Credit: Thai Thi Minh/IWMI

Multi-stakeholder platforms and processes in Ethiopia: The case from agriculture and water management

Dagmawi Melaku and Thai Thi Minh

1. Background

The importance of actively involving and engaging multiple stakeholders in agricultural research and development is well recognized. The need to address complex agricultural problems at multiple levels and across sectors has led to the development of multi-stakeholder platforms and processes (MSPs) in order to bring together multiple actors via different means (Dentoni et al. 2012; Breeman et al. 2015; Bisseleua et al. 2018). Such MSPs are increasingly seen as a promising vehicle for agricultural innovation in developing countries (Hemmati 2002; Adekunle and Fatunbi 2012; Schut et al. 2015; all cited in Bisseleuaa et al. 2018).

MSPs come in multiple forms and sizes, including both formal (e.g., multi-stakeholder alliances, partnerships, platforms and initiatives) and informal (e.g., networks, interactions and relationships) (Russo and Tencati 2009). MSPs may be led or initiated by government or non-government actors like non-governmental organizations (NGOs), international organizations, private sector and development partners. MSPs can be orientated around innovation, research or development, or established for coordination and networking. Such MSPs are increasingly used in natural resource management and agriculture (Kilelu et al. 2013). MSPs create opportunities for a more structural and long-term engagement with stakeholders in the agricultural sector, enabling them to interact to jointly identify problems, device solutions, implement solutions and valuate the cycle (Schut et al. 2015, Hermans et al. 2017). Thus, engaging stakeholders through MSPs is one of the strategic ways to meet development and innovation goals.

However, there are also challenges, and literatures show a mixed picture when it comes to MSPs' actual contributions and impacts. Some studies criticize MSPs as high-stake and high-cost endeavors. Loveridge and Wilson (2017), for example, argued that MSPs are often seen as not meeting expectations while being costly and risky. Their study also highlights from various works (Amerasinghe et al. 2013; Caplan 2013; ICAI 2015; Martens 2007; Tewes-Gardl et al. 2014; all cited in Loveridge and Wilson 2017) the different criticisms regarding the creation and cessation of multi-stakeholder partnerships, their effectiveness, and additional administrative and reporting work burdens. Another criticism regards the internal structure and conceptualization of MSPs, which may limit their life cycle, sustainability and effectiveness (Loveridge and Wilson 2017). However, there is limited information available in this regard, especially in the Ethiopian context. This study, therefore, analyzes how MSPs influence policies and practices, and explores the challenges and opportunities related to their impact and sustainability. Accordingly, this study aims to:

- Identify and develop MSP typologies using multiple contextual, structural and operational characteristics.
- Analyze how the different types of MSP influence policy and practice in their respective sectors.
- Suggest ways to strengthen and optimize MSP impact and sustainability.

We selected MSPs from the wider development sector and, specifically, the agriculture and water management subsectors in Ethiopia for this analysis for two reasons. First, the agriculture sector is an essential component of the Ethiopian economy and the country's development. Agriculture accounts for 40 percent of GDP, 80 percent of exports and an estimated 75 percent of the country's workforce (USAID 2020). Despite its important roles, the agricultural sector is characterized by low production and productivity. There are various reasons for this, including environmental degradation, high rainfall variability and poor agricultural water management (AWM) in traditional farming systems (Langan et al. 2015). These have created many challenges and issues that need to be tackled, creating an interesting empirical setting in which to analyze the dynamics of the MSP landscape. Second, there is considerable interest in the development of the agriculture sector, including AWM, in order to achieve the intended changes in production and productivity. MSPs have key role in this dynamic policy and development environment. This provides a relevant case to analyze the relationship between MSPs and policy processes. In the next section, we outline the methodological approach used for this study.

2. Methodology

2.1 Research approach

The study used a qualitative research approach, following three steps. First, **MSPs identification** was carried out using purposive sampling. This was done by applying expert knowledge of the population to select samples in a non-random manner (Lavrakas 2008), i.e., by identifying the corresponding governmental and non-governmental actors (NGOs and private sector) working in agriculture and water management. These include sustainable development, climate change, agricultural development, food and nutrition, water and irrigation, environment and natural resource management, gender, and livestock (fodder). In total, 32 MSPs that operate at national, regional and local levels were identified and documented for this analysis (Annex 1).

Second, an online search for **secondary data** on current MSPs was carried out. In addition to providing an overview of the MSP landscape, this search supplemented primary data on further identification of MSPs, as well as specific aspects of given MSPs, in cases where primary information was not available or limited. Further, the search acquired additional information on the overall context of MSPs as well as regional and international experience. The two main sources of the secondary information were, firstly, grey literature gathered from MSPs and organization/project websites, meeting reports and proceedings, briefs, brochures and presentations; and, secondly, academic literature on MSP-related topics. A total of 23 grey literature sources and 18 academic publications were reviewed and cited.

Third, **primary data** was collected from key informants via email correspondences and telephone calls. The key informants were first identified from secondary sources (websites and grey literature), followed by non-probability sampling (purposive and snowball sampling) using social and professional networks. Twenty potential respondents were contacted for information on MSPs and/or other potential sources of information about MSPs, of which 13 provided inputs (Annex 1). A protocol for data collection was developed and used to organize and document different types of qualitative information about each MSP that was identified (Annex 2). This information includes geographical coverage (national, regional or local), thematic focus areas, objectives, lead organization, participants and stakeholders, strategic and routine activities as well as life cycle (short term/project based, long term/not-project based).

2.2 Data analysis

The data analysis followed the principles of content analysis (Hsieh and Shannon 2005) to identify relevant themes, concepts and patterns across the gathered qualitative data. The analysis and its presentation in this report are based on two main guiding analytical questions. First, '**How are MSPs organized?**' This is to help characterize and develop typologies of existing MSPs in Ethiopia. Hence, the report looks at the type of lead institutions for each of the documented MSPs: governmental, NGO and private sector. Second, '**How do MSPs operate and function?**' This question is to understand how MSPs influence policy and practices relevant to AWM. The analysis then looks at data on the issues around which the MSPs are organized, and the strategic and routine activities of those MSPs.

