

**ASSESSMENT OF CIDA'S FOOD SECURITY STRATEGY
IN HONDURAS AND ETHIOPIA**

SYNTHESIS REPORT

CANADIAN FOOD SECURITY POLICY GROUP

MARCH 8, 2013

AUTHORED BY: JEAN CHRISTIE

CONTENTS

- 1. INTRODUCTION 2
- 2. METHODOLOGY 3
 - 2.1 Research Questions 3
 - 2.2 Methodological Considerations..... 4
- 3. RESEARCH FINDINGS..... 7
 - 3.1. Spending Comparisons– Honduras and Ethiopia 7
 - 3.2 Comparative Findings – Honduras and Ethiopia 8
 - 3.3 Overall Findings - A Synthesis of the Four Research Studies 10
- 4. RECOMMENDATIONS..... 13
 - Comparative Data and Findings - Honduras and Ethiopia Studies 14
 - Additional Data - Trends in CIDA Food Security Funding- Ethiopia 23

1. INTRODUCTION

The Food Security Policy Group (FSPG) is a coalition of 21 Canadian international development and civil society organizations that formed in 1999 to promote global food security in Canada's aid and trade policies. To inform its policy analysis, the coalition draws on its members' programming experience in agriculture, rural development and food aid, with hundreds of partner organizations in the global South.

In May 2009, CIDA announced that food security would become one of its three main thematic areas of program focus, along with children and youth, and sustainable economic growth. The FSPG welcomed this policy commitment to food security, which CIDA planned to implement via three "action paths": 1) food aid and nutrition, 2) sustainable agricultural development, and 3) research and development.

In 2011/12, the FSPG undertook independent research on the implementation of CIDA's Food Security Strategy (FSS), to help the coalition's members understand how CIDA is implementing its FSS, and whether the new strategy is changing CIDA's approach to food security "on the ground". The research also aimed to assess the strengths and limitations of CIDA's approach, from the perspective of civil society partners in selected CIDA program countries where food security is a priority. For the FSPG, the research was intended to produce a base of evidence with which to engage CIDA on the future implementation of its Food Security Strategy, and signal ways that civil society organizations might be involved. CIDA officials were consulted in the early stages of the design of this research to help identify potential gaps in what this work was seeking to achieve.

There are several countries where food security is a CIDA priority. Honduras and Ethiopia were selected as research countries on the basis of an initial review of CIDA's country-level food security programs, an assessment of civil society capacities in-country to conduct the research, the potential to learn useful lessons with respect to the FSPG's key policy priorities for food security, and the available budget. In-country researchers were then hired in both countries, with common Terms of Reference. Two pieces of additional desk research were commissioned in Canada. One compiled and analyzed available CIDA statistical data on Canadian ODA (Official Development Assistance) disbursements to food security. The other looked at CIDA's and other Government of Canada departments' contributions to the multilateral and international dimensions of the FSS. It reviewed Canada's statements on food security at international fora; gathered data on multilateral institutions funded by Canada whose mandates address food security, and identified other federal departments whose policies were expected to have an impact on global food security.

This paper synthesizes the findings of these four pieces of independent research,¹ each of which is a stand-alone document with findings and recommendations that are not entirely captured in this summary. Taken together, these studies are the source of all the findings and recommendations that follow.

¹The four studies, all completed in November or December 2012 are: 1) *Independent Assessment of CIDA's Food Security Strategy and Programming in Honduras*, by Angela Bunch and Alexandra Lenton; 2) *Assessment of CIDA's Food Security Strategy and Funding in Ethiopia*, by REACH Consult Inc. and CHF; 3) *The Multilateral and International Dimensions of CIDA's Food Security Strategy*, by Bill Morton; and 4) *A statistical Review of CIDA's Food Security Theme 2008/09 to 2010/11*, an *AidWatchCanada* Briefing Paper by Brian Tomlinson.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Research Questions

The Honduras and Ethiopia studies addressed the same three research questions:

- To what extent are CIDA's program investments aligned with the priorities set out in CIDA's Food Security Strategy?
- To what extent do CIDA's food security policies and programs in each country align with the priorities of the recipient government?
- To what extent do CIDA's food security policies and programs in each country align with the priorities of male and female smallholder farmers and other vulnerable groups?

The studies conducted to assess the wider Canadian government context and Canada's relationship with multilateral institutions looked both at CIDA and beyond CIDA to answer three additional questions:

- To what extent do Canada's financial allocations through multilateral channels align with the principles articulated in the Food Security Strategy?
- To what extent do Canada's actions and statements at international fora align with the principles articulated in the Strategy?
- To what extent do the actions of other Government of Canada departments align with the principles articulated in the Strategy?

Supplementary statistical data on CIDA expenditures on food security across the agency, and in both research countries, were also gathered and analyzed, to help answer these questions. When considering the research papers and this synthesis, readers should take account of several methodological considerations, as well as the resource and time constraints faced by the FSPG in undertaking the research.

2.2 Methodological Considerations

2.2.1 Different contexts, different research approaches in the two country studies:

CIDA's program in Honduras has grown significantly in recent years, and several new food security initiatives reached the implementation stage only in mid-2012. The Honduras study, therefore, looked largely at program plans that were developed after the announcement of CIDA's Food security Strategy in 2009. It was too early to look at outcomes. The Ethiopia study analyzed current funding and future commitments for 2007-2017, and was able to provide data on the outcomes of some large programs that pre-date the FSS, but fall under the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) sector codes that CIDA has set out to monitor its food security theme.²The Ethiopia study looks at available information on future commitments in that country, which have no comparator in the Honduras study. Each document has an internal logic of its own.

2.2.2 Separating the FSS from prior activities:

Despite time constraints and the inaccessibility of some key informants and data, the two country studies and the paper assessing Multilateral and International Dimensions of CIDA's FSS paper managed to assess the alignment of CIDA's current and planned programs: with the Food Security Strategy, with recipient government priorities, and with farmers' needs (the three principal research questions). The available data made it less easy to assess what has changed since the adoption of the FSS in 2009, beyond funding levels³ and the proportion of budgets spent on food security. CIDA's support for food security-related programs did not begin with the FSS. Many ongoing multi-year commitments that fall under CIDA/OECD food security codes pre-date the FSS. Especially in Ethiopia and with multilateral institutions, where food aid and agriculture were significant features of CIDA's programming pre-FSS, and where many partners remain the same, it is difficult to separate pre- and post-FSS programming, except by annual volume of ODA expenditures, and the percentage of agency-wide and country budgets allocated to food security. A significant increase in CIDA's food security programming in Honduras post-FSS (see Table 1, pp. 5) makes the pre- and post-FSS comparison more real in that country.

This synthesis identifies trends with respect to total volume of funding for relevant CIDA program codes, changes in CIDA's "delivery channels" and partners and in the nature of projects supported – in both countries, and in CIDA-wide data. But it is still early in the life of the FSS to draw firm conclusions. It would be useful, after several more years have passed, to look again at how the ODA volumes and the percentage of total funding in each country has changed, and whether there has been a further shift in CIDA's choice of implementing organizations, or in the nature of food security programs since 2009.

²CIDA has determined that the Agency's sector code for basic nutrition, all codes for agriculture, and the codes for food aid make up the Food Security Strategy theme programs.

³ See tables 1-11 on pages 5, and 21-24 for analysis of CIDA's food security funding. The studies did not have access to the full country program strategies for Honduras and Ethiopia, but only to the short summaries that are in the public realm. Similarly, Performance Management Frameworks are not available to independent researchers.

