

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT MODELS REVIEWED (IMPLIED PRACTICES IN ETHIOPIA)

Mehari Getaneh*

Abstract

Economists, development thinkers and policy makers use development models/theories to approach the complex and wide problems of development in their endeavours to formulate, implement and evaluate policies, plans and strategies. To have a vision of such endeavours, an overview review of nine categories of development models with comparisons of Ethiopian practices have been made in this paper. As this review indicates, some of the models have focus on extensive methods of improvement such as conservation, frontier, industrial fundamentalism, urban-industrial impact models; others introduce intensive ways-such as high pay off inputs and induced innovation models while some others emphasize the need for educational and social changes. Not all these models are used directly in Ethiopia except conservation & Neo-Marxist models and partially high pay off inputs, diffusion and induced innovation models. The others are only implicitly applied, which came to be obvious at evaluation stages. However, the issues are very much open for further research with exhaustive review, enlarged country case studies and close comparisons with up to dated compiling on the Ethiopian practice & condition for a more clear picture of the models as well as for a more realistic conclusions thereon.

Ethiopia has started planned and systematic economic policy measures and development programs since the mid 1940s. Historically, looking at the three periods of policy regimes can summarize the overall policy spirit and practices in the country. The first regime (1950-1974) was characterized by a market economy encouraging foreign investment to industrialize the country using import substitution industrialization strategy which was mainly in line with industrial fundamentalism and urban industrial impact models. The second period (1974-1991) was a central planning system, which was a Marxian /Neo-Marxian development model realized through regulatory activities and nationalization of private undertakings with capital more than Eth. Birr 500,000. The third period (since 1992) i.e. the currently functional state, started economic policy changes with structural adjustment programs (SAPs). It is accompanied by successive policy changes and reform

* Senior Economic Expert, Ethiopian Privatization Agency, P.O. BOX 100770,
Tel. 509444 (Off), 521021 (Res), Fax 513955, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT MODELS REVIEWED (IMPLIED PRACTICES IN ETHIOPIA)

Mehari Getaneh*

Abstract

Economists, development thinkers and policy makers use development models/theories to approach the complex and wide problems of development in their endeavours to formulate, implement and evaluate policies, plans and strategies. To have a vision of such endeavours, an overview review of nine categories of development models with comparisons of Ethiopian practices have been made in this paper. As this review indicates, some of the models have focus on extensive methods of improvement such as conservation, frontier, industrial fundamentalism, urban-industrial impact models; others introduce intensive ways-such as high pay off inputs and induced innovation models while some others emphasize the need for educational and social changes. Not all these models are used directly in Ethiopia except conservation & Neo-Marxist models and partially high pay off inputs, diffusion and induced innovation models. The others are only implicitly applied, which came to be obvious at evaluation stages. However, the issues are very much open for further research with exhaustive review, enlarged country case studies and close comparisons with up to dated compiling on the Ethiopian practice & condition for a more clear picture of the models as well as for a more realistic conclusions thereon.

Ethiopia has started planned and systematic economic policy measures and development programs since the mid 1940s. Historically, looking at the three periods of policy regimes can summarize the overall policy spirit and practices in the country. The first regime (1950-1974) was characterized by a market economy encouraging foreign investment to industrialize the country using import substitution industrialization strategy which was mainly in line with industrial fundamentalism and urban industrial impact models. The second period (1974-1991) was a central planning system, which was a Marxian /Neo-Marxian development model realized through regulatory activities and nationalization of private undertakings with capital more than Eth. Birr 500,000. The third period (since 1992) i.e. the currently functional state, started economic policy changes with structural adjustment programs (SAPs). It is accompanied by successive policy changes and reform

* Senior Economic Expert, Ethiopian Privatization Agency, P.O. BOX 100770,
Tel. 509444 (Off), 521021 (Res), Fax 513955, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

programmes to realize market economy (though the formal market for land is still controlled) by expanding the participation of private investments applying many development models.

With all these state and policy changes, the Ethiopian economy is still agrarian economy, which accounts for about 50% of the GDP. Ethiopian agriculture is predominantly a traditional farming system. It is also characterised by small holdings with a continuous degradation, overgrazing and high population pressure on the existing farmland. This resulted in uneconomic farmland conditions and size with a very little structural transformation of the sector over the last six decades. The agricultural sector still suffers from recurrent drought effects emanating from high dependency on natural phenomena that are used as a main reason for the failures in all the three policy periods. But, this fact has to be evaluated in terms of conscious actions without which the sector can/could be inhibited from practical transformation. That is, it shows the gap in policy consideration, which has to be further studied for the appropriate measures.

