# Stocktaking:

# Changes in African Agriculture resulting from the implementation of CAADP approaches

Purpose: to assess the progress that your country is making and the challenges your country is facing in implementing your CAADP NAIP. Focus on the progress you have made since the convening of your country’s high level Business Meeting that i) validated and endorsed investments and confirmed implementation readiness and ii) declared funding commitments and agreements on modalities and timelines to meet the funding needs of the country's investment plans.

Task: Review the post compact roadmap your country developed based on the results of the high level Business Meeting. Rank your progress in achieving changes in your country’s agriculture situation that have resulted because of the implementation of CAADP approaches.

### Consider

* The progress that has been made
* The major challenges you are facing in each area

Status Rankings

No policies or programs have been put in place

Policies and programs have been formulated but not implemented

Policies and programs have been implemented and progress can be measured

***CAADP Stocktaking***

***Ethiopia RED&FS Development Partners Comments***

***The following document has been produced at the request of the CAADP Donor Partners Task Team through a process of solicitation of inputs from a broad range of Development Partners active in the various platforms of Ethiopia RED&FS. Inputs and comments have been consolidated into a single report.***

| **CAADP Results Framework**  **Implementation Measurements[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Status** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. How would you assess the progress you have made on **increasing agriculture production and productivity?** |  |
| Narrative:  Consider the improved and inclusive policy design and implementation capacity that your country has developed since the NAIP was signed. Assess the work you have done on developing policies and programs that have led to increased agriculture production and increased agriculture productivity.  In ranking your progress, consider programs and policies that you have formulated and implemented, the challenges you have encountered and the success you have had in overcoming those challenges |
| Country Team Comments and Clarifications:  **Consolidated DP Comments**  **Background**   1. **In 2009, the Rural Economic Development and Food Security (RED&FS) Sector Working Group was established as the joint coordination platform for the Ethiopian agriculture sector. It brings together the GoE mainly through the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) with 22 of the major multi and bi-lateral Development Partners (DPs) who are making development investments in the sector. The RED&FS is the multi-platformed umbrella under which investments are coordinated and harmonized.** 2. **In 2010, the Ethiopian Growth and Transformation Plan was established as the GoE 5 year plan of cross-sector economic growth. Much of this economic growth will be agriculturally dependent. Indicators are established, baselines determined and targets set for 5 year objectives.** 3. **In 2010, The Policy and Investment Framework (PIF) was established as the Ethiopian NAIP for 2010-2020, a product led by the GoE and supported by DPs. This sets out a 10 year Roadmap of agricultural aspirations and identifies GoE and DP support for those aspirations. The PIF is regarded as the operational document in the agricultural sector of the Growth and Transformation Plan and is adopted as the strategic document for RED&FS Work Plans** 4. **In 2010, the Agricultural Growth Programme (AGP) was established as the primary mechanism to coordinate agricultural growth investments and activities. Funded by GoE with 4 DPs under a basket funding mechanism plus 1 DP (USAID) in parallel, the AGP coordinates $350,000,000 plus $50,000 GAFSP fund awarded on completion of NAIP. The AGP is GoE implemented with joint Technical and Steering Committees.** 5. **In 2010, the Household Asset Building Programme was established as a programme component of the Ethiopia Food Security Programme. Basket funded by GoE, Irish Aid DFID, DFATF and World Bank. The $75,000,000 investment is targeted to enhance agricultural growth and secure assets in chronically food insecure households.** 6. **In 2011, the Agricultural Transformation Agency (ATA) was established as a GoE body, mandated to work alongside the Ministry of Agriculture and Development Partners in order to accelerate and innovate agricultural growth and create a transformation agenda.** 7. **Other bi-lateral projects also operate within the AG sector. Under RED&FS the Agricultural Growth Technical Committee is mandated to coordinate and harmonize these activities through several dedicated focal Task Forces. (Private Sector Development, Agricultural Inputs and Financing, Extension and Capacity Building, Research and Technology).