2.2.3 Availability, consistency and comparability of data:

Because the country studies looked at different types of data and time periods, Tables 1-11 (pages 5, and 21-24) were compiled to provide comparable data across the two countries over six years. These tables present actual CIDA disbursements for the selected food security codes for both countries, by CIDA code and delivery channel, for three-years that predate the FSS (2005/06 – 2007/08), and three years after its announcement (2008/09 – 2010/11). Data for 2011/12 are not yet available. Projections to 2017, based on approved projects in CIDA's Project Browser⁴, are presented in the Ethiopia study only.

All of the studies point to the difficulty of getting detailed information on Canada's ODA expenditures not disbursed by CIDA, and not covered by CIDA's online project records—which were the main data sources for three of the four research papers.⁵ Information on ODA expenditures for food security via the Departments of Finance and Foreign Affairs, for example, are available only in the annual Statistical Report, which does not provide the project-level data available from CIDA's Historical Project Dataset. Descriptive information on programs and projects which CIDA funds through large, multilateral agencies is also harder to locate than data on CIDA's bilateral projects, and harder to analyze against FSS objectives. Data on the actual role of civil society organizations in food security programming is sometimes obscured in the country tables compiled, because these organizations receive multi-year funding via various CIDA funding windows, and because only their funding for Honduras and Ethiopia is captured the country tables presented below.⁶ To capture this level of detail, a different, more detailed analysis of the data would have been needed.

In at least one case, a multilateral program, for its own reasons, does not gather the data needed to monitor food security impacts that CIDA hopes to achieve. The World Food Program in Honduras, which received 39% of CIDA's annual food security funding in that country for the most recent data year (coded to basic nutrition), does not monitor for nutrition outcomes of school feeding programs, instead tracking school attendance and other (also important) outcomes. Data gaps of this kind limited the reach and consistency of this research. Unless addressed, they will also limit CIDA's (and the public's) ability to assess the effectiveness of the FSS over time.

Two of the studies pointed to the lack of a detailed, publicly available implementation plan for the FSS, and success indicators against which to conduct a comprehensive analysis of its progress. Similarly, Performance Monitoring Frameworks for country programs are not in the public domain. In response to a September 2011 Access to Information Request, one FSPG member received some internal CIDA documents in early 2012, about how the agency planned to implement and evaluate the FSS. But it was not a comprehensive implementation plan, and CIDA has never made the material public. There is still no implementation plan in the public realm. A review of public announcements by the Government of Canada at international fora that address and agree on policy directions for food security (e.g. G8 and G20 meetings) provided some information regarding Canada's intentions. Beyond broad principles and statements of directions, however, very little public information is available on Canada's role or position at such meetings. This makes it difficult to ascertain whether Canada's statements are consistent with the intent of the FSS, or how CIDA intends to implement the FSS as a whole. Similarly, at the country level, it was

⁴ CIDA's project browser includes only approved projects.

⁵ Principal data sources for Honduras, Ethiopia and the Statistical Review included CIDA's Project Browser, Historical Project Data Set, and annual Statistical Reports. The Morton study also looked at press releases and public announcements (e.g. related to G8 and G20 commitments) and the websites of multilateral agencies supported by CIDA. In-country consultants requested and received information from CIDA staff in Honduras and Ethiopia.

⁶ E.g. In most years, the Canadian Foodgrains Bank receives a substantial contribution from Multilateral Branch for food security programming globally (\$30 million in 2011/12). In 2009/10 it received a total of \$29.8 million, of which \$22.1 million was for Ethiopia. This is the only year since 2005/06 for which disbursements by CFGB for Ethiopia or Honduras were recorded in CIDA's Historical Data Set. Hence CFGB does not appear in the annual "snapshots" in Tables 6 and 7, for the years 2010/11 and 2005/06. More comprehensive data on CSOs as a channel for CIDA's FSS can be found in AidWatch Canada's Statistical Review.

sometimes hard to assess specific programs, because there was mixed access to detailed information about how CIDA intends to implement the FSS.

In Honduras and Ethiopia, the research difficulties noted above were compounded by the skepticism of some government and multilateral officials about a civil society group conducting research to examine the programs of the Canadian and recipient governments, and the nervousness of some potential civil society informants to talk freely. Both country reports noted that the “space” for civil society organizations to operate is severely restricted, and closing, affecting their capacities to undertake research initiatives such as this one.

Finally, given time and resource constraints and the limited scope of these studies, it was impossible for any of the researchers to do more than raise questions about broad, but highly relevant issue areas (particularly trade and climate change) where government policies beyond those expressed by CIDA can affect global food security, and have the potential to enhance or undermine the effectiveness of CIDA’s Food Security Strategy. The need to deepen a “whole of government” approach was raised, but was well beyond the scope of this research. Further study would be needed to assess the alignment and impacts of Canada’s trade and climate change policies with the Food Security Strategy.

2.2.4 Contribution, attribution, and the need for consistent monitoring:

In many “CIDA projects”, and in line with “aid effectiveness” good practice, CIDA is often one of several donors to a large initiative. In such situations, it is inappropriate to attribute positive outcomes or program weaknesses to CIDA alone. In these cases, the researchers could only assess whether the programs as a whole had impacts (in the case of Ethiopia) or aim to have impacts (in the case of Honduras) that align with the objectives of the FSS. In cases of this kind (i.e. some multilateral and most government funding)it is especially important that the monitoring tools and indicators of the implementing partners are agreed in advance among donors (including CIDA) so that CIDA can monitor its programs against indicators that signal progress on FSS objectives.

3. RESEARCH FINDINGS

3.1. Spending Comparisons– Honduras and Ethiopia⁷

Tables 1 and 2 (immediately below) indicate the current dollar value of CIDA’s food security spending in Honduras and Ethiopia by sector code for the three years immediately pre- and post-FSS, and the percentage of the total that each code represents.

Table 1: CIDA’s Food Security Spending in Honduras, Pre- and Post-Food Security Strategy

Honduras Sector Code (Millions Cdn \$)	2005/06 2006/07 2007/08 Cumulative	% Country Total	2008/09 2009/2010 2010/11 Cumulative	% Country Total
Nutrition	\$2.5	33.3%	\$17.8	60.3%
Agriculture	\$4.8	64.3%	\$11.8	39.8%
Food Aid/Food Security	\$0.1	1.4%	\$-	0.0%
Emergency Food Aid	\$0.1	1.0%	\$-	0.0%
Total	\$7.4		\$29.6	

Table 2: CIDA’s Food Security Spending in Ethiopia, Pre- and Post-Food Security Strategy

Ethiopia Sector Code (Millions Cdn \$)	2005/06 2006/07 2007/08 Cumulative	% Country Total	2008/09 2009/2010 2010/11 Cumulative	% Country Total
Nutrition	\$26.8	17.9%	\$24.4	9.3%
Agriculture	\$57.5	38.5%	\$122.2	46.8%
Food Aid/Food Security	\$37.3	25.0%	\$83.2	31.9%
Emergency Food Aid	\$27.9	18.7%	\$31.4	12.0%
Total	\$149.4		\$261.2	

Source Tables 1 and 2: Historical Project Dataset, accessed by AidWatch Canada (Brian Tomlinson), December, 2012

The first thing to note from the figures above is that the programs differ greatly in size. CIDA’s food security spending in Ethiopia was almost nine times higher than in Honduras for the most recent period. It was 20 times higher pre-FSS. In both countries, however, total spending on food security rose substantially post-FSS. In Honduras it quadrupled. In Ethiopia it increased by 75%, and also increased as a percentage of the total (Table 3, Row 6 Ethiopia). This would indicate that CIDA’s new focus on food security made a difference in both country programs, with respect to the volume of funding.

