p> <p>On the basis of capacity needs assessment completed in 2013, the ReSAKSS is planning to establish SAKSS node in Ethiopia to be hosted by PPD, MoA. Key functions of country SAKSS include strategic analysis, effective M&E, knowledge management, communications, and policy dialogue, and capacity strengthening.</p>	
--	---	--

Appendix 2: Summary of Working Group Presentation in the context of four questions

	What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current PIF for your TC?	What are the 4 priority strategic issues for your TC to address leading to the PIF revision and how to align with GTP II and CAADP?	What does your TC see as the key steps required for the revision of the PIF?	How to ensure synergy and linkages are built across TCs within a cohesive PIF? How to engage wider stakeholders in the PIF revision: who to engage and how?
I. AG TC	<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having PIF as guiding document in place is a strength; • Some issues are better treated in PIF than in GTP such as rural commercialization. The document is comprehensive, provide better target and guidance. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to revise indicators and targets. More consistency, realism and greater alignment with GTP • Inadequacy and clarity of institutional set up; • Lack of a strong M&E System. • Role of private sector was not clearly elaborated. 	<p>Priority strategic issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nutrition, climate and gender dimensions; 2. Pests control (regulatory aspects) 3. Private sector engagement and contribution for AG. 4. Capacity development for the MoA staff those involve in flagship programmes. 5. Research and evidence generation and management <p>Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual structure of PIF helping implementation (Pillars, SOs, flagship programmes) • Well designed M&E system need to be introduced in PIF. 	<p>Key steps :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GTP II to be aligned with PIF II • Developing agriculture sector wide strategy for five years; • PIF to operationalize both documents explained above. <p>ASUMPTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government would exercise its leadership role and define the process. RED&FS would receive the direction and timeline for consultations. • CAADP Compact will inform the process as well. • When to start? Do we need till GTP II approved or do we work side by side? 	<p>How to ensure synergy and linkages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define institutional structures and responsibilities. • Explicitly address coordination issues. • The conceptual structure can help the coordination. • Linkages should be established between flagship programmes by Cross-pillar TF and reflected in the PIF.

2. Livestock TC	<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created the opportunity of different actors to work together (establishment of TCs etc) <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Livestock sector was not adequately addressed in the PIF considering recent developments; No clear strategic objective is attached to the livestock sector; Limited consideration of livestock in drought resilience is evident; The nutritional impact of livestock is not well addressed; 	<p>Priority strategic issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Improve the enabling environment (i.e., address policy and instructional issues like animal breeding, animal health regulation, extension, nutrition, etc). In addition, there is need to reflect livestock related data/information in the PIF) 2) Enhance the contribution of livestock sector to the economy by improving livestock production and productivity is well recieved; 3) Improve feed, forage, pasture and rangeland management and water supply; 4) Improving livestock marketing system and trade, domestic, cross border, and international 	<p>Key steps :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Finalize livestock development master plan; 2) Incorporate the key issues of the master plan into the PIF; 3) Incorporate also the CPP (country Programming Paper) into PIF 	<p>How to ensure synergy and linkages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensuring synergy by strengthening the cross-pillar taskforce; creating mechanism to strengthen the taskforce's accountability to higher level officials; Towards engaging wider stakeholders, prepare consultative workshops; Who to engage and how? This may include: public organizations, sectoral associations, civil societies groupss, NGOs
3. SLM TC	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic direction and roadmap defined by flagship program framework including results, indicators, technical guidelines, planning process, and institutional set up (potential model) Enduring commitment from government, regional , local and DPs Gender initially considered in PIF framework <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TCs members are not timely 	<p>Priority strategic issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mainstream and align CRGE Strategy into PIF and mobilize additional resources Continue and focus on on-going work to align/harmonize SLM results frameworks of PIF, CRGE, and GTP-2 (alignment with CAADP and TerrAfrica already good) Consider use of “impact evaluations” at programme level to better quantify achievement of complex results that go 	<p>Key steps :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that PIF preparation team has sufficient expertise cutting across all disciplines and themes Stakeholder consultations SLM TC's M&E working group to finalize program level M&E framework for SLMP, for inclusion in PIF (and CRGE, GTP-2) 	<p>How to ensure synergy and linkages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ExCom ought to identify major synergy gaps to be filled PIF should emphasize use of harmonized technical guidelines across programs (small irrigation, watershed, and other interventions). Continue/strengthen cross-program collaboration on preparation, updates and implementation of technical guidelines and monitoring Continue to identify and put in place interface/mechanisms for collaboration