** 8. **GoE data sources reports agricultural growth figures of 6.5% per year from the 2007-2008 to the 2010-2011 period. The GTP Annual Progress Report of February 2013 reports Agriculture and Allied Activities Growth of 9.6% for 2010-2011 and 4.8% for 2011-2012, short of the 8.5% expected annual growth rate identified in the GTP. Some reasons for this shortfall have been attributed to failure of the Belg rains and ongoing climate change.** 9. **Many projects and programmes are now responding and/or considering Climate Smart Initiatives and Resiliency components in order to respond to CC impacts and shelter gains.** 10. **Progress on Policy has been achieved through the creation of the new Seed Proclamation and the ongoing initiative of the National Cooperative Strategy.** 11. **The need for improvement in the agricultural extension services and an implementation strategy has been articulated in a National Extension Strategy. Responding to this have been several significant bi-lateral projects (GDC, JICA, WB, USAID, DFATD in particular) and all three Flagship Programmes (AGP, SLMP, PSNP) have substantial extension components. Several projects have built capacity of Farmers Training Centers (FTCs). FTCs are designed to be grassroots centers of agricultural excellence where farmers can access training and inputs and be exposed to innovations and technologies.** 12. **The Agricultural Technical and Vocational Education and Training (ATVET) system has been altered to focus on providing extension system Development Agents (DAs) more practical skills.**   **Constraints and Challenges**   1. **Lack of capacity on GoE systems is often cited as a constraint for programmes/projects utilizing GoE implementation, procurement and M&E systems. MoA in general requires additional staff with enhanced skills. This same lack of capacity permeates throughout many GoE systems and sectors including research, extension, and education (ATVETs). However, it is critical to ensure that Capacity Building go beyond skill upgrading and in synchronicity, incorporate strategies to increase retention of skill upgraded personnel within the GoE system. High turnover of MoA staff, especially critical at Regional and Sub-Regional levels, creates a lack of continuity and institutional knowledge. A cycle can occur where capacity gaps are identified; people are trained with new skills to address those gaps, and then equipped with new skills they move out of the government system. This requires a more holistic approach to Capacity Building.** 2. **Many somatic constraint points inhibit agricultural growth. In the case of the physical environment of agriculture, several constraints of note are wide spread, including:**    1. **The agriculture sector is still predominately rain-fed and the capacity for irrigation still needs to be developed. There are in place projects dealing with this, but there is still a significant gap.**    2. **There exists underdeveloped rural market infrastructure and weak market linkages.**    3. **There is limited use of farm inputs and technologies.**    4. **There is limited presence of the Private Sector resulting in a lack of stimulus.** 3. **In spite of opportunities to align projects through major programmes and through multi-lateral communication provided by TCs, some DP projects are fairly uni-laterally implemented. The Planning and Programming Directorate (PPD) of the MoA is seen to as the platform that is best placed to ensure alignment of all projects. However, this Directorate is faced with a serious capacity restraint.** 4. **The role of ATA is dynamic. It may be argued that its dynamism is more freely exercised outside of RED&FS. However, in order to align and harmonize the myriad of investment and initiatives within the agriculture sector it is important that ATA engages with RED&FS on its initiatives.** 5. **M&E systems abound and generally each programme/project creates and maintains its own M&E system, which is often characterized by component and indicator duplication with other systems. A comprehensive cross sector M&E system would create efficiencies, increase accuracy and minimize gaps in M&E.** 6. **Associated with this is institutional variability in statistical reporting. The World Bank CPS 2012 pg. 9 reports “*However, some independent studies shed some doubt on the reliability of official statistics”*. Capacity is lacking in public institutions and systems responsible for collection of statistics relevant to the agriculture sector, such as the Central Statistics Agency and the National Meteorological Agency.** 7. **As the agricultural sector grows in scale and scope, the need for holistic cross-sector, cross-agency and cross-ministerial communication, coordination and alignment increases. This is hampered by lack of internal capacity and external authority offices mandated to amalgamate disparate offices and institutions.** 8. **The Paris Declaration tenet on Mutual Accountability, although generally recognized and appreciated, is also generally not expressed. This may be due to challenges of information flow on the GoE and DP sides and the inability and/or reluctance of Donor Institutions to provide unequivocal commitment to their investment plans.** |