Looking at funding percentages allocated to different components of the food security envelope in each country (Tables 1, 2 above), other shifts are evident. In Honduras, funding (in percentage terms) has shifted away from agriculture to nutrition and in Ethiopia away from nutrition and emergency food aid to agriculture and food aid/food security. This research was unable to ascertain whether these shifts were driven by CIDA, other donors, national

⁷Except where indicated otherwise, all data in this section, including tables, are from *A Statistical Review of CIDA’s Food Security Theme 2008/09 to 2010/11*, an AidWatch Canada Briefing Paper by Brian Tomlinson.

governments, or some combination. In neither country were they the result of consultation with the intended beneficiaries of the FSS.(Table 3, Row 7 Honduras; Rows 6, 7 Ethiopia)

The additional statistical data provided in Tables 4-11 (pp. 19-22) reveal other shifts. Table 8 indicates that in Honduras, in percentage terms, there was a marked change away from civil society organizations as implementing agencies (down from 54% to 21%) toward multilateral partners (up from 42% to nearly 74%).In Ethiopia implementing partners changed less in percentage terms, pre- and post-FSS. In that country, CIDA's support to multilaterals was high pre-FSS, and inched up post-FSS, from 82% to 85% (see Table 4). In both countries, the vast majority of CIDA's food security funding is channeled to multilaterals agencies (Tables 4, 8). It appears that these institutions are absorbing most of the increased volume of CIDA funding for food security, though they are less amenable to CIDA program control, or influence by smallholder farmers.

3.2 Comparative Findings – Honduras and Ethiopia

This section draws entirely on the country studies for Ethiopia and Honduras. Table 3, at the end of this document (pp 11-18), summarizes the major findings of the two country studies, and cross-references all data in the table by page number to the country studies. Because of its length, Table 3 is placed at the end of this document. It is the evidence base for this synthesis, however, and should be read before the following sections.

References to Table 3 are noted by column and row for each of the findings below.

Table 3 organizes the country findings under the following ten headings.

1. Agriculture in the National Economy
2. Nutrition Data
3. Nature of Food Insecurity
4. Small Scale Farming
5. Government Institutions and Policies on Food Security and Nutrition
6. CIDA Program and Funding for Food Security
7. Alignment of CIDA Country Program with CIDA FSS
8. Alignment of CIDA Country Program with Government Priorities
9. Alignment of CIDA Country Program with Farmers' Needs
10. Summary Assessment

Sections 7, 8 and 9 present data that address the three principal research questions for the two country studies.

Role of Agriculture in the National Economy: The comparison between Honduras and Ethiopia reveals that agriculture plays a very different role in the economies of the two countries, and that the nature of food insecurity and its causes are also markedly different. In Ethiopia, 83% of the people rely on agriculture for their livelihoods; in Honduras, it is about 50%. Honduras relies less on agriculture for GDP (at 23%) than Ethiopia (at 42%). Ethiopia depends almost entirely (97%) on local food production for domestic consumption. Honduras imports 70% of its food, and production for local consumption is declining. Not surprisingly, then, international trade – and specifically the new Central American Free Trade Agreement with Canada – is singled out in the Honduras report for its potential negative effects on small-scale farmers. (Table 3, Rows 1, 2)

Malnutrition: Malnutrition is a serious problem in both countries, but substantially more pervasive in Ethiopia. In both countries, a concern for nutrition appears to be more integrated into all food security programming than it was in the past, including (importantly) in World Food Program efforts. Urban food security is addressed in neither country program, and is identified as a significant omission by the authors of the Honduras study. (Table 3, Row 2)

Land: Land issues are a serious concern in both countries, but quite different in nature. In Honduras, landlessness is pervasive, and critical to rural livelihoods. In Ethiopia growing land fragmentation and decreasing farm size are the concerns. Despite the importance of these issues for national agriculture, small-scale farmers, and food security, CIDA devotes limited resources to addressing them in its country programs. In Honduras this is raised as an important priority. (Table 3, Rows 3, 4, 9, 10 Honduras; Row 4 Ethiopia). Productivity and yield are much more consistently addressed.

Women and Gender: Women play an important role in small-scale agriculture in both countries, and have particular needs because they lack access to land, inputs and credit, when compared with men. Gender appears to be addressed seriously in the Honduras program. The Ethiopia report is less clear about the place of gender in that CIDA program. (Table 3, Row 7 Honduras; Row 6 Ethiopia)

Rain-fed Agriculture: Small farmers in both countries rely entirely on **rain** for their production, and identify the need for small-scale water management and /or irrigation among their top priorities. Both studies identify climate change as a critical concern, and stress the need to work with the most vulnerable farmers to mediate its impacts, including droughts, “unseasonal” rains and severe flooding in both countries. CIDA has addressed these issues in both programs. Farmers have identified them for priority programming in the future. (Table 3, Row 9 Honduras; Rows 3, 10 Ethiopia)

Commercial Farming: Large-scale commercial farming is more common in Honduras, and continues to push small-scale farmers onto mountainous land not well suited to agriculture. Landless farm labour is a feature of the Honduran agrarian economy. Farm labourers and small-scale farmers in Honduras migrate seasonally to supplement their incomes. (Table 3, Rows 3, 4,9,10 Honduras) In Ethiopia, while large scale farming accounts for a small percentage of the land, smallholders face shrinking farm sized and land fragmentation. (Table 3, Row 4 Ethiopia)

Government Policy Framework: Governments’ attention to agriculture and their *policies to address food security* differ significantly between Honduras and Ethiopia. In Ethiopia, the cycle of devastating droughts and massive famines has focused the attention of the Government of Ethiopia (GoE) on small-scale farmers and agriculture. In Honduras, small-scale agriculture has been neglected, in favour of large-scale commercial agriculture for export. The food security strategy of the Government of Honduras (GoH) is new, and uncoordinated. In Ethiopia much more attention has been paid to food security, and government programs now seem much better coordinated, and more effective. CIDA has supported the creation of a solid policy framework for food security and nutrition in both countries, to apparent good effect in Ethiopia. The Honduras study raises serious concerns about governance, government capacity and coordination with respect to policy implementation. (Table 3, Rows 4,5 Honduras; Row 5 Ethiopia)

Farmers’ Participation: Farmers and the farmers’ organizations that participated in both country studies articulate clear priorities for development which align, to a significant degree, with CIDA’s food security programs in Ethiopia and Honduras. But farmers, producers’ organizations and other CSOs are reportedly excluded from both government planning and CIDA’s country plans in both countries. In Ethiopia, civil society and farmers’ organizations that took part in the study feel that CIDA does not learn from their experiences or best practices in nutrition or agricultural development, for example, and instead see CSOs as “gap fillers”, rather than as essential actors in the development process. In Honduras, civil society was reportedly not consulted when CIDA’s food security program was developed. (Table 3, Rows 4, 5, 6 Honduras; Row 7 Ethiopia)

Research: In both countries, farmers’ organizations (and others) recognize the importance of farmer-centred and *farmer-led research*, and question whether some of the research done by institutes of the Consultative Groups on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) and other research bodies actually addresses the needs of the poorest

and most vulnerable farmers. In those cases where they are critical, these organizations are concerned that many “research products” are beyond the reach of the poorest farmers, who are the intended beneficiaries of CIDA’s FSS. (Table 3, Row 7 Honduras; Rows 7,10 Ethiopia)