3. Multi-stakeholder platforms and processes: Typologies and characteristics

This section provides an overview of MSPs in Ethiopia. The documented MSPs are organized and presented by three main typologies based on the type of lead organization as presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Different typologies of MSPs in Ethiopia

Characters	Government-led MSPs	NGO-led MSPs	Private sector-led MSPs
Main themes	- Sustainable development, agriculture and rural development, natural resource management and environment, gender, climate change, and WASH.	- Sustainable development, natural resource management, agriculture and rural development, food and nutrition, gender and youth, climate change and WASH.	- Irrigation, value chain development and solar technologies.
Issues to form MSP/focus areas	- Economics of climate and environment, green growth, WASH - Irrigation and agriculture water management - Renewable energy - Watershed development and management - Soil and water conservation - Agribusiness and small and medium-sized enterprise value chain development - Gender equality and women's empowerment.	- Sustainable water resource management and agricultural development - Agribusiness development (cooperative development, contract farming, access to finance, value chain, market, food and nutrition for small-scale farmers) - Climate resilience and circular economy, conservation agriculture, agro-ecology, natural resource management - Renewable energy - Gender and youth in agriculture.	- Water and irrigation technologies for smallholder agriculture - Solar energy development - Value chain development - BDS.
Coverage	- National, regional, and local.	- National, regional, and local.	- National.
Stakeholders	- Government, research and academia, non-governmental development patterns and actors, private sector, farmers and farmer cooperatives.	- Private sector, government, non-governmental development partners and actors, farmers and farmer cooperatives, research and academia.	- Government, private sector, non-governmental development partners and actors.
Objectives	- Knowledge management: information sharing and learning, function as sectoral knowledge hub, capacity development - Engaging and influencing: supporting policy development and implementation, linking research with practice, advocacy - Facilitating partnerships and collaboration: connecting stakeholders, establishing partnerships, joint planning and implementation, coordination, creating synergy between stakeholders and harmonizing efforts.	- Knowledge management: capacity building, entrepreneurship and business development, learning, conduct research and assessments, develop roadmaps, document and share information - Engaging and influencing: advocacy and engagement for adoption/integration of best practices and policy improvements - Facilitating partnerships and collaboration: establish long-term collaboration and partnerships, connecting stakeholders, coordination, joint planning and implementation.	- Knowledge management: testing and developing business models, awareness raising, capacity building, information sharing - Engaging and influencing: dialogues and advocacy to support policy and business environments for solar energy development - Facilitating partnerships and collaboration: connecting service providers and consumers, linking private sector actors with each other and other stakeholders.
Activities	- Facilitate the promotion of innovations; awareness raising campaigns; act as a knowledge hub for the generation of information and knowledge by facilitating research and studies; provide training and technical supports - Facilitate advocacy, lobbying and dialogues with key stakeholders and policy makers to influence policy, practices and operating environment; support evidence-based decision making by linking research and practice; support policy makers in strategy development and planning; provide financial program supports for policy implementation - Liaise with similar MSPs across sectors; facilitate collaboration, coordination and harmonization of different mutual efforts of actors under one umbrella by leveraging existing programs; create public-private partnerships and partnerships among stakeholders and members.	- Conduct research and assessments to generate knowledge and information; document and disseminate information; study outputs - Provide training and awareness raising for members and stakeholders; enhance capacity for policy and program implementation - Develop sectoral road maps to shape national agenda; support policy, strategy and standards development; advocate better political commitment and research-based decision making to integrate best practices into sectoral policy - Test innovative pathways and approaches, such as market-based solutions, inclusive business models and low-tech efficient technologies, to achieve objectives and influence practice - Explore innovative ways to establish long-term collaborations by providing leadership; promote commercially-oriented partnerships with the private sector.	- Create a forum for the dissemination and exchange of information; increase awareness and skills to enhance service and technology delivery; develop a pool of private sector business service providers - Advocacy and dialogues with policy makers and processes to enhance enabling policy and business environments; promote interests of members among government, public and external stakeholders - Pilot and test new and innovative business models for scaling - Establish partnerships between key supply chain actors; establish a network of service providers.

3.1 Government-led MSPs

This typology includes 14 MSPs that are led by government institutions. Examples of government institutions leading MSPs include the Ministry of Water, Irrigation and Energy; the Ministry of Agriculture; the Environment, Forest and Climate Change Commission; the Agricultural Transformation Agency and Addis Ababa University, as well as regional bureaus of agriculture and water. While MSPs in this typology are all government-led, there are cases where MSPs were first initiated by (or with the support of) NGOs but the primary leadership was then transferred to government, such as Partnering for Green Growth and the Global Goals 2030, and the National Watershed and Agroforestry Multi-Stakeholder Platform. There are also MSPs jointly established by government and non-governmental actors. For instance, the Ministry of Agriculture and the international organization World Agroforestry (ICRAF) established the National Watershed and Agroforestry Multi-Stakeholder Platform. There are also examples of multiple government organizations coming together to establish MSPs, like the Environment for Development Initiative – Ethiopia, which was established by the Environment and Climate Research Centre and Policy Studies Institute.

Government-led MSPs involve and engage with a range of stakeholders as shown in Table 1. The various stakeholder types are categorized under government (ministries, various institutions, sectoral bureaus at different levels and policy makers); research and academia (local and international universities, technical colleges, research institutions); non-governmental development partners and actors (NGOs, civil society organizations (CSOs), donor agencies, international organizations and development partners); private sector (small and medium-sized enterprises, agro-industries and agribusinesses, technology suppliers, service providers, financial institutions and other value chain actors); and farmers and farmer cooperatives (including smallholders and other organized producers).

These MSPs operate mainly at the national level but also at regional and local levels. Most of the MSPs have a long-term life cycle and are not project based. This could be due to institutionalization and embeddedness of the MSPs. In some cases, where MSPs are based on specific programs, such as the ONE WASH platform and REED+ Learning Network, their lifespan is longer than the average project-based platforms that usually last between 3-5 years.

The goals of the MSPs vary as per their thematic areas of interest. The MSPs have goals linked to certain thematic areas that are key to national development agendas and priorities, such as sustainable development, agriculture and rural development, natural resource management and environment, gender, climate change and water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH). The sectoral focus areas and issues that the MSPs are working to address are presented in Table 1. Most MSPs have multiple objectives, but common ones are to facilitate knowledge management, engage and influence stakeholders and decision makers, and facilitate partnerships and collaboration.

Knowledge management focuses on enhancing capacities and the knowledge base of stakeholders, members and other target groups. Good examples include the National REED+ Learning Network, the Horn of Africa Regional Environmental Centre and Network Agriculture Water Management Task Force, the Environment for Development Initiative – Ethiopia and the Forum for Learning on Water and Sanitation. To achieve this objective, these MSPs implement a set of strategic and routine activities:

- *Strategic activities:* facilitating the promotion of innovations; awareness raising campaigns; acting as a knowledge hub for the generation of information and knowledge through facilitating research and studies; provision of training and technical support.
- *Routine activities:* periodic events promoting learning, connecting stakeholders with mutual interests, sharing experiences and joint action; identifying, documenting and disseminating different types of information (e.g., policy developments, research and study outputs, lessons learned and other communication materials); serving as a focal point for interaction between domestic and international institutions; liaising with similar MSPs across sectors.

Engaging and influencing aims to influence decision makers and stakeholders to improve enabling policies, business environment and certain practices. Examples include the Sanitation Marketing Multi-Stakeholder Platform, the Environment for Development Initiative Ethiopia, the Horn of Africa Regional Environmental Centre and Network, and the Forum for Learning on Water and Sanitation. To achieve this objective, these MSPs implement the following set of activities:

- *Strategic activities:* facilitating advocacy, lobbying and dialogues with key stakeholder and policy makers to influence policy, practices and operating environment; supporting evidence-based decision making by facilitating linkages between research and practice; supporting policy makers in strategy development and planning; providing financial program supports for policy implementation.
- *Routine activities:* periodic events like workshops, consultation meetings and experience sharing events to engage and influence decision makers and stakeholders.