| 2. How would you assess the progress you have made on **improving the functioning of agriculture markets, increased markets, access and trade**? |  |
| Narrative:  Consider the specific improvements, policies and programs that your country has initiated and implemented to improve farmers’ access to agriculture markets and trade opportunities  In ranking your progress, consider programs and policies that you have formulated and implemented, the challenges you have encountered and the success you have had in overcoming those challenges |
| Country Team Comments and Clarifications:  **Consolidated DP Comments**  **Background**   1. **In the revised PIF RoadMap (March 2012), market system function is identified under Strategic Objective 2 as *“Support investments to establish and improve markets and marketing systems (market information, market infrastructure etc.)”.*** 2. **In 2008 the Ethiopian Commodity Exchange was launched as a trading floor for several agricultural commodities including coffee, wheat, maize, legumes, oilseeds and pulses with the objective to streamline trading and payments. This has been supported by several development investments.** 3. **Improvements in the telecommunication network have made market information more widely available to farmers. This knowledge has enhanced their decision making capacity as well as their ability to maneuver within the market.** 4. **In particular, AGP, AGP/AmDE, AGP/LMD and HABP are programmes with significant investment in market systems. In addition many bi-lateral projects (examples; DFATD, USAID, Finland, DFID, EKN, EU, GDC, IDC, JICA, WB) provide support to market access through:**    1. **Construction of market centers**    2. **Construction of storage facilities**    3. **Construction of improved road access**    4. **Capacity building and skills training on value chain and market linkage approaches to agricultural development** 5. **Based on RED&FS Data, approximately $214,000,000 is identified as ongoing DP investment in PIF SO2.**   **Constraints and Challenges**   1. **Road construction is an ongoing issue. Many high potential production areas are still effectively isolated from market access. The GoE has a Universal Rural Roads Access Programme that envisages improved road access for all 19,000 kebeles. However, this is a demanding goal and progress is not keeping up with potential.** 2. **The need for improved market centers is an ongoing issue. Much trade is still done in open markets without shelter, creating quality issues and post-harvest losses. Associated with this, is that occasionally, even when improved centers are constructed and available, traders still maintain their traditional trading methods and locations. The motivations for this need to be addressed and compensated for.** 3. **The “mind-set”, experiences and attitudes of producers of commodities, also needs to be appreciated. Many producers maintain a “subsistence” approach to production rather than a “commercial” approach. Under a commercial approach more attention must be given to market and consumer standards of quality grading, sanitation, availability etc.** |
| 3. How would you assess the progress you have made **in increasing private sector involvement along the agriculture value chain?** |  |
| Narrative:  Private sector involvement will be critical to sustaining the advances being made in agriculture production. Consider the status of the country’s Private Sector Investment Plan and the impact that the involvement of the Private Sector has had on strengthening the agriculture value chains.  In ranking your progress, consider programs and policies that you have formulated and implemented, the challenges you have encountered and the success you have had in overcoming those challenges |
| **Country Team Comments and Clarifications:**  **Consolidated DP Comments**  **Background**   1. **In 2010, the GTP identified the growth and vigour of the Private Sector as essential to the achievement of the GTP goals.** 2. **In 2010, the PIF under SO2 identified Private Sector Growth as a Priority Investment Area.** 3. **In 2011, the World Economic Forum launched Grow Africa. In Ethiopia, the AGP is the vehicle mandated to largely deliver on the Grow Africa Public/Private partnership model.** 4. **In 2012 the G-8 New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition was launched. This Framework identified 15 policy actions aimed to facilitate and increase Private Sector engagement in the agriculture sector. The agreement also identified DP commitments to the New Alliance. However, many of these commitments are tentative and flexible, meaning they may not be new commitments but actually prior commitments to other programmes.