Program Integration: In both countries, the most promising CIDA projects with small farmers (including those implemented by multilateral agencies) have adopted an integrated approach that brings together some combination of ecologically sustainable agricultural and agro-forestry practices, environmental protection, crop diversification, increased production, local market development and access, rural infrastructure development (e.g. water management, roads, etc.), household asset building and protection, income enhancement, nutrition, and training – all backed up by enabling government policies and donor coordination. Ethiopia’s *Productive Safety Net Program* and *Household Asset Building Program* show particular promise in making the transition from emergency food aid to long-term development. (Table 3, Rows 6, 7 Honduras; Row 7 Ethiopia)

3.3 Overall Findings - A Synthesis of the Four Research Studies

3.3.1 CIDA’s Food Security Strategy has led to increased programming in food security, at least in the short term. In the past three years, the agency has increased both its overall spending on food security and its spending on food security in the country programs for Ethiopia and Honduras. (Tables 1-11)

3.3.2 Post l’Aquila funding levels must be maintained, for the FSS to be effective. It is too early to know whether commitments to food security will be sustained. All of the research studies cautioned that continued funding at current levels would be needed for the FSS to have a sustained impact. In particular, the statistical analysis of CIDA spending pointed out a large, single-year funding “bump” in 2009, following Canada’s food security commitments at the l’Aquila G8 meeting. In that year CIDA made large contributions to a number of multilateral organizations, intended to cover several years, all paid “up front” in 2009. If these l’Aquila commitments turn out to be “one off” payments, and are not replenished when the initial commitments are spent, the sustainability of the FSS will be in doubt. On the other hand, if (annualized) post-l’Aquila spending levels on food security are sustained or increased, it will signal an ongoing commitment to food security. Canada’s recent commitment to the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) at the post-L’Aquila level is seen as a hopeful sign of continued commitment. (Tomlinson study)

3.3.3 At the country level, CIDA’s food security programs align well with the Agency’s Food Security Strategy, with government policies, and with the needs of small-scale farmers in most respects. (3.1 and 3.2 above, Table 3 below.)

3.3.4 In the two countries studied, CIDA has channeled a disproportionate percentage of its funding to multilateral implementing partners, and this tendency is growing. Three quarters of CIDA’s food security funding in Honduras now goes through multilateral channels, and 85% in Ethiopia. Donor coordination of food security programming, including through multilaterals, is important and welcome. But all studies question whether these are the most effective implementing partners to reach and engage small-scale farmers. In general, while contributing to their overall governance and management, CIDA has less influence over these implementing partners than it does over projects funded and implemented more directly. CIDA has singled out three specific multilateral institutions (the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the World Food Program, and CGIAR) as preferred multilateral partners for its three food security action paths (sustainable agriculture, food aid and nutrition, and research and development, respectively). Their mandates align with the FSS in broad strokes. But all the researchers feel that further study is needed to assess in more detail which multilateral agencies and programs best meet the objectives of the FSS, how CIDA can work with these institutions to make their programs more responsive to the needs of the most vulnerable, and whether funding via other channels, or via the same channels in different proportions, would be more effective and/or sustainable. (Morton study, both country studies)

3.3.5 Further study is also needed to ascertain how much of the research funding allocated to agricultural research centres of the CGIAR and national research institutes actually targets small-scale farmers and is of benefit to them. The studies suggest that at least some of CIDA's research funding in Honduras and Ethiopia is not used to address the needs of small-scale farmers, and results in products and technologies that poor farmers cannot afford to access. (Table 3, Row 7 Honduras; Rows 7, 10 Ethiopia)

3.3.6 Regular participation of civil society is reportedly absent from both government development strategies and CIDA planning, despite the close relationship that producers' organizations and other CSOs have with the intended beneficiaries of CIDA's FSS. Though CIDA itself and CIDA's multilateral partners work with civil society organizations in both countries, CIDA does not, according to CSO country informants, systematically take their experience into account, or learn from their best practices. Both country studies call for better collaboration between CIDA and civil society organizations, as development practitioners with important experience. Equally important, CIDA's governing legislation, the ODA Accountability Act, requires CIDA to "take into account the perspectives of the poor". Lack of civil society involvement was identified as a weakness in both countries, and one which civil society organizations expressed interest in addressing. (Table 3, Rows 6 Honduras; Row 7 Ethiopia)

3.3.7 CIDA has not made public its implementation plan for the Food Security Strategy, though it has been in effect for three years. This makes it difficult for observers to monitoring implementation and effectiveness. Two of the research studies call for a transparent detailed implementation plan for the Food Security Strategy, and greater transparency in reporting on achievements. (Tomlinson study)

3.3.8 There appears to be limited coordination between the Food Security and Maternal and Child Health thematic programs at CIDA. While the two program streams are clearly complementary, in particular with respect to nutrition and intended nutrition outcomes, they appear to be less integrated than they could be. Both country studies suggest more intentional coordination or integration in the future, especially with respect to shared or complementary indicators. (Table 3, Row 7 Honduras)

3.3.9 A portion of ODA funding for food security is not disbursed by CIDA, and is managed by departments other than CIDA—mainly by Finance (for the World Bank) and smaller amounts by DFAIT (the UN Food and Agriculture Organization) and IDRC. For the years 2008/09 to 2010/11, 8.3% of Canada's ODA was disbursed by departments other than CIDA⁸. These disbursements, and the relationships with the institutions to which they are directed may be managed by departmental officials whose primary expertise is not development. In addition, these funding commitments are not tracked in CIDA's historical project databases or Project Browser in the way that CIDA-managed projects are tracked, and could not be assessed adequately in these research studies. Greater transparency and strong inter-departmental mechanisms and reporting procedures are needed, to ensure that the aims of the Food Security Strategy are well represented by all government departments, and that institutions funded with ODA resources outside CIDA are monitored against CIDA's Food Security Strategy and indicators. One way to address this would be for other departments that distribute ODA, in particular Finance, Foreign Affairs and the International Development Research Centre, to publish data to the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) standard.

3.3.10 In key fora that deal with food security, Canada is sometimes represented by departments other than CIDA, whose primary expertise is not development or food security. This is particularly true at G8 and G20 meetings, and again signals the need for good coordination among departments, to ensure that Canada's FSS is well reflected in the positions that Canada adopts in these venues. It was beyond the scope of this study to assess the quality of current mechanisms for inter-departmental cooperation, or to assess the role of CIDA in them. This would require further study.

⁸In these years, \$204.97 million of a total ODA disbursement of \$2,462.86 million. (Tomlinson study)

3.3.11 Government policies and international positions managed by other Canadian government departments can have a significant impact on global food security, and may be inconsistent with the aims of the FSS. Government of Canada policies on trade (managed by DFAIT and Agriculture and Agrifood Canada) and climate change (managed by Environment Canada) were specifically raised in this regard. The Honduras paper noted the negative impact that recent trade agreements have had on small-scale farmers (Table 3, Row 1, Honduras). Both country studies identified the importance of climate change mitigation and adaptation for small-scale farmers and food security outcomes (Table 3, Rows 3, 9,10 Honduras; Rows 3, 9 Ethiopia). The Morton study noted that Canada’s positions in the international trade and climate change arenas may not fully take account of ODA objectives. These questions were beyond the scope of this research, which could not address the impact of such policies on food security in Ethiopia, Honduras or more broadly. But in different ways three of the research studies signaled the concern that other Government of Canada policies could (or already appear to) undermine the FSS. To address this, and the findings in 3.3.9, and 3.3.10 above, a “whole of government” approach to global food security should be strengthened, to ensure that “CIDA’s” Food Security Strategy (a policy of the Government of Canada) is taken into account when Canadian policies are being developed for trade and climate change, in particular. Further study would be needed to identify which departments, international fora and policies are most relevant to food security, and where coordination across government is most critical.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

To respond to these findings, the Food Security Policy Group makes the following recommendations.

