

20. JOINT EVALUATION

COUNTRY PARTNERSHIP FRAMEWORK ETHIOPIA-SPAIN (2011-2015)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



Edition: November 2016

© Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation
Secretary of State for International Cooperation and for Ibero-
America
General Secretariat for International Development Cooperation

Pictures © PROEVAL Consultores, S.L.

Report made by: PROEVAL Consultores, S.L. with a team formed by:
Javier Carmona (Team leader)
Inés Mazarrasa
Noelia Tiedeke
Kaleab Getaneh (Field support)

NIPO online: 502-16-188-X

The opinions and views expressed in this evaluation report are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation.

It is authorized to reproduce total or partial portions of this document as long as the source and authors of the copyright are adequately named.

If you have any questions about this document, please contact:

Evaluation and Knowledge Management Division
General Secretariat for International Development Cooperation
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation
C/ Serrano Galvache, 26. Torres Ágora. Torre Norte
28071 Madrid
Ph:+34913948808
e-mail: evaluacion-sgcid@maec.es

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Country Partnership Framework 2011-2015 (CPF) is the joint country partnership strategy that has guided the work of the Spanish Cooperation in Ethiopia since 2011. Its preparation in 2010 coincided with the development of the Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP) by the Government of Ethiopia for the same period. The CPF focuses on three priority sectors (basic social services, health, and rural development and fight against hunger), two sectors of intervention (gender and culture) and humanitarian action as field of action. In addition, gender and environment are considered cross-cutting priorities.

CONTEXT

- Ethiopia is one of the main recipients of ODA at the global level.
- The country is a key actor for the stability of the region, with a democracy under construction.
- Significant progress is being made in terms of socio-economic development but regional, rural-urban and gender-based disparities remain high.
- Ethiopia is subject to frequent natural and/or man-made disasters.
- Relationship between the Government and donors is determined by a high level of leadership and ownership and by commitment to the principles of aid effectiveness.
- Spanish Cooperation is present in Ethiopia since 2007. From 2007 to 2010 Spain provided €160 million of official development assistance (ODA) and actively participated in existing coordination groups.

MAIN FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

I. The context of international cooperation in Ethiopia and the methodological approach of the CPF design have contributed to progress in the implementation of the Aid Effectiveness Agenda (despite Spanish ODA reduction), to strengthen policy dialogue (thanks to proactive attitude of individuals), and to better structure the working lines. However, the CPF has not contributed to improving the already weak participation of Ethiopian society in development policy. It has not been used by Spanish Cooperation as a guide for strategic management, coordination of actors and monitoring of progress, neither internally nor in its relationship with the Ethiopian Government. The absence of specific goals for Spanish Cooperation in order to contribute to national development results is one of the determining factors of these weaknesses.

1.1. Spanish ODA to Ethiopia has dramatically declined, following the decrease of Spanish ODA worldwide. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation has been the largest funder (over 90% of Spanish ODA to Ethiopia). During the CPF period, Spanish NGOs have been the largest channel of delivery (42% share), whereas multilateral organisations have witnessed a 90% reduction and Ethiopian public institutions have received similar funds in both periods (30% share in the CPF period).

1.2. The CPF is well aligned to Ethiopian development policies but it was too ambitious given the structural limitations of Spanish Cooperation. The CPF reflects the principles of aid effectiveness. However, many of the specific goals on aid effectiveness established in the CPF have not been fulfilled: i) aid predictability: Less than 60% of the estimated funds for the period 2011-2015 have been disbursed; ii) prioritizing program-based instruments: the use of these instruments has regressed compared to the previous period; iii) participation of civil society: Spain has not actively promoted any remarkable action. The only aid effectiveness goals met are i) Partial geographical concentration of AECID-funded NGO interventions; ii) progress on harmonization in rural development.

1.3. The CPF design process was based on the 2010 CPF methodology but was less participatory than desirable and it failed to define specific goals for Spanish Cooperation within the respect of ownership and alignment principles. The absence of Spanish decentralized cooperation actors in the CPF design process is noteworthy; even in their relative weight in Ethiopia was low. They also have not used the CPF as a reference for their work. In this sense, the CPF only reflects AECID's strategy. The CPF shows a strong commitment with the aid effectiveness agenda by prioritizing sectors and funding mechanisms promoted by the Ethiopian Government. However, it lacks a critical analysis of government policies and it fails to set specific products, goals and targets for Spanish Cooperation contribution to national development results in each sector and to define the logical and expected cause-effects links among the different elements of the results chain. This lack of a strategic approach hinders an overall shared understanding of i) what is to be pursued; and ii) the best optimal use of all resources available to Spanish Cooperation, be it in the form of funding, expertise, knowledge, or division of labour.