** 5. **Following the New Alliance launch, In order to lead the implementation of the G-8 Framework, a Private Sector Development Task force was formed under RED&FS. This Task Force brings together MoA, ATA, DPs, NGOs, and National and International Agri-Businesses. The Task Force is mandated to move ahead on:**    1. **Private Sector participation in the seed sector.**    2. **One window service for agricultural investors.**    3. **Refine policies on agrochemical importation, distribution and use.**    4. **Strengthen livestock value chain through production, health, and value addition components.**    5. **Increase the availability of credit.**    6. **Strengthening of land use rights.** 6. **The ATA has vigorously engaged in the area of Public/Private Partnerships and have built linkages with local and international industries and markets.**     **Constraints and Challenges**   1. **Many of the points of the New Alliance Framework remain as ongoing initiatives, although strongly identified under the mandate of the RED&FS Private Sector Task Force. Within the MoA, the refurbishing of the institutions required for the delivery of the Framework has proceeded slowly. The Investment Directorate turned over several Directors over two years and most recently the Directorate has been altered to an Agency, once again with a change in leadership. However, as mentioned, these remain as ongoing activities.** 2. **In the distribution of agricultural inputs, it may be interpreted that the GoE preference is to use Cooperatives as a primary distribution platform for inputs. A debate can develop around the divergent positions “Cooperatives are more effective or Private Sector is more effective in the distribution of inputs”.** 3. **There is a perception that the GoE is inhibited to move away from a direct and active control of several commodity sectors and evolve to a more passive, regulatory role. The World Bank CPS 2012 pg. 30 reports *“the direct or indirect influence of the Government in key areas such as seeds, fertilizer, breeds and other agricultural inputs undermines competition and thus innovation and effectiveness”.*** 4. **Access to credit remains a constraint to private sector growth and investment. USAID reports the *“27% bond purchase requirement for new loans restricts liquidity and access to the finance for the private sector, particularly since the CBE is exempted from this requirement while private banks must adhere to it”.*** |
| 4. How would you assess the progress you have made on increasing the availability and access to food and access to productive safety nets? |  |
| Narrative:  Consider the types and number of policies and programs that you have initiated and implemented to ensure an adequate, dependable food supply for your population, the widespread availability, dependability and access to food supplies and the types of safety nets that have been put in place to ensure that the population has adequate nutrition on a consistent basis.  In ranking your progress, consider programs and policies that you have formulated and implemented, the challenges you have encountered and the success you have had in overcoming those challenges |
| Country Team Comments and Clarifications:  **Consolidated DP Comments**  **Background**   1. **In 2005, the GoE, with the support of DPs, designed and commenced implementation of a Food Security Programme which included a Productive Safety Net Programme as well as complementary programming to strengthen local livelihoods.** 2. **In 2010, the GoE developed a new five year Food Security Programme (FSP) comprising four complementary program components: (i) PSNP, including a risk financing mechanism (ii) Household Asset Building Programme (iii) Complementary Community Investment (CCI) Programme and (iv) Resettlement Programme. DPs provide support to the PSNP and HABP while the other two components are entirely implemented, managed and resourced by the GoE.** 3. **The PSNP/HABP, through its aligned, multi-donor, multi-stakeholder model has grown into a $2,000,000,000 programme and has succeeded in:**     1. **Improving food security.**    2. **Decreasing the food gap.**    3. **Protecting assets by decreasing distress depletion.**    4. **Increasing access to inputs.**    5. **Buffering impacts of environmental shocks.**    6. **Contributing to rural and community infrastructure, water points, roads and decreasing environmental degradation.** 4. **The PSNP/HABP, together with other components of the FSP, are expected to graduate Households (HH) out of food insecurity.