Facilitating partnerships and collaboration focuses on networking and fostering partnerships and collaborations between stakeholders. Examples include the Environment for Development Initiative – Ethiopia, the National Watershed and Agroforestry Multi-Stakeholder Platform and Water Sector Working Group, the National REED+ Learning Network and the Horn of Africa and Regional Environmental Centre and Network. To achieve this objective, these MSPs implement the following set of activities:

- *Strategic activities:* liaising with similar MSPs across sectors; facilitating collaboration, coordination and harmonization of different mutual efforts of actors under one umbrella by leveraging existing programs; creating public-private partnerships and partnerships among stakeholders and members.
- *Routine activities:* providing space for joint planning, implementation and monitoring as well as resource mobilization for partnership-based activities; serving as a focal point for interaction between domestic and international institutions; organizing periodic events to connect stakeholders with mutual interests.

3.2 NGO-led MSPs

This typology includes 16 MSPs that are led by different types of non-governmental actors. These organizations include NGOs like the Christian Relief and Development Association and DanChurchAid; CSOs such as the Forum for Environment and the Civic Engagement Alliance; international organizations, including the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) and various United Nations bodies; and donors and development partners such as USAID and the World Bank. Some NGO-led MSPs, like the Ethiopian Beverage Alliance for Water, the Ethiopia Agroecology Platform, the Environment and Coffee Forest Forum and the Sustainable Food Platform, are established in partnerships with other non-governmental actors (including development partners, academia and CSOs), government and the private sector. Few are initiated and led by CSOs. NGO-led MSPs involve and engage with a range of stakeholder groups similar to those in government-led MSPs. These include the private sector; government; non-governmental development partners and actors; farmers and farmer cooperatives; and research and academia (Table 1). NGO-led MSPs have a mixed coverage and life span. Nearly half of MSPs are project-based, usually short-term, and operate at regional and local levels. This is in contrast to government-led platforms, which are mostly longer term and not project based.

These MSPs work across various thematic areas, including natural resource management, agriculture and rural development, food and nutrition, gender and youth, and climate change. The thematic areas are very similar to those of government-led MSPs. This may be because of a desire among non-governmental actors to align their efforts with national development priorities and key agendas. The main focus areas and issues that these MSPs are addressing are presented in Table 1. These MSPs have multiple objectives, but the most common ones are similar to those of government-led MSPs.

Knowledge management focuses on supporting the generation of information and knowledge, promoting its use for decision making, planning and building the capacity of stakeholders. Example MSPs are the Ethiopian Beverage Alliance for Water, the Agroecology Platform, and the Local Innovation Platforms (Africa Rising project). The MSPs undertake the following activities:

- *Strategic activities:* conducting research and assessments to generate knowledge and information; documentation and dissemination of information and study outputs; training and awareness raising for members and stakeholders; enhancing capacity for policy and program implementation.
- *Routine activities:* organizing periodic events for learning and experience sharing; field days; awareness raising campaigns; market linkages.

Engaging and influencing aim to improve policy and regulations as well as support informed decision making with regards to investments and policy formulation. Examples include the Forum for Environment, the Environment and Coffee Forest Forum, and the Civic Engagement Alliance – Ethiopia. The following activities are undertaken to achieve these objectives:

- *Strategic activities:* developing sectoral road maps to shape national agendas; testing innovative pathways approaches such as market-based solutions, inclusive business models and low-tech efficient technologies to achieve objectives and influence practice; advocacy for better political commitment and for research-based decision making in order to integrate best practices into sectoral policy; supporting policy, strategy and standards development.
- *Routine activities*: organizing periodic events to engage and influence decision makers and stakeholders via learning and experience sharing.

Facilitating partnerships and collaboration is an additional objective that is common to most MSPs. Examples of platforms with this as a main objective are the Ethiopian Beverage Alliance, Agri Profocus, the Sustainable Food Platform and the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN) Nordic Partnerships. For this purpose, the following activities are undertaken:

- *Strategic activities:* exploring innovative ways to establish long-term collaborations by providing leadership, and promoting commercially-oriented partnerships with the private sector.
- *Routine activities:* organizing events for connecting stakeholders and fostering partnerships; providing space for various actors to work towards joint actions and coordination, such as project development, implementation and monitoring activities.

3.3 Private sector-led MSPs

MSPs that are led by private sector actors in the water management subsector make up the smallest category, with only three such MSPs documented. The first, Solar Energy Development Association – Ethiopia, is a non-profit association founded by solar energy market actors. The second, the Smallholder Pump Alliance, is led by the international non-profit Technoserve. The third, the Synchronized Network of Value Chain Innovation Actors (SYNOVIA), was founded by several local service provider companies with the support of an NGO. These MSPs engage and work with different groups of stakeholders, including the private sector (local and international producers, technology suppliers, service providers), non-governmental development partners and actors, and sectoral government institutions. Engagement with groups like research and academia or farmers and cooperatives is not observed in the accessed information. All the three MSPs operate at national levels. Two are not project based whereas the Smallholder Pump Alliance is a short-term, project-based MSP.

These three MSPs' goals and activities are focused on value chain development, irrigation and solar energy. The main focus areas and issues that the MSPs are working to address are presented in Table 1. The MSPs have multiple objectives which are similar to the previously discussed MSP typologies.

Knowledge management focuses on increasing stakeholders' capacities, access to services and information, and testing new approaches and learning. SYNOVIA, the Smallholder Solar Pump Alliance and Solar Energy Development Association – Ethiopia all have knowledge management as part of their main objectives. Key activities are:

- *Strategic activities:* creation of a forum for the dissemination and exchange of information; increasing awareness and skills to enhance service and technology delivery; developing a pool of private sector business service providers.
- *Routine activities:* facilitating knowledge and experience sharing through periodic events like workshops and meetings, and provision of business development services (BDS).

Engaging and influencing focus on providing members with opportunities to interact with decision makers and stakeholders in order to advocate their interests and influence policy and/or practice. The Smallholder Pump Alliance and the Solar Energy Development Association – Ethiopia are mainly involved in this through the following activities:

- *Strategic activities:* advocacy and dialogues with policy makers and processes to enhance enabling policy and business environment; promoting interests of members among government, public and external stakeholders; piloting and testing new and innovative business models for scaling.
- *Routine activities:* Engaging with decision makers and stakeholders through periodic meetings, workshops, experience sharing and learning events.

Facilitating partnerships and collaboration focuses on networking and fostering partnerships and collaborations. All three private sector-led MSPs considered here regard this a main objective, achieved through the following activities:

- *Strategic activities:* establishing partnerships between key supply chain actors and establishing a network of service providers.
- *Routine activities:* organizing events for connecting stakeholders, networking with members and enhancing coordination for collective action.

3.4 Similarities and differences

Data collected on the MSPs shows there are some similarities and differences between the three typologies. These similarities and differences are seen in the different aspects of the MSPs, including the main themes and issues the MSPs work on, general goals and specific objectives, the types of stakeholders they engage, and strategic and main activities.