1. At the country level, and in dialogue with country-level stakeholders, consider implementing the country-specific recommendations in the Ethiopia and Honduras reports (summarized in Table 3).
2. Sustain annual funding for food security at post l'Aquila levels, both in CIDA as a whole, and in the two countries studied. Given annual funding fluctuations, interpret "post l'Aquila levels" to be the average annual funding from 2008-09 through 2010-11.
3. Assess the balance of funding allocated through multilateral channels against the effectiveness of other channels in achieving the objectives of the Food Security Strategy, including their effectiveness in reaching and achieving benefits for those most vulnerable to food insecurity.
4. Assess all funded research, to ensure that it is addressing the objectives of the Food Security Strategy. Ensure that agricultural research focuses on the expressed needs of small-scale farmers and the most vulnerable. Assess the products of funded research to ascertain that they are accessible to small-scale farmers.
5. Ensure that civil society organizations, including farmers' organizations, are fully involved in the planning, implementation and monitoring of CIDA's Food Security Strategy in its priority countries, and as a matter of policy agency-wide. Work with national governments to ensure that civil society organizations are fully involved in the planning, implementation and monitoring of national food security policies and programs.
6. Make public a detailed implementation plan for the Food Security Strategy, and for each country program, against which CIDA can be monitored. Make public the Performance Monitoring Frameworks for all country programs, and the outcomes of all assessments of the FSS that CIDA initiates.
7. Build more deliberate synergies between CIDA's Food Security Strategy and its programs in Maternal and Child Health, including with respect to common indicators.
8. Strengthen coordination among all Government of Canada actors that manage ODA funds and represent Canada on ODA matters internationally, to ensure that CIDA's Food Security Strategy is well represented by all of them, including departments other than CIDA.
9. Publish aid data by all relevant government departments to the IATI standard.
10. Strengthen a "whole of government" approach to global food security within the Government of Canada, to ensure that all policies (including those on trade and climate change) in all relevant departments, are consistent with and do not undermine the aims or the effectiveness of the Food Security Strategy.

Table 3: Comparative Data and Findings - Honduras and Ethiopia Studies

(Note: The numbers behind each sentence indicate the page number in the country study.)

	HONDURAS	ETHIOPIA
1. Agriculture in National Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23% of GDP is from agri-food sector. (H5) • About 1/2 the population lives in rural areas, the majority of them rely on agriculture for their livelihood. (H4) • 70% of all food consumed is imported, including 70% of rice, 40% of corn. (H5) • Agri-food imports are growing 3 times faster than exports. Corn, rice, beans and sorghum production continues to lag behind demand. (H5) • 70% of locally produced food is grown by small farmers. (H5) • Only 25% of working population is formally employed. Of these, 39% work in ag, fisheries and forestry. Gender breakdown is not available. (H6) • Honduras was declared a highly indebted poor country in 1999; national debt has deepened sharply since 2006. (H6, 5) • Productivity began declining in 1980s, and declined sharply in the past decade. (H4) • Coffee, oil palm, bananas and shrimp account for 40% of all exports. (H5) • Coffee production employs 25% of the rural labour force. • A coffee production boom is increasing hillside deforestation. (H17) • Production for local markets has declined sharply in recent years. (H5) • Government subsidies dropped after the 2006 Dominican Republic Central America Free Trade Agreement, undermining domestic markets and hurting small producers. (H5) • 2008 financial crisis led to falling demand and prices for ag exports, and rising input prices. (H5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 41.6% of GDP is from agriculture.(E7) • Agrarian economy depends on traditional subsistence agriculture .(E7) • Over 70% of export earnings are from agriculture. (E8) • Domestic agriculture covers 95% of food requirements. (E9) • 83% of people depend on agriculture for their livelihood. (E7) • Urbanization is increasing at an estimated 3.8% annually. (E25) • 13.3 million hectares of land is cultivated, of which only 1.2% is irrigated, therefore highly dependent on seasonal rains. (E8) • Rain-fed agriculture accounts for over 97% of agricultural production. (E8) • Crop production grew from 14.5 to 25.9 million tons between 2005 and 2011.(E18) • Average yield per hectare grew from 1.38 to 1.95 tons from 2005-2011.(E18) • Land area cultivated for 3 main crops (cereals, pulses, oil crops) grew from 9.8 to 11.8 million hectares. (E18) • Area under irrigation grew from 487,000 to 835,000 hectares in the same period. (E18) • Crop diversification also increased. (E18)

	HONDURAS	ETHIOPIA
2. Nutrition Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9.6–12% of Hondurans are malnourished. (H6) • 9-11% of children are underweight, 30% chronically malnourished (stunted), and 1-4.9% acutely malnourished. (H6) • Acute malnutrition can rise during the dry months by 3-4%, especially in the south and southwest. (H6) • Over half the deaths of children under 5 are partly attributable to malnutrition. (H6) • In rural areas, children suffer from iron deficiency and low birth weight. (H6) • GoH does not have a national nutrition information system. (H6) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malnutrition rates among children are among the highest in the world. (E11) • Among the 1/3 of children under 5 who are underweight, 44.4% are moderately or severely stunted, 10% wasted. (2011) (E11) • Micronutrient deficiency is extremely high. • Between 2005 and 2011, stunting declined by 2.1%, wasting by 0.8% and the proportion of underweight children by 9.7%. (E23)
3. Nature of Food Insecurity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2011 UNDP human development index ranked Honduras 121st out of 187 countries.(H4) • 59.2% of the population lives in poverty; 36.2% in extreme poverty (H4) • 72% of Hondurans (4.5 million) are food insecure. (H6) • Unequal land distribution and insecure tenure underlie food insecurity and ag production. (H5) • In 2008, 25% of rural families were landless. (H5) • Seasonal migration for work is increasing among those who rent land. (H14, 16) • 80% of the extreme poor live in rural areas. The highest rates of extreme poverty are in rural, largely indigenous areas of the southwest, and the dry corridor of the south. (H4) • Structural factors and external shocks are responsible for low ag productivity and food insecurity.(H4) • Climate instability causes droughts and prolonged rains, and regularly leads to crop losses.(H5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2011 UNDP human development index ranked Ethiopia 174thout of 187 countries. • Overall poverty was estimated at 29.2% in 2009/10, but is declining. (E8) • The majority of Ethiopians are food insecure, 1/3 chronically food insecure, but improving. Food poverty head count index dropped from 38% in 2004/05 to 28.2% in 2009/10. (E8,9) • Rain-fed ag permits only one crop per year. (E8) • Reliance on rain makes agriculture and food security highly susceptible to weather shocks. 8-10 million people in agro pastoral areas suffer regular shocks. (E8,9) • Production variability can reach 50%. (E8) • The number of people affected by drought in 2003 was 13 million, and in 2011 4.5 million. The drop is attributed to the GoE's preparedness policies. (E24) • Yields of main food crops (cereals, pulses, oil crops) are typically low, but increasing. (E8) • Yield growth from small farms does not cover food needs for average family, even with good harvests and inputs. (E9)