1.4. Beyond an overall definition of intervention priorities, the CPF has not been used as a strategic management tool. The CPF provides a structure and a formal framework for a strategy of continuity in relation to the previous period. As it represents official commitments with the partner country, the CPF has been instrumental in clarifying the sectorial prioritization, helping to keep in line with the work and avoiding sudden unilateral changes in decision making on support for initiatives outside this framework. However, the absence of specific goals for Spanish Cooperation inhibits results based management and monitoring. In practice, the contribution to expected Ethiopian development results, as defined by the CPF, has not driven management and monitoring. The CPF is not monitored as a whole, no comprehensive reports have been produced, nor has a joint Ethiopian-Spanish monitoring system been established. This has prevented taking advantage of the potential complementarities between the various funders, entities, instruments and interventions.



Common Interest Group of Women in Oromiya

1.5. AECID has actively and strategically engaged in coordination and policy dialogue fora, although Spanish Cooperation has not defined a strategy for action in this respect. Through the Agricultural Growth Program (AGP) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Pool Fund associated coordination structures, AECID's Technical Cooperation Office (OTC) in Ethiopia has reinforced relationships of trust with other donors and relevant Ministries and has positioned itself as a significant player, both in health and rural development sectors. It has been active in strategic and technical decision making structures, forums and joint missions. These achievements have been made despite the absence in Spanish Cooperation of an institutional definition of policy dialogue and the lack of a strategy to identify and systematize progress made in this sense. Positive results have relied heavily on personal voluntarism and hard work of individuals within the OTC, despite not having had all the needed resources. The commitment to maintain this engagement even in the face of difficult financial restrictions has been commendable throughout the past years.

Spanish Cooperation has actively contributed to rural development and fight against hunger (through improvement of agricultural and livestock productivity and increase of vulnerable population income) and health (by strengthening the public health system). The evaluation has not identified remarkable contributions to development results in basic social services, culture or gender related to interventions launched during the CPF period.

2.1. Rural Development and Fight against Hunger: Fully aligned with national policies and structures, Spanish Cooperation has taken a two-fold approach: i) it supported high value production agricultural development through the AGP; and ii) it addressed rural poverty by reducing vulnerabilities and improving income through NGO interventions. The evaluation shows that in both types of programs the bulk of the efforts has been dedicated to capacity building of public players and farmers, and to providing equipment and building or rehabilitating rural infrastructures that are improving access to water and agricultural inputs. However, construction of medium and large rural infrastructures has faced considerable challenges from a technical and financial perspective, as well as with regard to maintenance and sustainability. In addition, interventions have focused on production rather than marketing and commercialization. No evidence has been found regarding the contribution of business CAP projects to development results in this sector.

2.2. Health: Through support provided to the Government-led SDG Pool Fund, the largest volume of funds has been allocated to the procurement of medical equipment and supplies, and of health products. Through other bilateral interventions in the sector, Spanish Cooperation has also supported the construction of health infrastructure, as well as training to develop skills. These actions have contributed to improve access to health care. Technical assistance for the implementation of health care insurance in Ethiopia has faced sustainability challenges.

2.3. Basic Social Services: This is the CPF sector with the biggest divergence between what was planned (over 50% share of CPF budget) and what has been executed (less than 10% of CPF funds). This is explained by the fact that the Promoting Basic Services Programme (PBS) was mostly supported through AECID's financial cooperation instrument (FONPRODE). Due to changes in regulation related to the Spanish economic crisis, during the CPF period FONPRODE could not provide non-refundable resources and Ethiopia was not eligible for State to State refundable cooperation.

2.4. Gender in Development: Under the CPF, Spanish Cooperation has restricted its role basically to tracking on-going interventions funded in previous years. The biggest budget was allocated to strengthening the structure of the Ministry of Women, Children and Young Affairs (MoWCYA) but the evaluation has not appreciated any sustainable results.

2.5. Culture and Development: Spanish Cooperation support has not followed a clear and comprehensive strategy and has been limited to finalizing pre-CPF financed interventions. During the CPF period, only scholarships, assistance ships and inter-university cooperation and scientific projects (PCI) received funds. The three major interventions were funded prior to the CPF and show uneven performance: two handicraft cultural centres (the one in Harar has been completed and is functional while the one in Addis Ababa has not been constructed due to unsettled claims over the land), and the FABLAB at Addis Ababa University, which is an isolated initiative, currently running but with questionable sustainability.