Similarities. First, a common group of stakeholders are observed across all three platform typologies including private sector, government and non-governmental development partners and actors. Some of the government-led and NGO-led platforms also engage with farmers and farmer cooperatives as well as stakeholders in research and academia. However, the representation and participation of private sector actors seems to be less when compared to that of government and development partners. Further, MSPs led by government and NGOs operate at both national, regional and local levels. The MSPs that operate at regional and local levels are in most cases project based.

Second, different MSP typologies share common themes and most of the corresponding issues which the MSP are working on. This is particularly true for MSPs led by government and NGOs, where there are similar main themes such as sustainable development, agriculture and rural development, natural resource and environmental management, climate change, WASH, renewable energy and gender and youth inclusion. Private sector-led MSPs also work on water resources, but the specific issues are directed more towards technology supply chains and business development rather than the management of agricultural water resources. Further, all MSP platforms have three general aims, as discussed in Sections 3.1-3.3: knowledge management, engaging and influencing, and facilitating

partnerships and collaboration. However, there are differences in the specific objectives within the three general goals, which are discussed in the next subsection.

Third, most platforms work to influence both policy and practice in their respective thematic areas through regular and strategic activities that are common across the MSP typologies**.** Regular activities include organizing periodic events for connecting stakeholders; establishing partnerships; and learning and experience sharing among members and external stakeholders**.** Strategic activities include the development of projects and programs; conducting assessment and research, policy reviews and recommendations; developing strategies, road maps, and action plans; resource mobilization; capacity building; establishing strategic partnerships; and promoting strategic interests of members and stakeholders.

Building the capacity of stakeholders and members is another common activity where MSPs raise awareness, disseminate information and provide training. In addition, all MSP typologies aim to achieve the engaging and influencing objective through advocacy and lobbying to influence policy and operating environments for promoting sectoral agendas (for government- and NGO-led MSPs) and the business interests of members (private sector-led MSPs).

Differences. Comparisons of MSP typologies show that the types of stakeholders are different**.** MSPs led by the private sector seem to engage with fewer groups of stakeholders, focusing mostly on government, other private sector actors and non-governmental development partners and actors. Other groups, like research, academia, farmers and cooperatives are not seen in the documented MSPs. Additionally, the geographical coverage of the studied private sector-led MSPs is primarily at the national level, unlike those led by government and NGOs which operate at regional and local levels as well.

Further, the scope of themes and issues seem to be much narrower for the private sector-led MSPs assessed in this study. The main themes are irrigation/water technologies and business and value chain development. Private sector-led MSP also have slightly different objectives compared to the other two typologies. For instance, the knowledge management objectives of private sector-led MSPs include testing and developing business models, which are unique for this typology. Meanwhile, government- and NGO-led MSPs include knowledge generation through research and assessment as part of their knowledge management objective. Engaging and influencing objectives also show some differences between the MSP typologies. Government-led MSPs focus on supporting policy improvement, implementation and linking research with practice. MSPs led by NGOs are more focused on integration of best practices into policies, whereas private-led ones focus on dialogues and advocacy towards enabling business and policy environments. For the partnership facilitation and collaboration objectives, private sector-led MSPs mostly focus on connecting service providers with each other and with consumers, whereas MSPs led by NGOs focus on using innovative approaches and leadership to establish long-term collaboration. Government-led MSPs focus on coordination (e.g., joint planning and action, harmonizing efforts between stakeholders) in addition to creating linkages and partnerships.

While most regional MSPs operate and link stakeholders only at a regional level, a few MSPs, like the Regional Transformation Council, facilitate the connection of regional stakeholders and issues with federal ones. Another difference is in terms of funding sources. Project-based MSPs have the financial resources to cover their operating costs for a given time, whereas platforms that are not project-based are required to secure external funding and mobilize resources.

Finally, there are some differences in the strategic activities among the MSP typologies. For example, in knowledge management, some of the government- and NGO-led MSPs conduct various types of studies, assessments and research to support informed decision making at higher (policy and strategy) levels. These include developing sectoral road maps to shape national agendas, supporting policy and developing standards. In terms of facilitating partnerships and collaboration, these MSPs also focus

on coordination and harmonizing efforts of various stakeholders for joint planning, implementation and monitoring at the program level.

4. Influence on practice and policy

This section briefly assesses if and how the different MSPs influence practice and policy in Ethiopia. For this purpose, the study looks at how MSPs under the three typologies carry out engagement and influencing, knowledge management (including capacity development), and other relevant strategic activities that contribute towards improving the policy environment and the adoption and scaling of best practices. Key points are summarized in Table 2.

4.1 Influence on policy

Most themes and corresponding policies are similar between government- and NGO-led MSPs. The targeted policies are: general development and climate-resilient green economy; agriculture and rural development; agricultural water management (AWM) and irrigation development; renewable energy; gender and social inclusion; natural resource, environmental management and policy and regulations regarding agribusiness development; value chain and market; and business development services (BDS). However, the policy influence of private sector-led MSPs seems to be limited to renewable energy and irrigation development. This could be due to the purposeful selection of AWM-related MSPs and the limited number of private sector-led MSPs identified in this area and studied.

MSPs can influence policy in one of two ways. First, through direct involvement in the study and the development and review of policies and strategies. Second, by facilitating different types of direct and indirect support for the implementation of specific policies and for meeting certain targets (Table 2).

Government-led MSPs seem to have a more direct involvement in policy processes. For instance, the Water Sector Working Group connects stakeholders to jointly discuss, develop, review and propose the policies and strategies agenda for water resource management and WASH sectors. The MSP also facilitates opportunities for stakeholders to suggest strategies and actions required to mainstream sustainable and integrated water resources management in sectoral development agendas and plans. Other MSPs, like the Environment for Development Initiative – Ethiopia, are focused on policy research and dialogues for the economics of climate and environment, energy, natural resource management and green growth. Such MSPs influence policy by generating knowledge and information, and by communicating outputs with stakeholders and policy makers to support decision making with regards to socio-economic policies. Some MSPs, like the Partnering for Green Growth and the Global Goals 2030, influence policy by supporting effective on-the-ground implementation to help meet selected (general development) policy targets by developing projects on circular economy, agriculture and renewable energy, and resource mobilization. The Ethiopian Network for Gender Equality in Agriculture supports the development and implementation of gender-responsive agricultural policies, strategies, programs and projects by raising awareness, linking stakeholders and partners, and harmonizing such efforts. The Forum for Learning on Water and Sanitation influences policy by identifying challenges and lessons learned, and documenting these in order to identify and set national priorities for the subsector.