	<p>replaced;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TCs meeting were not held regularly as planned • Minor gap among SLM related objectives and indicators in PIF, CRGE (and future GTP-2?) and SLMP • PIF should strengthen mechanisms and actions for work across programs, directorates, and agencies • Weak M&E and knowledge management at program level and across programs (including gender) 	<p>beyond agriculture/SLM (i.e. poverty reduction, benefits to women, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include comprehensive mechanism for harmonized financial resource mobilization and management • Further engagement of private sector should be steadily nurtured. 		<p>between programs on knowledge management, gender outreach, and other topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to engage other ministries, private sector, NGOs, producer organizations, academia/research, DPs, sub-national government entities in stakeholder group.
<p>4. DRMFS TC</p>	<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some programming support to address malnutrition, nutrition coordination unit in DRMFSS, nutrition hotspot analysis • DRMFSS State Minister co-chairs the NNCB. Clear targets for reduction of stunting by 3% per year <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nutrition not mainstreamed in PSNP and HABP (current programmes) and needs to be strengthened. DRMFSS nutrition coordination unit needs to rally the full MOA around nutrition. • Flagship program consumes bulk of members' time, leaving little time/space for other issues (early 	<p>Priority strategic issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nutrition mainstreamed in PIF (and flagship programs) • More simplified structure for TC and revised work plan (DRM SPIF) needed. • Next generation PSNP should strengthen linkages to other ministries, agencies. • Harmonization of capacity building efforts across flagship programs, lessons learned, increasing efficiencies. 	<p>Key steps :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparatory work at various levels to feed inputs related to cross-sectoral work (gender, climate change, nutrition) involving DRMFSS , MOA and other ministries. • How to involve other relevant ministries who are not formally part of REDFS (Trade, Roads Authority, Industry, Water, Energy) • Suggestion: MOA should organize large stakeholder meeting to incorporate input from all relevant parties to PIF. 	<p>How to ensure synergy and linkages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TC should strive to convene as scheduled to facilitate this work. • Create a platform for the four pillars to share learning, approaches and modalities. • Assign a TC member to present on their respective TC at the learning platform • Other actors can be invited to participate (private sector, NGOs, others).

	warning, DRM)			
--	---------------	--	--	--

Appendix 3: RED&FS SWG TCs Annual Work Plan of 2006 EFY and progress towards its implementation

2006 EFY Work Plan for AG TC	Progresses
1). Complete the definition of a “Common Intervention Framework “for projects and programmes under AG, including results, indicators, geographical areas for non AGP interventions, guidelines, institutional arrangements and subsectors/division of labour.	Not much has been done
2). Framework “for projects and programmes under AG, including results, indicators, geographical areas for non AGP interventions, guidelines, institutional arrangements and subsectors/division of labour;	AG Pillar data analysis exercise done to shows ODA flows but not yet comprehensive enough .
3). AGP Mid Term Review, define strategic areas where AG TC can support the implementation of AGP and collaborate on the design of AGP II.	This is done
2006 EFY Work Plan for SLM TC	Progress
1). Develop Basket fund mechanism	There has been efforts towards development of comprehensive implementation manual which caters to the needs of different SLM stakeholders; harmonization and streamlining of implementation modalities; and efforts of fund soliciting from potential partners towards the development of basket funding is continued;
2). Soliciting resources for SLMP	It is secured resources from different sources including from IDA credit, MOFED, Ethiopian Government (tax exemption), SWAP, GDC, FAO, and other partners
3). Organize regular TC meetings	Out of 6 expected annual meetings the TC convened 5 meetings
4). Development of joint results framework for SLM and development of harmonized M &E	Discussions and preparations are underway towards designing a largely harmonized Monitoring and Evaluation system based on agreed results framework by stakeholders.
5). Development of Capacity Development Strategy	First draft of Strategy document expected to be submitted by mid April Strategy document will be accompanied by an action plan for practical implementation
2006 EFY Work Plan for DRMFS TC	Progress:

1). Finalize DRM policy	DRM policy finalized and DRM SPIF document to be launched after stakeholder's discussion. The DRM policy has been endorsed by the council of the ministers and printing of the document is completed and the printed document shared with partners
2). Formulation of PSNP II	The formulation process of the next generation of PSNP/HABP is rolling well. The draft of the designing document has been prepared, and a discussion has been conducted at the federal and regional level with concerned senior experts of the government and the Development Partners. Final review and approval is in process.
3). Identification of beneficiaries and soliciting resources	The first round emergency response for to 2.7 million people have been made for the first round; In 2006 EFY six million beneficiaries are targeted to receive cash payment. Accordingly, cash resource needed to implement the program which amounts birr 1.8 billion has been transferred to regions, simultaneously regions have transferred the cash resource to woredas and payment to the clients have been started.
4). Meeting Bi-monthly on regular basis	Two regular technical committee meeting of the DRM has been conducted
5). Conduct annual DRM conference	The annual DRM conference has been has been conducted as per the plan and completed successfully.
6). Finalize DRMFS households impact evaluation	PSNP household's impact evaluation study has been finalized and the impact evaluation report has been distributed to the regions. PSNP Graduation Prediction System (GPS) has been introduced in the four major regions, training on the GPS tools provided to the regions, and regions cascaded the training down to the woreda level. But there is always concern that graduates usually fall back to poverty
2006 EFY Work Plan Livestock TC	Progress:
1). Finalize the TOR for approval by RED&FS Executive Committee	TC has developed a comprehensive TOR which elaborate areas of interventions, objectives, activities, and stakeholders.
2). 1st Livestock TC meeting to formally establish the TC, taskforces and action points	done
3). Formal launch of the Livestock TC	It is formal launched
4). Development of the Livestock Master Plan	Ongoing; Livestock Sector Analysis completed; commodities based analysis is ongoing

5). Refine regulations and policy frameworks related to Livestock Sector; promote private sector engagement thru Private Sector DTF

2 policies (livestock &HSL) passed by GOE; planning for review and discussions was held in April; Private sector engagement not yet addressed clearly

Appendix 4: RED&FS Structure