3. For each CPF priority sector, instruments and channels of delivery have been used in a different way. Thus, aid to rural development has been implemented primarily through NGO projects and programs and to a lesser extent through the multi-donor basket fund for agricultural growth. Spanish NGOs work has enabled access to remote areas and especially vulnerable populations but this large part of the portfolio remains invisible in coordination fora and policy discussions. Support to health and basic social services has been mainly channelled through multi-donor basket funds. Spain's proactivity in health and agriculture has been publicly recognized by implementing Ministries and by other donors in Ethiopia. Interventions in gender and culture have been piecemeal, ad hoc and disconnected. In both cases dialogue was based on project implementation, lacked a comprehensive sector approach and ended once the interventions concluded.

3.1. 53% of the CPF funds have been allocated through projects and programs, which tend to increase aid fragmentation. However, some projects imply continuity in previous lines of action and the majority of them have been aligned with national development policies. The high number of agreements and projects via NGOs translates into the use of parallel structures and an increase of aid fragmentation. This seems to be in contradiction with the expressed intention to improve aid effectiveness. However, the Ethiopian Government recognizes that Spain-funded NGOs' work is fully aligned with national development policies and strategies, strengthens public institutions at local level and has greater ability to reach remote areas (evidenced when comparing the AGP Pool Fund with NGO agreements). Funds channelled through NGOs (channel 3 for Ethiopian Government) are not considered in the sector working groups, coordination structures and policy dialogue opportunities. Bilateral projects with the Government have encouraged the aid effectiveness agenda when they were part of an articulated strategy between the Government and the donors. All the other projects funded via different calls for proposals -open and permanent calls (CAP), business CAP, PCI- have had little relevance in terms of budget and influence. Further, there has been little to no coordination and complementarity of these interventions with AECID sectoral strategies in Ethiopia and sometimes their contribution to development results is unclear.

3.2. Support through basket or pool funds has enabled Spanish Cooperation to be a key donor in health and rural development despite its modest resources. Basket or pool funds have been the second most used instrument in the CPF period. In the three priority sectors, resources have been allocated to existing basket funds: the SDG-Pool Fund in health; the AGP in rural development; and the PBS in social services. Spain has also done a small contribution to the Development Assistance Group (DAG) Pool Fund. AECID decision to participate in both the SDG Pool Fund and the AGP was smart and strategic, thanks in part to the proactive profile of the OTC staff. Even though Spain's weight has been very small in terms of funding (around 0.4% in the SDG and 2.5% in AGP), it has enabled Spanish Cooperation to participate on an equal footing with other donors in the dialogue and decision-making structures. Conversely, Spain did not participate in the development of the PBS and when the PBS III was launched AECID ceased to contribute and lost its position in the dialogue structures.

3.3. Technical cooperation and multilateral aid have played a limited role during the CPF period. Spanish Cooperation has missed the opportunity to use their full potential. Technical cooperation has been under-utilized in Ethiopia, despite its potential as a complement to larger interventions. Most of the funds have been allocated to scholarships and assistance ships, along with one intervention connected to the APIA Program (Support to African Inclusive Public Policies). During the CPF period the only voluntary contributions to multilateral organisations specifically earmarked to Ethiopia come from AECID's Humanitarian Action Office (OAH). However, prior to the CPF several interventions were financed through the NEPAD Spanish Fund for the Empowerment of African Women, and the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F). In spite of their volume and possible connection with the CPF priorities, there is no evidence of their integration in the CPF strategy. It does not seem that Spanish Cooperation has taken any advantage of these experiences to improve policy dialogue, to establish relationships with new partners, to enhance information regarding CPF priority sectors or to foster complementarity with other interventions.

3.4. Aid instruments and not an overall country-programme strategy have determined management and funding. There is a disconnection between results-based planning at country level and actual decision making and budget distribution at headquarters level. Overall, management and monitoring of interventions are strongly defined by the type of funding instrument. Too often programme management is restricted to administrative and bureaucratic follow up of instruments, which being an essential duty absorbs most resources and staff efforts. The decision on budget allocations is fragmented among different Spanish Cooperation stakeholders and AECID departments. This hinders a comprehensive view of the overall picture, undermining the possibility to choose the most adequate instruments to better serve the CPF strategy in order to achieve the planned results.