NGO-led MSPs also work to influence sector-related policies. For example, the Ethiopian Beverage Alliance for Water influences water policy and strategies by conducting water accounting surveys and sub-sectoral assessments to develop a roadmap for the industry and shape the national agenda for water resources and management. Ethiopia Agroecology integrates conservation agriculture into Ethiopian extension policy by using in-country evidence, which it does by conducting research and advocacy, sharing research findings, and promoting experiences, sharing and learning. The GAIN Nordic Partnership develops policy and standards for food and nutrition quality and safety. The

National Learning Alliance informs investment and policy making decisions for agriculture policy by communicating research outputs, providing training on sustainable agricultural intensification, and engaging decision makers, government, donors and the private sector. The Food and Land Coalition – Ethiopia also influences the policy environment relating to productive and regenerative agriculture, protecting and restoring nature, health and nutrition, and food waste by promoting learning and developing long term pathways (strategies and plans) for sustainable food and land use systems in Ethiopia. The Ethiopia Climate Change Consortium influences the implementation of climate policies and strategies by creating awareness, building capacity, advocating better political commitment on climate change and by influencing decision makers to take sound measures on the ground.

The **private sector-led MSPs** focus on advocacy and lobbying to improve the policy framework for private sector development and business. The Smallholder Pump Alliance and the Solar Energy Development Association – Ethiopia are examples of platforms that aim to enhance the national policy and operating environment for solar energy development. They do this by: bringing together business providers for collective influence; awareness raising; instigating dialogue with policy makers; advocating pro-renewable energy policies and regulations; and by advocating an overall improved business environment for the supply of – and access to – renewable energy technologies.

4.2 Influence on practices

All three types of MSPs also influence key practices and technology use regarding crop production, AWM and irrigation development, gender and social inclusion, access/use of renewable energy, agricultural and rural development, natural resource and environmental management, and WASH (Table 2).

Table 2. MSP Influences on policy and practice

Government-led MSPs	NGO-led MSPs	Private sector-led MSPs
Influence on policy: targeted policies and mechanisms		
- General development and climate-resilient green economy - (Renewable) energy - AWM and irrigation development - Gender and social inclusion - Natural resource and environmental management - Policy environment for development of agribusiness, value chain, market and BDS	- Agriculture and rural development, agricultural extension - Renewable energy - AWM and irrigation development - Gender and social inclusion - Natural resource and environmental management - Policy environment for development of agribusiness, value chain, market and BDS	- Renewable energy - Irrigation development
Mechanisms - Conducting socio-economic research and studies to support informed decision making - Support for policy implementation including training, technical support, financial and program support - Support for policy makers in strategy development and planning - Advocacy, lobbying and dialogues with key stakeholders and policy makers for policy improvement - Promoting collaboration and partnerships for resource mobilization and joint policy implementation	- Inform policy and investment decision making via research and assessments of policies and strategies - Awareness raising and capacity building for stakeholders to enhance lobbying and advocacy works, and policy makers to create enabling policy environment - Advocacy and lobbying for integration of best practices into policy - Developing sectoral road maps and long term pathways to shape national agenda - Technical support for policy and standards development - Facilitating partnerships and coordination for resource mobilization and joint action for policy implementation	- Engagement and advocacy with policy makers and stakeholders to promote pro-renewable energy policies, regulations and enabling environment

Influence on practices: targeted interventions and mechanisms		
- Good practices and technologies (agronomy, AWM and irrigation) - Gender and social inclusion practices - Access to renewable energy - Enabling good practices (agribusiness, value chain, market, business development) - Natural resource and environmental management practices - WASH	- Good practices and technologies (agronomy, AWM and irrigation development) - Gender and social inclusion practices - Access to renewable energy - Natural resource and environmental management practices - Enabling/good practices (agribusiness, value chain, market, business development) - WASH	- Access to renewable energy - Enabling/good practices (for agribusiness, value chain, market, BDS)
Mechanisms - Conducting assessments and pilots to test and identify best practices, innovations and technologies regarding the sustainable and efficient use, management and conservation of natural resources; agronomic and AWM practices; renewable energy; gender and social inclusion - Documenting and disseminating information; organizing learning; awareness raising and experience sharing events; developing manuals and guidelines on best practices, technologies and innovations for wider adoption	- Conducting action research and assessments to test and identify best practices, innovations and technologies regarding agronomic and agricultural water management, sustainable natural resource management and use; gender and social inclusion; renewable energy; market-based solutions and inclusive business models - Capacity building and other support to promote best practices regarding agribusiness development practices (entrepreneurship, market and value chain development and BDS) - Documenting and disseminating information; organizing training, learning, awareness raising and experience sharing events; advocacy and lobbying for wider adoption and scaling	- Raising awareness to stakeholders and potential users about solar technologies - Capacity building to increase the number of qualified practitioners for solar technologies and the quality of renewable energy technologies and services provided - Enhance capacity of BDS providers, develop a pool of BDS qualified providers, link BDS providers with clients, incentivize innovations and develop quality standards for services

Government-led MSPs mainly influence practices by supporting the coordinated implementation of sectoral polices and strategies, enhancing capacity of implementers and by promoting innovative approaches. The National Watershed and Agroforestry MSP influences practices regarding natural resource management and agriculture production systems by promoting watershed development and agroforestry practices, which it does by harmonizing scattered efforts, leveraging existing programs, and supporting evidence-based scaling at national levels. The Ethiopian Network for Gender Equality in Agriculture influences gender and social inclusion practices by synergizing various efforts and bringing together stakeholders for better learning, and by building the knowledge base for more efficient mainstreaming and delivery of gender-responsive outputs. Some MSPs influence practices by introducing or adopting innovative approaches and partnerships. For instance, the Sanitation Marketing MSP influences practices by promoting an enabling business environment for market-based WASH products and solutions. It does this by establishing and supporting business models with small and medium-sized enterprises and financial institutions to support nationwide scaling.

NGO-led MSPs influence practices in various ways, including: identifying and promoting innovations, best practices and technologies; strengthening partnerships and collaborations for joint implementation; and enhancing capacity of actors. The Ethiopian Beverage Alliance for Water influences practices of efficient water resource management by assessing overall water use efficiency in the beverage industry and by developing a roadmap towards increased sustainability and accountability. Agri Profocus influences practices regarding agribusiness development and farmer entrepreneurship by facilitating innovative ways of working together, enhancing knowledge and skills, and stimulating long-term collaboration among stakeholders including producers, financial institutions and private sector value chain actors. Other MSPs, like Sustainable Food, influence practices regarding food and nutrition security by facilitating market-based solutions, tapping into

existing knowledge, and by bringing together local producers and global partners to develop and test low-tech and energy-efficient food solutions. The GAIN Nordic Partnership follows a similar approach to influence food and nutrition security, and gender and social inclusion, by promoting scalable and inclusive business models and commercially-oriented partnerships, and by training stakeholders to enhance the nutritional value of food.

MSPs like the Forum for Environment influence practices relating to natural resource management, water resources, pollution, climate change and energy via advocacy, lobbying, awareness raising campaigns and community mobilization. The Environment and Coffee Forest Forum shapes practices around conservation, climate change and the sustainable use of the genetic resources and ecosystems in order to improve the livelihoods of local communities by conducting research and developing and implementing specific strategies. The Water and Sanitation Forum employs joint research, learning, advocacy and lobbying to promote best experiences in the WASH subsector. Local innovation MSPs, like the Africa Rising Project, promote innovative agricultural practices at community levels by conducting action research, training, learning and experience sharing events; creating linkages between value chain actors; and mainstreaming gender.