In other words, the gap in and possibilities for formulations in common with implementations of sustainable environmental, agricultural and overall developmental conditions have to be analysed further in light of these theories along with detailed historical practices for the road ahead. As this assessment points out, the improvement and then the sustainable growth of the Ethiopian agriculture or the economy at large entails the application of conservation, high pay off inputs, diffusion and induced innovation models in more appropriate ways or mixes than tried in the past.

1. INTRODUCTION

Agricultural policy makers apply one or more models from theories for policy formulations in realizing the development/ improvement objectives of the agricultural sector. Many writers do also recommend for mid-point alternatives from two or more models and two or more country cases. In other words, although there is no general formula to take one country as an example for another, it is common phenomenon to learn from experiences of countries with closely comparable resources, state of growth and development, physical features and/or socio-political settings.

Beyond the theoretical justifications, all these tried facts in many successful countries at different times in different forms do have invaluable significance for the practical case in current Ethiopia. It is defects of policies that are at the midpoint of the failure in developing the country's sector/the economy in one way or the other. Therefore, review of literatures accompanied by relevant assessments of comparable country cases on the topic under consideration is recommended to come up with highlights of the appropriate theories or models. This is the reason why this paper is presented.

Ethiopia has started planned and systematic economic policy measures and development programs since the mid 1940s. The overall policy spirit and practices since then can be evaluated by looking at three distinct periods reflecting different policy regimes. The first period (1950-1974 imperial regime) can be characterized by a market economy. In the late 1950s export promotion was exercised by a package of incentives encouraging foreign direct investment while in the late 1960s a principle of saving as much foreign exchange as possible was considered to industrialize the country using import substitution industrialization strategy. This was mainly in line with industrial fundamentalism model. The period can be implicitly explained by urban-industrial impact model as well. At that first time, therefore, agriculture was not the focal point of discussion as neither much as its socio-economic role/contribution nor for its own merit of development although refocusing to agriculture was started at the end of the regime (see also Mulat 1999). As a result of the last refocusing measure, there was indication of transforming the sector but the result could not be sustained any more because of the drought and the overthrow of the regime.

The second period (1974-1992 Derg regime) was a central planning system, which was a Marxian/Neo-Marxian development model realized through governmental regulatory activities and nationalization of private undertakings with capital over Eth. Birr 500,000. Until the promulgation of mixed economy (Decree No.17/90), the main belief of agricultural development (modernization and mechanization of the sector) was to be realized by state farms (by the 1975 Land Reform Proclamation) and through collectivisation. In fact, ADLI was the implied (and also stated) principle of development strategy given the 'socialist' system of the time.

The regime introduced the mixed economic system in 1990 with the objective of allowing the participation of the private sector. The mixed economy system resulted in dismantling cooperatives (especially farmers' producers cooperatives) without any other constructive contribution to the sector/economy. Actually, many undertakings were allowed to private investors with some sectoral restrictions and capital upper ceilings (Decree No.17/90, Reg. No. 7 & 10/90) though the overall policy change was ineffective mainly because of the immediate overthrow of the regime in 1991.

The third period (since 1992 i.e. the currently functional state) started economic policy changes with structural adjustment programs (SAPs) with successive policy changes and reform programmes to realize market economy by expanding the participation of private investments applying many development models. In terms of structural transformation, Alemayehu (2002) has proved that "the post Derg regime period did not show major change in the structure of the economy. However, there was an encouraging trend of structural changes before the Derg period though it could not be sustained because of the drought and downfall of the regime. Nevertheless, ADLI is the guiding principle of development strategy under the existing system still. Specifically, the main means (policy instrument) of developing the agricultural sector is extension system known as PADETS.

In general, with all these state and policy changes, the Ethiopian economy is still agrarian (predominantly a traditional agricultural economy), which accounts for about 50% of the GDP with a very little structural transformation over the last many years. The agricultural sector (with a very little structural transformation within itself over the last six decades) is highly characterized by smallholders. This sub-sector has suffered from a continuous degradation and high population pressure on the existing farmland that resulted in uneconomic farmland conditions and size. The sector still suffers from recurrent drought effects emanating from high dependency on natural phenomena that are mentioned as main reasons for the failures in all the policy regimes. In effect, such realities have to be seen in terms of conscious actions/strategies without which the sector could be inhibited from practical transformation. The core intention of the paper is to present a vivid recommendation for desired policy interventions.

To be precise, evaluating the practiced economic policies vis-à-vis the known development models/theories is believed to be ready to lend a hand for drawing sound scientific conclusions on pitfalls of past performances as well as recommending possible alternative measures for the future. Thus, the practices in the past within the models in theory have been reviewed and evaluated for appropriate mixes/specification of models. All these tried facts in many countries at different times in different forms are believed to serve as references for development strategies in current Ethiopia.