4. In line with the lack of guidance regarding crosscutting approaches in the 2010 methodology, the CPF has been blind to crosscutting issues.

4.1. The CPF document did not include specific analysis on crosscutting issues and references to them are generic and vague. It considers mainstreaming gender and environment but there is no explicit reference to cultural diversity or to the human rights-based approach, two other horizontal priorities in Spanish Cooperation III Master Plan 2009-2012 that seem relevant to the Ethiopian case. The evaluation has found attempts to promote the participation of women in rural development. However, the fact that projects include actions for women does not mean that gender is mainstreamed. Spanish Cooperation in Ethiopia has not made sufficient efforts to identify and consider key elements that (at least in theory) could influence crosscutting issues. Similarly, the CPF lacks of a better understanding of environmental challenges derived from the path of the country's economic and demographic growth. In the Ethiopian context, where the vast majority of the population depends directly on natural resources, environmental sustainability needs necessarily to find integrated solutions that overcome the dichotomy "economic growth" vs "environment".

5. The CPF includes some elements that make it moderately adapted to Ethiopia's fragilities and chronic vulnerabilities. However, these aspects are not explicitly and sufficiently covered. In addition, factors such as the proactivity and flexibility of Spanish Cooperation are strengths to build on.



AGP irrigation

5.1. Crisis prevention and resilience building aspects are not sufficiently covered in the CPF given Ethiopian proneness to crises. The CPF does not consider Ethiopia as a fragile state. However, the lines of work it proposes do fall within some of the OECD Principles on Fragile States. When the CPF was designed, the Fragile State Principles were not taken as a reference. In fact, many respondents do not see Ethiopia as a fragile State although they suggest that there are certain economic, political, social and environmental issues with potential risks that make Ethiopia especially vulnerable. The CPF methodology does not contain any specific aspect to be considered in this typology of countries. Thus, there was no analysis of the linkages between development and emergency. However, the CPF includes some factors that are consistent with resilience building: supporting state-building, national structures and capabilities and aligning with national priorities and coordination mechanisms among existing international actors. At the same time, NGOs interventions are often located in hot spots, high vulnerable communities, and work on assets and capacities building, which can be considered as key elements of resilience. Similarly, although crucial aspects such as access to water and sanitation are not explicitly included in the CPF, they have been worked under rural development. On the other hand, there is no evidence that the CPF has enabled Spanish Cooperation actors to undertake common analysis of the underlying causes that undermine development possibilities, with regards to individuals, families and communities. Similarly, joint risk analyses have not been undertaken. AECID supports the national disaster risk management structures for risk profiling in the country but it does not seem to use these profiles for the design of new interventions.

5.2. The assessment on Spain's comparative advantage was limited when formulating the CPF. Overall, the analysis of comparative advantage conducted in the CPF is shallow and does not provide a thorough assessment of what specific added values and opportunities Spanish actors can offer. The focus on the criteria of past experiences (programmes funded) may have underestimated other considerations such as the existence of capacities (technical, financial, administrative, etc.) within Spanish Cooperation that could add value in comparison to other players and donors in meeting Ethiopian needs. It is important to highlight that Spanish Cooperation added value may not rest so much on the volume of its financial contribution but rather on the consistency, quality and sustainability of the support and on the relationships of trust it has built. For instance, in rural development the identified added value (transfer of knowledge and promotion of fruit trees and horticulture) has been quite limited in terms of resources and efforts allocated, whereas Spain's pro-activity, commitment, and problems solving spirit in policy dialogue has been commended.

6. The inclusion of humanitarian action in the CPF was controversial and its budget has suffered the strongest decline during the CPF period, both in absolute and relative terms.

6.1. The inclusion of humanitarian action in the CPF was a matter of debate in AECID.

The OAH considered that humanitarian action should not be negotiated or planned with partner countries in order to ensure the respect of the principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence. On the other hand, the OTC considered necessary to include prevention due to the predictable and recurring humanitarian crises in Ethiopia. Finally, the CPF included a generic paragraph on humanitarian action, with no mention to prevention.

6.2. Spanish humanitarian action to Ethiopia has experience the largest decline in budgetary terms in comparison to ODA allocated to development sectors. From 2011 to 2015, over €9.5 million were disbursed to humanitarian actions in Ethiopia through funds coming from AECID and to a lesser extent from the Autonomous Regions of Madrid and Catalonia and other funders. Most of the funds disbursed from 2011 to 2015 responded to the 2011 humanitarian crisis. In this context, the flexibility and availability of Spain's humanitarian action and its good relationship with other international humanitarian donors and with the Government stood out as strength in the specific humanitarian action evaluation conducted.