** 5. **In early 2013, the GoE indicated its intention to continue elements of the FSP which would include a next generation of PSNP/HABP, as well as explore new thinking and ideas in light of GoE policy and strategy developments that evolved since 2010 including:**    1. **The Disaster Risk Management Policy**    2. **The Disaster Risk Management Strategic Programming Investment Framework (DRM-SPIF).**    3. **The National Social Protection Policy and accompanying strategy.**    4. **The National Nutrition Programme.**    5. **The Climate Resilience Strategy.**   **Constraints and Challenges**   1. **Despite its scale and longevity, PSNP remains less than a fuly national (or even fully rural) safety net. On its own, it has not provided a comprehensive social protection programme and in isolation, cannot lift chronically poor people out of poverty at the rate desired by the government and development partners. The persistent under coverage of the PSNP programme (due to limited resource envelope) is refleted in the continued provision of emergency assistance in most PSNP woredas.** 2. **Nutrition concerns have not been adequately addressed in the PSNP/HABP and beneficiaries are not specifically linked to the provision of basic social services (e.g. health, education).** 3. **Graduation from the PSNP has been less than predicted. This has led to pressure to increase graduation or change the definition of graduation in order to meet the GTP target of graduating 80% of the current caseload by 2015. A major concern is that HHs are being graduated prematurely.** 4. **Graduation itself is often not fully understood by beneficiaries.** 5. **Cash transfers are institutionally preferred over food transfers due to efficiencies and the concept of allowing free market supply and demand to enhance local production and markets. However, many beneficiaries prefer food transfers due to instability in commodity prices and the occurrence of “price-hiking” by traders.** 6. **The PSNP implementation includes devices that proactively engage with female beneficiaries. In spite of this female engagement is less than desired due to their challenge of balancing HH and PSNP activities and cultural influences that inhibit their access to extension and credit.** 7. **The PSNP and its $2,000,000,000 funding has been used as an example of imbalance in terms of the ongoing debate on investment in Food Security vs. Agricultural Growth. However, in fact, the PSNP contributes significantly to the Agricultural Growth and Natural Resource sectors through extension, public works and NRM investments, elements which are often lost in the debate on sector investment.** |
| 5. How would you assess the progress you have made on improving the management of natural resources for sustainable agriculture production? |  |
| Narrative:  Consider the work you have done to include programs and policies that specifically take into account the impact of agriculture production on your natural resources.  In ranking your progress, consider programs and policies that you have formulated and implemented, the challenges you have encountered and the success you have had in overcoming those challenges |
| Country Team Comments and Clarifications:  **Consolidated DP Comments**  **Background**   1. **The AU/Nepad TerrAfrica initiative supported the establishment of the Ethiopian SLM Investment Framework which supports the continental Green Wall Initiative and leads to the Sustainable Land Management Programme in Ethiopia.** 2. **In 2008, The Sustainable Land Management Programme (SLMP) established a $70,000,000 multi-donor fund, and focused on 40 watersheds in 6 Regional States with components of**    1. **Integrated Watershed and Land Rehabilitation**    2. **Institutional Strengthening, Capacity Building and Knowledge Generation and Management**    3. **Rural Land Administration, Certification and Land Use** 3. **The SLMP coordinates and aligns additional projects in the sector** 4. **SLMP 2 is currently approved with identified commitments of $107,000,000.** 5. **PSNP public works contribute to NRM (terracing, water collection, bund construction, replanting) with an estimated $290,000,000 investment.** 6. **RED&FS Data identifies $760,000,000 active current investment in NRM. Many projects and programmes outside of the direct SLM Pillar carry NRM components.** 7. **WB and many other DPs practice environmental safeguard evaluation on projects across all sectors.**   **Constraints and Challenges**   1. **Many lessons learned and a great amount of knowledge has been generated. However, there is a need to institutionalize Knowledge Management and make it more easily available.** 2. **Various programmes and initiatives exercising specific internal M&E systems have resulted in a broad and complex over-all indicator set. There is a need to establish a small but concise share-set framework of indicators** 3. **Absorption capacity often cannot fully match investment levels. There is a need to advance and more fully develop all the components influencing absorption.** 4. **There is a need to harmonize all sectoral flagship programmes in terms of coverage, activities and operational issues (wage rates, per diems etc.) in order to avoid programmes “competing” with each other.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 6. How would you assess the progress you have made regarding women small holder farmers? |  |