Private sector-led MSPs influence practices focused on enhancing business practices and environments; supply and use of technologies; provision of key services; and capacity building of targeted actors. The Smallholder Solar Pump Alliance influences practices relating to AWM and irrigation development by improving access, use and affordability of solar powered irrigation technologies, and by developing strong business and financing models for smallholder solar pumps through pilots and scaling in local markets. The Solar Energy Development Association influences the adoption of solar pumps by increasing the number of qualified, highly-skilled solar energy practitioners; by improving the quality of products and services provided; and by sharing information and creating awareness about the technologies. SYNOVIA also changes practices regarding agriculture value chain development by innovative approaches to enhance the capacity of BDS providers; developing a pool of qualified BDS providers; linking BDS providers with clients; incentivizing innovations; and developing quality standards for services.

5. Strengthening and optimizing multi-stakeholder platforms and processes

5.1 State-of-the-art agricultural water management-related MSPs

The data collected with regards to water management-related MSPs in Ethiopia shows that mainly governmental and NGO actors, and to some extent private sector actors, play active roles in establishing and leading these MSPs. Almost all the MSPs have objectives relating to knowledge management, engaging and influencing, and facilitating partnerships and collaboration within their thematic areas of interest. MSPs also have specific objectives as well as strategic and routine activities they undertake to achieve their objectives. Moreover, the MSPs also have different roles in research, innovation and development, as well as corresponding mechanisms to influence policy and practices. About one third of the assessed and currently operational MSPs are project based (usually short term), and the others are not project based (usually long term).

Such MSPs have the potential to tackle complex development challenges by bringing stakeholders together for collective action (Hermans et al. 2017). Among the key challenges in the Ethiopian agriculture and water resource landscape are: the degradation of the resources; challenges in institutional and (cross-)sectoral coordination and linkages; gaps in capacity and in the enabling environment for implementation of policies and measures. Sharing new ideas, technical information, experiences, knowledge and resource management approaches among the different actors is critical to overcoming these challenges (RFS 2020).

The water management-related MSPs in Ethiopia are attempting to address challenges across the sectors and to facilitate changes at different levels. One example is the provision of opportunities for

linking and enhancing communication between key stakeholders, and harmonizing scattered efforts, for the conservation and sustainable management of land and water resources (e.g., integrated water resource management or watershed rehabilitation,). Another approach is to strengthen the capacity of actors in the agriculture and water sectors through awareness creation, training and technical support for government (decision makers, policy/program implementers), private sector (suppliers of key water/irrigation technologies and related services, business development providers) and the public (users of technologies and innovations, communities). Some platforms also contribute towards improved enabling environments through engagement in the policy review and write-up process or through lobbying and advocacy. Others work to address challenges relating to on-farm water access and use and irrigation practices by: encouraging joint efforts to promote best practices; introducing innovative solutions and technologies; improving access by strengthening the supply chain for irrigation technologies and services; and pushing for a better business environment.

Although there is scarce information on the actual performance, sustainability and impacts of water management-related MSPs in Ethiopia, factors that can affect these aspects of MSPs are seen. These relate to:

(I) Formation and operation, such as a short life cycle; the lack of any long-term institutionalization and resource mobilization strategy; and unclear or limited information on their governance, operations and role of members.

(II) Weak commitment and ownership from both lead organizations and members. This could be due to a lack of incentives, or gaps in demonstrating potential benefits for participants, especially private actors, who may demand immediate beneficial outcomes beyond networking and occasional events.

(III) Capacity gaps, particularly when it comes to managing the platforms, their critical resources, stakeholder diversity and needs, coordination, and knowledge and information.

Hermans et al. (2017), Brouwer et al. (2013) and Kusters et al. (2018) argue that the complex nature of the problems that MSPs attempt to address, and the inherent uncertainties that come with them, influence the outcomes and performances of the processes. These studies also note that the diversity of stakeholders' needs and interests, as well as their respective influences, are among the key factors that makes MSPs challenging. In some cases, the design and operation of processes can be problematic as well. Therefore, there is always room for strengthening and optimizing MSPs. Below is a brief overview of opportunities and challenges for optimizing MSPs in Ethiopia.

5.2 Challenges, opportunities and ways forward

The **availability of and access to organized information and documentation** about MSPs in Ethiopia is limited. A lack of basic information on MSPs, like Terms of Reference (detailing the establishment, operational and governance mechanisms, and the role of members), communication materials (e.g., proceedings and reports), and their interactions with other MSPs, make efforts to better understand and enhance the multi-stakeholder engagement processes difficult. More information is documented and available on NGO-led platforms compared to government-led ones. Access to documented information on regional and local government-led platforms is very limited, whereas information about national-level NGO-led platforms is relatively well documented and accessible. Enhancing MSPs' information and knowledge management practices is a key point for future consideration. Monitoring and evaluation systems, clear Terms of Reference, and strong record keeping, communication and information dissemination mechanisms are necessary to ensure transparency, provide data for decision making and allow learning from successes and failures (Amerasinghe et al. 2013). Further in-depth studies and a closer look at MSPs in Ethiopia is also recommended to better understand the different aspects of these MSPs and to come up with concrete ways of strengthening and optimizing them. This includes investigating how MSPs operate, including their dynamics, processes, governance

and operational mechanisms, power balance and their impact and sustainability. This could perhaps be achieved with specific case studies.

The **duplication of thematic areas** among MSPs may put their efficiency into question. Such duplication is a result of limited available information regarding interactions between MSPs and how emerging issues can be integrated into existing ones. To avoid possible duplication of MSPs, the capacity of existing MSPs to take on new initiatives should be assessed (Loveridge and Wilson 2017). Loveridge and Wilson (2017) also mention that following a 'whole system approach' can strengthen connections between MSPs and avoid overlap between focus and membership across MSPs with common agenda and goals. This can be through moving towards greater consolidation or by combining efforts. While there are possible advantages of consolidating similar MSPs, such as greater economies of scale and increased influence and impact, consolidation may also lead to less diversity, creativity and innovation (Loveridge and Wilson 2017).

Another important factor determining the efficiency of MSPs is **capacity**. A lack of technical capacity to coordinate, mobilize resources and implement decisions has affected the stakeholder engagement process and outcomes in Ethiopia (CIFOR 2019). Such inefficiency of MSPs can be risky and costly in terms of finance and time investment (Kusters et al. 2018; Loveridge and Wilson 2017). Necessary conditions for successful and sustained MSPs include: the capacity to manage financial and other resources; adaptive management and leadership; a clear and mutual theory of change, facilitation and communication; trust between stakeholders; and commitment (Kusters et al. 2018). Hence, one essential way to improve MSP efficiency and ensure return on investment is to enhance their technical capacity and professional skills regarding MSP management, leadership, advocacy, facilitation, conflict resolution and coordination (Amerasinghe et al. 2013).