LESSONS LEARNED

1. Effective alignment with national policies' goals and indicators of partner countries needs to be accompanied with a framework of specific targets for Spanish Cooperation that allows critically engaging, tracking progress and using available means at their full potential.
2. Given the current Spanish Cooperation constraints there is divergence between what the CPF intends to achieve and what it can actually do. In order to narrow the gap between planning, decision- making, budgeting and managing, careful consideration at the highest level is required about the structural changes that need to be put in place to foster a more coherent practice.
3. Working with partner countries with strong national and sectorial drive like Ethiopia requires Spanish Cooperation to engage in actions beyond self-contained projects. The contribution of funds should not be the only factor to be considered when assessing Spain's added value in a specific context, but aspects such as the quality of the relationships with partners, trust, proactivity, leadership and commitment over time are also significant.
4. Alignment with national policies in sectors where there is not strong ownership and drive from the recipient country may lead to weak sectoral policy dialogue, increase the chances of not achieving expected results and negatively affect the sustainability of interventions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Looking to the next CPF, it is recommended to:

1. ***Strengthen the CPF design and planning phase, so that it reveals a comprehensive overview of the country strategy in order to allow an optimal use of knowledge, coordination and complementarity between different Spanish Cooperation funders, entities, instruments and actions.***

Involving decentralized cooperation should start from the design phase of the CPF. Given the multitude of Spanish sources of ODA funding, a pragmatic approach to decide what actors need to be involved in the CPF planning and implementation is highly recommended. Since decentralized actors often have no fieldwork staff, ways to encourage their regular participation by means of remote communication (video conference, etc.) should be sought throughout the CPF implementation. Another way to involve them could be through the knowledge and experience of NGOs who usually know who works where. As such, in the CPF design process, the OTC can encourage them to think about other Spanish actors potentially interested in participating in the CPF, either with monetary contributions or in kind (e.g. sharing the know-how of municipal companies).

Spanish Cooperation should establish its own specific goals for each sector -either process or results related- accompanied by indicators and targets, to facilitate monitoring and to better identify complementarities among interventions and instruments. Likewise, the CPF should realistically adapt its objectives to Spanish Cooperation reality by taking into consideration the choice of instruments and aid modalities, and the limitations to perform multi-annual disbursements.

In addition, a sector-integrated analysis of relevant key crosscutting issues should be conducted, to make visible what the different socio-cultural specificities are; which factors hinder or promote the enjoyment of rights; and what are the social, cultural, political and legal dimensions that perpetuate relations and systems of discrimination and inequality between men and women.

Regarding fragility, a joint risk analysis is recommended. It should contain possible scenarios with reference to the five dimensions introduced by the OECD in its recent report on fragility, and envisage mechanisms that allow flexible adaptation to changing contexts.

Finally, some important factors should be considered when assessing Spanish Cooperation's added value, such as its quality and flexibility, the lack of specific restrictions on the type of institutions it can support, or the diversity of instruments available and their potential for strategic complementarity.

2. Use the CPF as a management tool, and implement a monitoring system based on the strategy and not only on individual interventions.

The next CPF should include regular and realistic monitoring mechanisms involving main Spanish Cooperation actors under the auspices of AECID. The monitoring system should allow measuring aggregated progress against jointly defined development, management and aid effectiveness results under a sectoral approach fed by individual interventions. It should also help to identify challenges to be overcome and opportunities to explore. In addition, to monitor projects directly funded by AECID, regular meetings with Spanish actors should be held in order to build and consolidate common understanding around the CPF strategy, improve the dialogue and seek further complementarity and synergies between the different approaches and interventions. It is also recommended to strengthen joint monitoring with Ethiopian Government based on the strategy defined in the CPF. To that end, annual CPF monitoring reports should be produced and joint sessions should be conducted to account for progress, as well as regular meetings with both the Ministry of Financial and Economic Cooperation (MoFEC) and sectoral ministries.

Efforts to improve recognition of interventions channeled through NGOs (channel 3) by Ethiopian authorities and coordination structures should be made. Spain should also work with other donors and the Government to ensure safety and protection of NGOs staff and ease their working conditions, especially in conflict areas.

3. Concentrate the next CPF in the sectors of rural development and health, including a resilience approach. Include humanitarian action in the CPF preserving its principles.