| Narrative:  Consider the work you have done to include programs and policies that specifically take into account gender and the role of women farmers.    In ranking your progress, consider programs and policies that you have formulated and implemented, the challenges you have encountered and the success you have had in overcoming those challenges |
| Country Team Comments and Clarifications:  **Consolidated DP Comments**  **Background**   1. **Under MoA, a Women’s Affairs Directorate has been established with the mandate to develop guidelines for mainstreaming gender into all MoA operations. A standard set of gender M&E indicators has been established.** 2. **Under the RED&FS Disaster Risk Management and Food Security Technical Committee (DRMFS TC) a dedicated Women’s Affairs Task Force has been established to promote gender mainstreaming and forward gender issues in the various DRMFS platforms.** 3. **Under AGP, grass root gender issues are identified in the Common Interest Groups. In some components of the programme, targets have been set for women participation. At the technical committee level workplans are reviewed and provided evaluation on gender and youth components.** 4. **Under the SLMP conscious effort has been practiced in order to increase the engagement of women in the programme with close to 40% engagement reached in several components. Women are ensured of pay parity. Under Land Administration, advances have been made in the granting of equal rights to land for women and men.** 5. **Under PSNP gender issues have been demonstratively advanced by:**    1. **The (2008) *Contextual Gender Analysis of the PSNP* found that women’s participation in the program's public works (PW) earned them greater respect in their communities and that the PSNP is having a positive effect on the gender division of labour and power within the household, leading to strengthened social cohesion in decision-making at the household level.**    2. **Similarly, at community level, it was found that some men had revised their attitudes towards women’s work capabilities as a result of regular joint work on PW sites. Focus groups also revealed that some women were learning to articulate their views more as a result of participating in PW activities and related community meetings. This emphasis on women’s participation has also resulted in a more active role for the Women’s Association in some communities, and to the provision of more information on family planning services, presumably because of the recognition of the importance of having more control over the balance of domestic work and PW activities.**    3. ***Public Works and Social Cohesion for Women and Girls:* It was found that in some cases the PSNP has reduced the need to travel for work opportunities.  Mission reports reveal that without the PSNP, beneficiaries would have to migrate in search of employment. The PW programme has reduced the long hours that women often spend each day to walk to collect water, as well as the long distances that teenagers and young boys have to walk to herd the family livestock.**    4. ***Female Representation:* Gender dimensions present a mixed picture. In nearly all (98%) surveyed *kebeles*, there is at least one woman and at least one DA on the *Kebele* Food Security Task Force (KFSTF) and women are fairly represented (at least one woman per kebele) in the *Kebele* Appeals Committee (KAC). Male and female-headed households reported similar perceptions of benefits of public works activities. But both women and men report that women experience significant difficulties in balancing required participation in PW with other household responsibilities.**   **Constraints and Challenges**   1. **The lower level of engagement of women in higher offices, in spite of affirmative actions and targeting initiatives, may be a reflection of the low availability of qualified women. This in turn may be a reflection of their lower level of access to education and resources as girls. There are many deep rooted social and cultural influences impacting the opportunities for women which will require a profound and measured shift in attitudes.** 2. **Women, especially rural women, are often burdened with ongoing daily household responsibilities. There is a traditional gender allocation to specific tasks (firewood and water collection, cooking, child rearing). Development projects that wish to increase the engagement of women, need to consider these social and cultural constraints and provide mechanisms, capacity, infrastructure and technologies that will alleviate the traditional labour and time demands on women in order to increase female engagement in project participation.