Sustainability of MSPs is one of the most frequently mentioned challenges. This can refer to the lifecycle of project-based MSPs, which usually ends after the completion of projects. Sustainability can also refer to the outcomes and outputs that MSPs produces, the partnerships among members that they broker, the overall contribution to development goals, and benefits to individual members. Lack of ownership, leadership, institutionalization and resource allocation are challenges to MSP lifecycles and their outcomes. Limited leadership roles of organizations with a long-term commitment and strong decision making power is another challenge to ensuring the sustainability of MSPs and their achievements, especially regarding the facilitation and allocation of resources. Enhancing MSP sustainability can be achieved with good governance, institutionalization, transferring ownership, and by leveraging from resources and interventions from the existing MSPs. For example, USAID (2017) recommends facilitating and transferring ownership of the value chain program-based MSPs to either the private sector, relevant associations or government, as well as pushing for cost sharing among participants. Embedding MSPs within government structures provided those official bodies with a greater sense of ownership over the process and ultimately offered the MSPs a pathway to sustainability (Acosta 2019). Co-hosting of MSPs by a group of core members with diverse organizational representation is key to creating shared ownership, maintaining institutional memory and diversifying funding sources (Minh et al. 2020). Finding the right balance between clear and collectively-agreed rules of operation and adaptiveness is important for managing expectations, avoiding disappointment and enduring in the long term (Akhmouch and Clavreul 2016). In addition to cost sharing, self-financing mechanisms and seed funding to address emerging issues, and regular funding of important activities, are critical to strengthening MSPs' management capacity, effectiveness and sustainability (Minh et al. 2020). To ensure the sustainability of any institutionalization, policy dialogue or decision making, multi-stakeholder engagement processes have to be widely understood, accepted and integrated. This requires an anchor institution with significant relevant expertise to spearhead the process and a budget to facilitate continuous stakeholder involvement.

There are various **opportunities** that can be leveraged to build on and optimize MSPs and their performance. There is a need for multi-stakeholder engagements to solve complex problems in

agriculture, irrigation and water management subsectors. This need to address complex problems at multiple levels and across various sectors has led to the development of MSPs (Bisseleua et al. 2018; Dentoni et al. 2012; Breeman et al. 2015). There is also increasing interest in, and recognition of, the roles of MSPs by development actors, including donors and development partners, government and the private sector. MSPs have become critical to coordinating and aligning efforts, as well as information and knowledge sharing, including for AWM in Ethiopia (Langan et al. 2015). The experience of MSPs in Ethiopia has shown an active engagement of stakeholders, including decision makers, to influence policy environment (e.g., the development, evaluation and improvement of sectoral policies, strategies and regulations) as well as shape national agendas. These experiences and active roles of MSPs are also observed in the introduction, piloting and dissemination of innovations, technologies and best practices. These reinforce the MSP-related interventions and support to capitalize on these opportunities.

References

Acosta, M.; Ampaire, E.L.; Muchunguzi, P.; Okiror, J.F.; Rutting, L.; Mwongera, C.; Twyman, J.; Shikuku, K.M.; Winowiecki, L.A.; Läderach, P.; Mwungu, C.M. 2019. The role of multi-stakeholder platforms for creating an enabling climate change policy environment in East Africa. In: *The Climate-Smart Agriculture Papers*, (eds.), Rosenstock, T.S.; Nowak, A.; Girvetz, E. Cham, Switzerland: Springer. Pp. 267-276.

Akhmouch, A.; Clavreul, D. 2016. Stakeholder engagement for inclusive water governance: "Practicing what we preach" with the OECD water governance initiative. *Water* 8(5): 204.

Amerasinghe, P.; Cofie, O.O.; Larbi, T.O.; Drechsel, P. 2013. *Facilitating outcomes: multi-stakeholder processes for influencing policy change on urban agriculture in selected West African and South Asian cities*. Colombo, Sri Lanka: International Water Management Institute (IWMI). 34p. (IWMI Research Report 153). doi:10.5337/2013.214

Bisseleua D.H.B.; Idrissou L.; Olurotimi P.; Ogunniyi A.; Mignouna D.; Bamire S.A. 2018. Multi-stakeholder process strengthens agricultural innovations and sustainable livelihoods of farmers in Southern Nigeria. *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension* 24(1): 29-49.

Breeman, G.; Dijkman, J.; Termeer, C. 2015. Enhancing food security through a multi-stakeholder process: the global agenda for sustainable livestock. *Food Security* 7(2): 425-435.

Brouwer, H.; Hiemstra, W.; van Vugt, S.; Walters, H. 2013. Analysing stakeholder power dynamics in multi-stakeholder processes: insights of practice from Africa and Asia*. Knowledge Management for Development Journal* 9(3):11-31.

CIFOR. 2019. *The role of multi-stakeholder forums in subnational jurisdictions: The SHARE Bale eco-region multi-stakeholder forum, Oromia, Ethiopia*. Bogor, Indonesia: Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR). Available at https://www.cifor.org/knowledge/publication/7420/ (accessed on October 26, 2021).

Dentoni, D.; Hospes, O.; Ross, R.B. 2012. Managing wicked problems in agribusiness: the role of multi-stakeholder engagements in value creation. Editor's Introduction. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review* 15(B): 1-12.

Hermans F.; Sartas M.; van Schagen B. 2017. Social network analysis of multi-stakeholder platforms in agricultural research for development: opportunities and constraints for innovation and scaling. *PlOS One* 12(2): e0169634.

Hsieh, H.F.; Shannon, S.E. 2005. Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research* 15(9): 1277-1288.

Kilelu, C.W.; Klerkx, L.; Leeuwis, C. 2013. Unravelling the role of innovation platforms in supporting co-evolution of innovation: Contributions and tensions in a smallholder dairy development programme. *Agricultural Systems* 118: 65-77.

Kusters, K.; Buck, L.; de Graaf, M.; Minang, P.; van Oosten, C.; Zagt, R. 2018. Participatory planning, monitoring and evaluation of multi-stakeholder platforms in integrated landscape initiatives. *Environmental Management* 62(1): 170-181.

Langan, S.; Kebede, H.; Tadesse, D.; Terefe, B. 2015. *Proceedings of the Launching Workshop of the Agricultural Water Management Platform, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 15-16 January 2015*. Colombo, Sri Lanka: International Water Management Institute (IWMI). 56p.

Lavrakas, P.-J. (2008). *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods* (Vols. 1-0). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc. 1072p.

Loveridge, D.; Wilson, N. 2017. *Engaging with the private sector through multi-stakeholder platforms*. Donor Committee for Enterprise Development. 47p.

Minh, T.T.; Cofie, O.; Lefore, N.; Schmitter, P. 2020. Multi-stakeholder dialogue space on farmer-led irrigation development in Ghana: an instrument driving systemic change with private sector initiatives. *Knowledge Management for Development Journal* 15(2): 98-118.

RFS. 2020. *Multi-stakeholder platforms support the integration of Sustainable Land Management into smallholder farming systems in Ethiopia*. July 7, 2020, Nairobi, Kenya: RFS (Resilient Food Systems). Available at https://www.resilientfoodsystems.co/news/multi-stakeholder-platforms-support-the-integration-of-sustainable-land-management-into-smallholder-farming-systems-in-ethiopia (access on October 26, 2021).