	HONDURAS	ETHIOPIA
4. Small-scale Farming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of ag land is used for small-scale ag and animal husbandry. 72% of farm families practice subsistence ag on small plots (H5) • 18.2% of rural families farm less than one hectare, and the % is increasing. (H5) • 80% of land is mountainous, and small holders have been pushed to hillsides more appropriate for forestry than agriculture, by policies that favoured large landowners and cattle ranching. (H5) • GoH focus is to help medium and large producers compete in export market. (H7) • Women and children traditionally participate in all aspects of ag production. (H6) • Farmers complain that the Production Bonus (<i>Bono Tecnológico</i>) to provide inputs to small farmers is politicized and corrupt. (H7) • Small-scale farmers have limited access to credit. (H5) • Women have much less access to, use and control over land, credit and technologies than men. Most women do not own land. (H6, 17) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smallholder ag is the livelihood for 15 million ag landowners (E9) • Small-scale farming is characterized by land fragmentation and shortage, and increased vulnerability to shocks. (E9, 27) • Smallholders occupy 54.2% of cultivated land. Large-scale farming occupies 4.9% of land and accounts for 17.9% of annual production. (E9) • Farm size is declining: 36% of smallholders cultivate less than half a hectare, 59.8% less than one hectare, 83.8% less than 2 hectares. (E9) • Small-scale farming families tend to be large, resource poor, with limited literacy. (E9, 27) • Rising input costs and lack of affordable credit undermine adoption of improved farming practices. (E9)

	HONDURAS	ETHIOPIA
5. Government Institutions and Policies for Food Security and Nutrition	<p>Honduras began the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) process in 1999. The 2001-2015 PRSP was replaced after the 2009 Coup d'état by a 28 year Country Vision (<i>Vision de País</i>), and a National Plan (<i>Plan de Nación</i>) adopted in 2010. (H6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much of the focus on food security to date has been on policy formulation and establishing institutions. (H8) • The 2011 Food and Nutritional Security Law (<i>Ley de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional</i>) led to a new institutional framework, including an inter-institutional technical committee (COTISAN) that should facilitate coordination, but doesn't. (H6, 7) A new technical Unit (UTSAN) was to draft a new food security strategy, including monitoring and evaluation. It established indicators, but no national database exists to monitor outcomes. (H7, 8) • A National Food Security Strategy (ENSAN) was created with significant input from the FAO and WFP, based on the FAO's 4 food security pillars. Many civil society organizations working in the field are reportedly unaware of it. (H7) • GoH proposed a \$64 million budget for ENSAN, with 52% to come from GoH and 48% from aid. It already has major funding gaps. (H7) • Lack of coordination across government is a serious challenge. (H7) e.g. Above strategies are not well inked to the GoH's Agri-food Strategy. a (H9) • The National Plan and ENSAN divide the country along watersheds requiring multi-stakeholder regional coordination, rather than via political units, causing administrative problems. (H7, 9) GoH has not delivered on budget or autonomy needed to achieve regionalization. (H7) • Civil society is systematically excluded from planning, oversight and decision-making. (H7,8) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The third GoE PRSP, the Growth and Transformation Plan for 2011-2015 (GTP) aims to reduce the number of people below the poverty line from 29% to 22% and includes numerous targets relevant to land, ag and rural development; aims to reduce numbers of people dependent on safety nets program (E11): and focuses on mechanized ag, in addition to small-scale farmers (E19) • National Food Security Program integrates 4 components (E10): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Productive Safety Net Program (PNSP) is an integrated program linking direct transfers and paid work for most food insecure to rural public works and small-scale infrastructure development (E10). Program is assessed to be highly effective. (E12, 21, 25) - Household Assets Building Program(HABP) aims to build household assets, and minimize their depletion during crises. (E10, 24) - Complementary Community Investment Program for larger infrastructure projects. (E11) - Voluntary Resettlement Program to relocate people from vulnerable areas. (E10) • National Disaster Preparedness and Mitigation Strategy (E24) • National Nutrition Strategy took effect in 2005; a program for 2009-2013 aims to reduce chronic malnutrition to 40%, underweight children to 30%, and wasted children to 5% by 2013; to promote breast feeding and reduce iron deficiency. (E11, 12)

	HONDURAS	ETHIOPIA
6. CIDA Program and Funding for Food Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIDA is one of top 3 donors to the food security sector, targeting about \$10 million/year for 2011-2015. (H8) • CIDA shifted its focus from rural development to food security in 2009. (H9) • The CIDA-Honduras Country Food Security Strategy for 2010-2015 aims to “increase sustainable agricultural production and consumption of quality nutritious food by Honduran women, men, boys and girls”, by increasing sustainable production and consumption of quality nutritious food. (H8) • It was designed without significant input from civil society or GoH. (H8) • Funds are channeled via Bilateral and Partnership branches, on the basis of proposals received. CIDA does not fund government programs. (H9) • More than 25% of FS funding goes to the WFP for school feeding and lactating mothers. It is managed by CIDA’s Health and Education thematic area. (H9) • WFP doesn’t monitor comprehensively for nutrition outcomes, though there are indicators for lactating mothers and children under five.(H9, 14) • WFP programs began after Hurricane Mitch in 1998, and continue through Honduras is no longer in an emergency. They are country wide, bureaucratic, and politicized. Ministries of Health and Education lack capacity to take them over. (H13, 14) • PROSADE, PESA and FIPAH projects hold most promise to reach the poorest. They are integrated, challenge the dominant “technology transfer” approach, are better able to reach and involve farmers and meet their needs. (H15) PRASA also involves youth. (H15) • CIDA has staff in Honduras, who oversees the Honduras program in coordination with CIDA program managers in Ottawa.(H9) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethiopia is the 3rd largest recipient of Canadian ODA. (E5) • Canada was 8th largest donor to Ethiopia in 2010 at \$176.7 million. (E14) • A significant portion of CIDA’s ODA to Ethiopia is for food security. (E 15). • Consistent with other donors, CIDA supports the GoE in addressing asset depletion, population migration, mortality and malnutrition. (E24) • CIDA’s support for food security is increasing in actual value, and as a % of total program budget. (E27, Table 4) • CIDA food security expenditures in Ethiopia rose from\$149.5 million in the 3 years pre-FSS, to \$261.3 million in the 3 years post-FSS.(Table 4) • CIDA commitments for 2007-2017 allocate 73% to agriculture and food security.(E15) • 76% of commitments for food security in 2007-2017 are via multilaterals, 13% for civil society organizations, and 11% for research institutes. (E16) • Of food security commitments for 2007-2017, 61% is for “private sector development – agriculture”, 18% for nutrition, 14% for emergency food aid, and 7% for agricultural policy and research. (E17) • CIDA played a key role in integrating gender into the GoE’s National Nutrition Strategy. (E20)