** 3. **Data collection and M&E indicators need to be modified to allow for gender desegregated analysis.** 4. **There is a lack of accountability when gender targets are unsuccessful and not achieved. Gender targets require a higher level of priority and accountability.** 5. **Many projects and programmes identify gender targets. However, often there is insufficient budget allocated for activities.** 6. **There are, especially in rural areas, strong social, cultural and religious traditions, on all the sides, male, female and community that can decrease the ability of women to access extension, credit and other public services. In addition lack of understanding of the meaning and goals of gender equality is wide spread. Many programmes, projects and policies provide chapters and paragraphs addressing gender. However, in practice it is often forgotten or frustrating to implement.** 7. **PSNP Reports that there are still improvements that can be made with respect of PSNP impacts on women. The Overseas Development Institute (ODI) notes that the effectiveness of the PSNP as an instrument to tackle gender-specific economic and social vulnerabilities has been hampered by a number of significant, yet not insurmountable, implementation shortcomings. For example, equity issues, lack of recognition of the value of community childcare and lack of capacity building related to gender aims for PSNP clients and implementers.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5. What other dynamics would you highlight regarding implementation of agreed investment plans? |  |
| Narrative:  Consider the work you have done to date and what type and level of impediments were encountered.    In ranking your progress, consider programs and policies that you have formulated and implemented, the challenges you have encountered and the success you have had in overcoming those challenges |
| Country Team Comments and Clarifications:  **Consolidated DP Comments**  **Background**   1. **In 2010 the PIF was launched as Ethiopia’s National Investment Plan for Agriculture. Since then it has undergone two Review exercises. The Review exercise format includes the engagement of two external consultants who have been mandated to evaluate the progress of PIF in terms of inputs and outputs and also to evaluate the RED&FS effectiveness in implementing the PIF. Major findings and recommendations from two PIF reviews include:** 2. **Difficulties in accessing information on budgets and expenditures. The Planning and Programming Directorate is seen as the MoA office that should deliver on this information. However, it is not able to.** 3. **Lack of Mutual Accountability. On the GoE side this may be related to the difficulties in accessing information. On the DP side it may be related to the DP institutional inability or unwillingness to commit to investments that go beyond the time-lines of national budgets.** 4. **Since the PIF was launched several emerging issues have arisen (Nutrition, Climate Change). These emerging issues are not adequately addressed and given direction in the current PIF so an extensive revision should be done.** 5. **As the sector grows in complexity there is an increased need to engage other ministries and sector coordination platforms with the Agricultural Sector (Trade, Water, Industry, Energy, Transport etc.). Cross-Ministerial communication is often difficult to implement.** 6. **Capacity of government is limited. There is a need for an extensive coordinated capacity enhancement of the MoA. Skill development and staff retention needs to be improved. Skill development is relatively easy in providing training and education. However, this is counter-productive if the upgraded staffs are not retained within the GoE system. An innovative approach to CB is required.** 7. **Debate may be conducted on the extent of influence CAADP has played in the implementation of the Ethiopian NAIP, the PIF. Certainly Ethiopia, through the joint RED&FS, has been uni-laterally pro-active in conducting its own internal annual reviews of the PIF. In addition the PIF review also analyses the RED&FS structure itself and seeks ways to make it more efficient and functional in its mandate to deliver on the PIF. In the years since the PIF was launched, it may be said, not a lot of engagement or sustenance has been forthcoming from CAADP, in support of the annual reviews.** 8. **The “Flagship Programmes” of RED&FS, specifically AGP, SLMP, and PSNP are outstanding models of harmonization of DP and GoE development investments and alignment of initiatives with the identified development priorities of the GoE.** |

1. Based on the CAADP 2013-2023 Results Framework. The five elements are used to monitor changes in African Agriculture resulting from the implementation of CAADP approaches [↑](#footnote-ref-1)