Russo, A.; Tencati, A. 2009. Formal vs. informal CSR strategies: Evidence from Italian micro, small, medium-sized, and large firms. *Journal of Business Ethics* 85(2): 339-353.

Schut, M.; Klerkx, L.; Sartas, M.; Lamers, D.; Mc Campbell, M.; Ogbonna, I.; Kaushik, P.; Atta-Krah, K.; Leeuwis, C. 2015. Innovation platforms: experiences with their institutional embedding in agricultural research for development. *Experimental Agriculture* 52(4): 537-561.

USAID. 2020. *Ethiopia Fact Sheet: Agriculture and Food Security*. Washington, DC, USA: USAID. Available at https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Ethiopia_Fact-Sheet_Ag-Food-Security_Oct-2020.pdf (accessed on October 26, 2021).USAID. 2017. *Multi stakeholder platforms for value chain development. GRAD learning brief no. 5.* Washington, DC, USA: USAID. Available at: https://www.care.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/grad_learning_brief_5_msps.pdf (accessed on October 26, 2021).

Annex 1. Overview of AWM-related MSPs in Ethiopia and information sources

No	Name	Thematic focus areas	Geographic coverage	Life cycle	Name of respondent / information source
1	P4G – Partnering for Green Growth and the Global Goals 2030	Agriculture and renewable energy	National	Long term	https://p4gpartnerships.org/content/ethiopia
2	Ethiopian Beverage Alliance for Water	Water resource management	National	Long term	https://p4gpartnerships.org/partnership/ethiopian-beverage-alliance-water
3	Agri Profocus Ethiopia	Agribusiness, agricultural development, value chain and market, gender, youth and agriculture, soil health management, firm-farm relationships (cooperative development, contract farming, access to finance)	National	Long term	https://agriprofocus.com/ethiopia
4	Ethiopia Agroecology Platform	Climate resilience and circular economy, conservation agriculture, ecology, natural resource management	National and regional	Long term	https://agriprofocus.com/ethiopia-agroecology-platform
5	Forum for Environment	Forests and protected areas, fresh water, flowers; (renewable) energy, pollution and climate change	National and regional	Long term	http://www.climatenetwork.org/profile/member/forum-environment-ethiopia-ffe
6	National Watershed and Agroforestry Multi-stakeholder Platform	Watershed development and management, agroforestry	National	Long term	https://www.worldagroforestry.org/blog/2019/10/22/towards-national-watershed-and-agroforestry-multi-stakeholder-platform-ethiopia
7	Environment and Coffee Forest Forum	Conservation and sustainable use of the coffee genetic resources, forest ecosystems and the environment to improve the livelihoods of local communities	National	Long term	https://ecff.org.et/
8	Ethiopian Network for Gender Equality in Agriculture	Gender equality and women empowerment, agricultural and rural development	National and regional	Long term	Tigist Ayele
9	Environment for Development Initiative - Ethiopia	Economics of climate and environment, energy, natural resource management and sustainable development	National	Long term	https://efdinitiative.org/ethiopia
10	Water and Sanitation Forum	WASH	National		https://www.slideshare.net/CPWF/history-and-development-of-crdawater-and-sanitation-forum
11	Forum for Learning on Water and Sanitation	WASH	National	Long term	https://www.open.edu/openlearncreate/mod/oucontent/view.php?id=79856&section=5.2
12	Water Sector Working Group	WASH, water resource management	National	Long term	Kaleab Getaneh
13	Consortium for Climate Change – Ethiopia	Climate change, natural resource	National	Long term	https://ccc-ethiopia.org/
14	Solar Energy Development Association - Ethiopia	Solar energy development	National	Long term	Nabil Ishak
15	Agriculture Water Management Task Force	Water management, agriculture, soil and water conservation, irrigation	National	Long term	Zeleke Belay
16	National REED+ Learning Network	Climate change mitigation, carbon sequestration and trading	National	Long term	Eyob A
17	Ethiopian Agribusiness Acceleration Platform	Agribusiness development, small and medium-sized enterprise development	National	Long term	Eshetayehu Tefera

18	Synchronized Network of Value Chain Innovation Actors	Value chain development, BDS		National	Long term	http://www.value-chains.org/dyn/bds/docs/798/SYNOVIA%20Presentation.pdf
19	Ethiopian Fodder Roundtable	Forage and livestock development		National	Long term	https://cgspace.cgiar.org/bitstream/handle/10568/543/FAP%20Ethiopian%20forage%20seed%20systems%20flyer.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
20	Horn of Africa Regional Environment Centre and Network	Environmental governance; ecosystem, biodiversity and wildlife conservation; sustainable food systems and ecosystem-compatible value chains; sustainable energy, waste management and low-carbon development		East African and national	Long term	Asmeret Kidanemariam
21	Oromia Wash Cluster (for ONE WASH program)	WASh		Regional	Long term	Genene Abera
22	Value Chain Alliances	Value chain development for selected priority crops		Local	Long term	Eshetayehu Tefera
23	Regional Agricultural Transformation Councils	Agricultural development/transformation		Regional	Long term	Belete Bantero
24	Smallholder Solar Pump Alliance	Water and irrigation technologies for smallholder agriculture		National	Short term	Agar Mulat
25	Sustainable Food Platform	Value chain development of food and nutrition from small-scale farmer to consumer		National and regional	Short term	https://p4gpartnerships.org/partnership/sustainable-food-platform
26	Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN Nordic Partnership) Ethiopia	Agribusiness and marketing with focus on food and nutrition		National	Short term	https://www.gainhealth.org/partnerships/gain-nordic-partnership/
27	National Learning Alliance	Communicating research outputs on sustainable agricultural intensification		National	Short term	https://sairla-africa.org/what-we-do/learning-alliances/national-learning-alliance-ethiopia/
28	Sanitation Marketing Multi-Stakeholder Platform	WASH		National	Short term	Kassahun Bedane
29	Food and Land coalition, Ethiopia	Productive and regenerative agriculture, protecting and restoring nature, health and nutrition, food loss and waste		National and regional	Long term	https://www.foodandlandusecoalition.org/country/ethiopia/
30	Civic engagement alliance, Ethiopia	Food and nutrition security and economic empowerment of smallholder farmers		Regional	Short term	https://civicengagementalliance.org/countries/ethiopia
31	Technical Advisory Group (UNIDO Project on Moringa Value Chain Development)	Agro-processing and value chain development		Local	Short term	Daniel Desalegn
32	Innovation Platforms (Africa Rising project)	Sustainable intensification; crop-livestock system innovations; natural resource management; addressing institutional, market and policy challenges		Local	Short term	https://cgspace.cgiar.org/bitstream/handle/10568/59819/AR_brief14.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Annex 2. Template for data collection

Name	Key thematic area	Geographical coverage	Focus areas	Goals/ objectives	Address/link	Contact person and address	Lead organization	Member of partner/key participant organization	Type of stakeholder	Establishment year and life span	Activities

Acknowledgements