It is recommended to continue the commitment to support public health system, through the SDG Pool Fund, as well as other strategic interventions (e.g. supporting the Health Insurance Agency or providing training to medical specialists). Likewise, it is suggested to continue to support rural development and fight against hunger through two pathways: AGP and projects and agreements with NGOs. The quality of the support provided in rural development can benefit from the knowledge and lessons arising from NGOs experience in the country. Projects and agreements implemented by NGOs without expertise in the field should not include the construction of medium and large-scale infrastructures, which in most cases have absorbed much of their resources and energies, without visible results so far. In contrast, they should cover the entire value chain, focusing their efforts not only on production but also on marketing and commercialization (access and transportation, contact with wholesalers, market research and value chain studies). Public-private initiatives in rural development should be conducted in partnership with social institutions, to ensure their links with development results. Furthermore, it is advisable to assess the "pilot" initiatives of the new aid instrument "Innovative Actions" to track their performance.

Gender, culture and basic social services sectors should be excluded in the new CPF. Nonetheless, gender and cultural diversity should be mainstreamed in CPF interventions following AECID recently launched guidelines.

Given the context of recurrent crises in Ethiopia, the next CPF should address resilience building in a comprehensive manner; regardless of the aid instrument or the funding department. Both development interventions and humanitarian actions should be designed and implemented to build resilience and reduce risks.

Humanitarian action should remain in the next CPF in accordance with humanitarian principles. Further coordination, understanding and complementarity between humanitarian assistance and development bodies of Spanish Cooperation, particularly in AECID, should be promoted in order to advance towards a common position that better accommodates the specificities of the Ethiopian context. The risk profiles in the country supported by AECID could be used for the design of new interventions. Humanitarian action capacities and knowledge at OTC level should be reinforced, particularly in terms of access, humanitarian space and principles.

4. *Promote structural changes in SGCID and AECID to allow greater decision-making autonomy at country level. In addition, decisions at headquarters level should take more into account the CPF implementation needs from a whole-of-organisation strategic approach.*

Adapt funding decisions to results-oriented planning to ensure that operational decisions on programs and instruments allocations are coherent with a comprehensive results framework and are agreed upon based on an overall picture of the country strategy and not mainly on the budget available for each department. This might also involve greater decision-making at country level (OTC).

Coordination, pursuit of aid effectiveness and dialogue require flexible and fit-for-purpose capacities (personnel, instruments, and systems), resources and knowledge. Regarding staff selection criteria, the CPF strategy involves a type of work and skills beyond administrative or technical tasks associated with project management. Thus, knowledge on public policy making, empathy, communication and language proficiency, and negotiation abilities, for instance, are valuable skills to be sought.

5. *Continue the productive work done so far in policy dialogue, strengthening its definition and possible lines of development.*

Spanish Cooperation could benefit from a conscientious thinking about what policy dialogue involves in relation to its potential objectives and expectations. It should seek to build a common understanding among its main actors, or at least among AECID staff, particularly at OTC level. At country level, policy dialogue needs to be linked with strategic lines of work and build on strengths and gains already achieved by Spain in the country. Thus, the new CPF could identify and systematize the progress made so far in this regard, and use the available aid instruments to strengthen policy dialogue. It is important to *foster institutional policy dialogue (without being dependent on individual initiatives)*, and to maintain proactivity in coordination groups (RED&FS, SDG Pool Fund) to extend the established trust relationships and Spain's role in sectoral working groups.

6. **Make greater use of AECID Guidelines on Cooperation Modalities and Instruments to assess the opportunities and adequacy of instruments to the Ethiopian context.** Some ideas on potential use of aid instruments are presented hereunder.

Foreign policy grants, due to their flexibility and potential sectoral alignment, could be the basis upon which to articulate Spanish Cooperation support in each sectoral strategy of intervention and as an entry point for policy dialogue.

NGOs interventions have geographical reach and presence in more remote areas and carry out outreach work. They can also provide valuable information and experiences (knowledge and best practices) that could be brought forward and integrated into dialogue with policymakers.

Support to research and innovation or technical assistance could serve as strategic contributions to reinforce Government's guidance based on evidence produced by researchers and/or qualified professionals.

In a pilot experience (such as public-private partnerships in the field of Humanitarian Action), it is essential to gather and systematize information to enable learning and replicability of the model in similar contexts.



Agricultural Cooperative in Oromiya

Other related documents in:
<http://www.cooperacionespanola.es/en/publications>