7. Alignment of CIDA country program with CIDA FSS

HONDURAS

- The design and objectives of CIDA's Honduras program align well with the FSS. CIDA's 2009 shift from rural development to food security coincided with the adoption of the FSS. (H8, 10)
- Of the 3 FSS streams, the program emphasizes sustainable agriculture. Increasing production is the highest priority. (H10)
- All projects integrate gender. Some have clear gender-specific indicators. (H16, 17,20)
- Most address climate change and adaptive technologies. (20)
- Some projects (FHIA, IHCAFE) not designed to target the poorest. (H16)In general, projects target organized farmers, and may not reach the most vulnerable.
- On sustainable agriculture development: CIDA supports 6 large integrated multi-year projects managed by 2 Canadian civil society organizations (CARE, Oxfam Quebec), FAO, a national coffee institute, and 2 research institutes. (H10-13) They tend to include elements of agriculture, nutrition and research, and cover activities in climate adaptation, water management, agro-forestry, plant breeding, crop diversification, training, credit and input provision. (H10-13)
- On food aid and nutrition: CIDA supports WFP programs for school feeding and lactating mothers, which don't monitor comprehensively for nutrition outcomes, except for lactating mothers, and children under 5. (H13, 14)
- On research and development: To date, the research objectives of CIDA program are "largely aspirational". (H13)
- Research, including farmer-led and participatory research, is built into some agricultural projects (PROSADE, PRASA, FIPAH). (H10-13) Cooperation with GoH research institutes and the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT) (on corn development) is integrated into some projects. (H13)
- Two research institutes that CIDA supports tend to have a "top-down, technology transfer" approach. (H13)
- The International Development Research Centre (IDRC) supports a research partnership on communication technologies with a Honduran network, which is not well coordinated with CIDA.(H13)
- There are concerns that research in general does not always address the needs of the poorest. (H13, 20, 21)
- Projects funded via bilateral contracts allow CIDA greater control over alignment with FSS than do FAO and WFP projects. (H10).
- In general, projects target organized farmers, and may not reach the most vulnerable.

ETHIOPIA

- In general the program aligns well with CIDA's FSS.
- Questions are raised about: a) preponderance of multilateral channels (E29), and b) exclusion of civil society organizations in planning and implementation. (E28, 29)
- **On sustainable agriculture development:** The program aligns strongly with FSS commitment to small farmers, via strengthening of relevant government institutions, training for government extension workers and farmers, environmental protection, land remediation, tree planting, infrastructure development (including irrigation and water management), income support, crop diversification and livelihoods programs.
- Questions raised about a) impact on most food insecure in some cases (E20,21) and b) transparency of government institutions (E 19, 21, 22). Concerns raised about role of civil society, and CIDA ignoring experience from grassroots /civil society. (E22, 28)
- **On food aid and nutrition:** The program aligns strongly with the FSS, including curative and preventative programs (E23), integration of nutrition in ag projects (several), introduction of nutritional crops. (E22)
- Questions are raised about a) absence of nutrition and nutrition indicators in some projects that could include them (E25), b) lack of synergy between FSS and maternal and child health(MCH) strategies (E25), and c) absence of urban food insecurity from CIDA programs. (E 29)
- **Research and development:** Research is addressed via International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) support to GoEag policy development, (E20, 27), and CIMMYT for improved plant varieties for climate change adaptation and improved nutrition. (E22)
- Questions are raised about a) research not always targeting the needs of most food insecure (E20),b) the inability of the most food insecure to access benefits of research products (E20), and c) inattention to grassroots experience and learning. (E22, 28, 29)

	HONDURAS	ETHIOPIA
8. Alignment of CIDA FSS with national government policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small-scale agriculture has been neglected by GoH. (H5) • Public spending on ag dropped from 19% of budget in 1980-85, to 4% in 2001-06. (H5). The Agriculture and Livestock Ministry has an annual program budget of \$7 million. 70% of its program funding is from World Bank loans, IFAD and other International Financial Institutions. (H8) • CIDA shifted its focus from rural development to food security in 2009. (H9) Its program is derived from FSS and aligns with the GoH declaration of food security as a top priority in 2010. It also aligns with strategies of other donors. (H10) • CIDA's food security program focuses on one of the poorest areas in Honduras: the drought-prone dry corridor in the south. The GoH has designated this region as a pilot for both the National Plan and the Food Security Strategy and Policy, and plans to apply lessons to other regions. CIDA raises concerns about administration and governance of the watershed approach adopted by the GoH. (H9) • In its region of focus, CIDA was instrumental in getting the first regional coordinating body up and running. (H9) • CIDA has good working relations with the GoH and supports the National Plan and related strategies, but questions their long-term sustainability given concerns about governance, GoH capacity, and funding uncertainties. (H9, 10, 16, 18) • CIDA participates actively in relevant coordinating bodies with GoH and other donors, and encourages coordination. (H18,20) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GoE has paid significant attention to improving productivity in agriculture, and plans to raise budget for agriculture and food security from 4.9% in 2004/05 to 11.3% by 2015. (E8) • The CIDA Ethiopia program aligns strongly with GoE's Growth and Transformation Plan, its Food Security Strategy, including sub-components PSNP, HABP, plus the National Nutrition Strategy. • CIDA's FSS does not include health and nutrition components, while GoE Food Security Strategy does (E25). • Neither GoE policies nor CIDA address urban food insecurity, which is an oversight. (E25, 29) • Questions are raised about the very large proportion of the FSS program channeled via multilaterals. (E30)

	HONDURAS	ETHIOPIA
<p>9. Alignment CIDA program with small-scale farmer's needs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farmers' concerns from separate focus groups with men and women, and a workshop with producers' groups are as follows, differentiated by gender: (all from H14) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Climate change adaptation – to respond to uncertainty of rain and crop losses (men and women) - Access to land – because farmers don't plant perennial or invest in rented land (more men) - Market vs. basic crop balance – to produce enough food for annual household consumption, and generate cash (from coffee) as “insurance” (women and men) - Migration – a growing necessity after harvest, because local employment is scarce - Grain storage infrastructure–to facilitate community-wide sharing and exchange - Farm diversification (yard animals, beans, vegetables, fruit trees) – for household nutrition and sale (women) - Marketing and finance and micro-credit • Together, CIDA's program addresses most of farmers' concerns. Access to land is least well addressed (only in PESA). (H15) • Civil society and farm organizations propose a food sovereignty approach that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) assumes a human rights framework, including the right to food, b) pays attention to land issues; c) environmental concerns and climate change adaptation; d) access to credit and inputs; e) puts priority on domestic markets; f) nutrition. (H19) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CIDA program aligns strongly, especially via its support for PSNP, HABP, and its integrated approach to programming (as in 7 above). (E19) • Farmers consulted expressed approval for a) access to improved seeds (and productivity), other inputs and technology, b) crop diversification, c) infrastructure development, d) income enhancement, and e) training of various kinds. (E18, 19,20, 21) • Questions were raised about: a) limited impact of CIDA funded research on smallholders, due to uptake costs (E20,21), b) need to focus program more on farmers' immediate needs, especially water and resource management, conservation and potable water.(E24) • Future programming should continue to focus on the agricultural extension system, making it more demand-driven by small-holders. (E30)

	HONDURAS	ETHIOPIA
10. Summary Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIDA's program targets the poorest, most food insecure part of Honduras, and addresses all aspects of the FSS to some extent. (H17) It is too early to assess impacts. • CIDA addresses small scale producers better than many donors. Unlike other donors, CIDA has addressed land issues to some extent. Addressing access to land should become a higher priority. (H20,22) • National priorities for agriculture have not favoured small producers. (H5) • Agrarian conflict, insecure land tenure, and weak governance make programming difficult and sustainability hard to achieve. (H16) • Support for the role of farmers, strengthening farm organizations and civil society should become a more visible part of CIDA programming. (H18, 19, 22) • CIDA should focus on improving governance of the global food system at the national, regional and international levels. • Study proposes a range of detailed program activities (see report), plus a) improved monitoring and evaluation, b) marketing initiatives that focus on domestic food security, c) assessing the impact of trade liberalization on smallholders and food insecurity, d) coordination with IDRC, e) more inclusion of civil society in designing and implementing FSS program, f) local purchase for food, aid, g) adequate resources to ensure sustainability of programs. (H21-22) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIDA has chosen to support and strengthen GoE institutions and programs that have been assessed to have a positive impact on food security. (E28) • Direct attribution to CIDA is often difficult, but the programs that CIDA has funded have contributed positively to food security - increasing the incomes, assets and resilience to shocks, of the most food insecure farmers, increasing agricultural production and yields, rehabilitating land and improving nutrition, etc. (E27, 28) • The program reflects an integrated approach. • CIDA should pay greater attention to documenting FSS impacts. • Future programming should focus more on a) water management and small scale irrigation, b) reducing smallholder risks, c) research that addresses the priorities of the most food insecure (E 20, 30), d) enhancing the capacities of Ethiopian research and educational institutions, e) urban food insecurity, and f) closer cooperation with civil society organizations in program design and implementation (E27-30)

Additional Data - Trends in CIDA Food Security Funding- Ethiopia
(Brian Tomlinson, AidWatch Canada, December 2012)

Table4: Ethiopia - Total CIDA Food Security Disbursements by Implementing Partner

Implementing Partner (Millions of Cdn \$)	2005/06 2006/07 2007/08 Cumulative	% Country Total	2008/09 2009/2010 2010/11 Cumulative	% Country Total
Civil Society	\$15.5	10.4%	\$29.7	11.4%
Private Sector	\$7.3	4.9%	\$7.3	2.8%
Government	\$ 4.4	2.9%	\$1.2	0.4%
Multilateral Organization	\$122.3	81.8%	\$223.1	85.4%
Not Specified	-	0.0%	\$0.1	0.0%
Total	\$149.5		\$261.3	

Source: CIDA Historical Project Dataset, accessed November 2012

Table5: Total CIDA Ethiopia Agriculture Disbursements by Code

Agriculture (Millions of Cdn \$)	2005/06 2006/07 2007/08 Cumulative	% Country Total	2008/09 2009/2010 2010/11 Cumulative	% Country Total
Ag Policy and Admin	\$3.9	6.8%	\$11.3	9.2%
Ag Land Resources	\$16.9	29.3%	\$28.7	23.5%
Ag Water Resources	\$11.8	20.6%	\$17.6	14.4%
Ag Extension & Education	\$10.4	18.2%	\$16.7	13.7%
Ag Research	\$ 4.2	7.4%	\$11.3	9.2%
Other	\$10.2	17.7%	\$36.6	30.0%
Total Agriculture Codes	\$57.5		\$122.2	

Source: CIDA Historical Project Dataset, accessed November 2012

Table 6: Ethiopia CIDA Main Implementing Partners, 2010/11

Note: Tables 6 and 7 are one-year snapshots from data in CIDA's Historical Project Dataset. They do not capture data for the intervening years.

Implementing Agents, 2010/11 (Disbursements over \$100,000)	\$ Amount	%
World Bank	\$40.3	48.6%
WFP	\$26.5	32.0%
UNICEF	\$7.0	8.4%
International Livestock Research Institute	\$2.7	3.3%
Save the Children	\$2.1	2.5%
Hydrosult Inc.	\$1.9	2.3%
Mennonite Economic Development Associates of Canada	\$0.8	1.0%
International Food Policy Research Institute	\$0.8	1.0%
Nova Scotia Agricultural College	\$0.5	0.6%
Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade	\$0.2	0.2%
Canadian Physicians for Aid & Relief	\$0.1	0.1%
Total Organizations Listed	\$82.9	
% of total Ethiopia Food Security	98.8%	

Table 7: Ethiopia CIDA Main Implementing Partners 2005/06

Main Implementing Agents (Disbursements over \$100,000)	\$ Amount	%
World Food Program	\$33.0	66.8%
UNICEF	\$3.2	6.5%
Hydrosult Inc.	\$2.7	5.4%
CGIAR & Other Research Institutions	\$2.3	4.6%
Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada	\$1.6	3.3%
MicroNutrient Initiative	\$1.4	2.9%
Save the Children Canada	\$1.3	2.6%
CHF	\$1.3	2.5%
Africa Development Bank	\$1.1	2.2%
World Vision Canada	\$0.5	1.1%
DFAIT	\$0.4	0.8%
Total Organizations Listed	\$48.8	
% of total Ethiopia Food Security	98.8%	

Source for All Tables: CIDA Historical Project Dataset, Accessed December 2012

Additional Data - Trends in CIDA Food Security Funding - Honduras

(Brian Tomlinson, AidWatch Canada, December 2012)

Table 8: Honduras - Total CIDA Food Security Expenditures by Implementing Partner – 2005/06 – 2011/12

Implementing Partner (Millions of Cdn \$)	2005/06 2006/07 2007/08 Cumulative	% Country Total	2008/09 2009/2010 2010/11 Cumulative	% Country Total
Civil Society	\$3.9	53.8%	\$6.1	20.7%
Private Sector	\$0.1	0.8%	\$0.3	1.0%
Government	\$0.2	3.0%	\$1.4	4.5%
Multilateral Organization	\$3.1	42.4%	\$21.9	73.9%
Not Specified	-	0.0%	\$-	0.0%
Total	\$7.3		\$29.7	

Source: CIDA Historical Project Dataset

Table 9: Honduras Total CIDA Agriculture Expenditures by Code – 2005/06 – 2011/12

Agriculture (Millions of Cdn \$)	2005/06 2006/07 2007/08 Cumulative	%	2008/09 2009/10 2010/11 Cumulative	%
Ag Water Resources	0.0	0.5%	\$1.4	6.0%
Food Crops	\$0.2	3.7%	\$1.5	6.2%
Ag Extension & Education	\$0.3	5.7%	\$3.2	13.4%
Ag Inputs	\$0.1	2.9%	\$1.3	5.5%
Ag Development	\$0.4	9.3%	\$2.2	9.3%
Other*	\$3.7	77.9%	\$14.0	59.6%
Total Agriculture Codes	\$4.8		\$23.5	

Source: CIDA Historical Project Dataset

* Note: In 2005/06 and 2006/07, \$1.9 million of Agriculture was coded to Agriculture land and to agriculture research (56% of agriculture coding in these years).

Table 10: Honduras CIDA Main Implementing Partners, Food Security - 2010/11

Note: Tables 10 and 11 are one-year snapshots from data in CIDA's Historical Project Dataset. They do not capture data for the intervening years.

Implementing Agents, 2010/11 (Disbursements over \$100,000)	\$ Amount	%
World Food Program	\$5.70	39.3%
FAO	\$5.00	34.5%
CARE Canada	\$1.10	7.6%
FundacionHondurena de Investigacion Agricola	\$0.50	3.4%
Canadian Red Cross	\$0.40	2.8%
Honduran Institute for Coffee	\$0.40	2.8%
Oxfam-Quebec	\$0.40	2.8%
SOCODEVI	\$0.20	1.4%
Total of Organizations Listed	13.7	
% of total Food Security	94.5%	

Table 11: Honduras CIDA Main Implementing Partners 2005/06

Main Implementing Agents, 2005/06 (Disbursements over \$50,000)	\$ Amount	%
UNDP	\$0.40	27.0%
Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical	\$0.36	23.7%
World Food Program	\$0.12	7.7%
Canadian Baha'i International	\$0.09	6.1%
Jeunesse Canada Monde	\$0.06	3.8%
CESO	\$0.06	3.7%
Canadian Cooperative Association	\$0.05	3.7%
USC	\$0.05	3.6%
Total of Organizations Listed	\$1.19	
% of total Food Security	79.3%	

Source all Tables: CIDA Historical Project Dataset, Accessed December 2012