To rephrase what has been said, economists, development thinkers and policy makers use development models/theories to approach the multifaceted and wide problems of development in their endeavours to formulate, implement and evaluate policies, plans and strategies. For similar objective, about nine categories of agricultural development models (conservation, frontier, industrial fundamentalism, urban-industrial impact, high payoff inputs, diffusion, induced innovation, cultural change-first and community movement, Neo-Marxist and Dependency including Marxist Growth Models, Dependency Theories and Growth Stage Theories) have been reviewed at overview level up to the contentment of this particular objective. This is not meant to show the perfection or completeness of theories/models or that of other countries experiences for ready-made applications to any concrete development problems of LDCs or of Ethiopia today. But it is to show the tried sources to learn from and choose for the appropriate applications.

Logically, the selection of the models in this paper is based on their practical relevance, along with their theoretical refinements through time, to the Ethiopian policy making efforts in the past and at present. Indeed, on the one hand, not all these models are used in Ethiopia directly except conservation and Neo-Marxist models for the most part and high pay off inputs, diffusion and induced innovation models in some measures. The remaining is only implicitly applied, which came to be obvious at evaluation stages so that further evaluation of the Ethiopian practice is

very important. On the other hand, none of these models is sufficient individually for the best applications unless considered in combination with one or more models with meticulous adapting/adopting measures to the Ethiopian objective conditions for appropriate policy formulation and corresponding implementation and evaluation.

The review indicates that some of the models have focus on extensive methods of improvement such as conservation, frontier, industrial fundamentalism, urban-industrial impact models; others introduce intensive ways-such as high pay off inputs and induced models while some others emphasise the need for educational and social changes. But, the models at individual level and the approach in general hold very much open issues for further research. At this step, the literature reviewed along the related analyses of Ethiopian practices end up with conclusions on the past and current relevance of the reviewed models accompanied by recommendations on possible selections or adaptation/adoption for the specific circumstances of Ethiopia.

The highlights are, hence, geared to relate to the Ethiopian specific conditions and to see similar experiences in history for the lessons ahead. In the real sense, both rehabilitation in addition to developmental measures needs to be formulated as well as effected systematically and exhaustively with the necessary resource (alongside human resource) mobilization for the country. It is also an economic issue and strategic approach to make use of the available resources based on the basic resource potential/problem identification, allocation measures and re-allocation alternatives. Thus, if the Ethiopian practices in the existing conditions along with others experiences are studied further in depth with respect to each model, the result will give striking findings for designing valid strategies and evaluating implementations properly.

In other words, this work is mainly reviewing theoretical approaches/models related to the agricultural sector as per the original authors including successive additions/improvements through time and practices. It is an overview intended to make an enlarged research of evaluation type within the context of Ethiopian agricultural policy formulations /implementation practices. Therefore, it is intended for creating an enabling condition to get sufficient picture of each model that can be a springboard for similar undertakings that will help to specify and include other as much relevant models as possible for practical alleviations of policy failures in the country. As a result, this paper can also be a good initiative for further contemplation of the issues within the above-mentioned facts of the Ethiopian economy that are beyond hypotheses.

Some new theories have attracted the development thinkers of today (for instance, Hernando de Soto's Mystery of Capital). These new thinkings embraced under institutional economics are interdisciplinary approaches covering issues beyond economics that enable us to see development problems or strategies from other perspectives. However, these inter-disciplinary current issues are not readily

undertake large scale farming, the measures being taken for technological innovations/ adaptation/adoption etc. In full-scale commercial farming, neither the private sector is allowed to be engaged in all the areas of the country nor the government is involved in new such undertakings. Thus, there is a big gap of consideration for the real transformation as well as sustainable growth of the agricultural sector today.

Despite all the policy and government changes since the mid-1940s and though the country is sited for various resource endowments, the Ethiopian agriculture is still a very traditional sector exposed to the vagaries of nature which affect the livelihoods of the millions automatically. The sector is also unable to feed the producers sufficiently and sustainably, let alone its strength in the socio-economic linkage effects. Thus, the practices in the past within the models in theory (with relevant country cases) have to be reviewed widely. Evaluation is also needed for appropriate mixes/specification of models for the country. This can be a good initiative for further consideration of the issue within the above-mentioned facts of the economy, which are beyond hypotheses.

In other words, the gap in and possibilities for formulations in common with implementations of sustainable environmental, agricultural and overall developmental conditions have to be analysed further in light of these theories along with detailed historical practices for the road ahead. As this assessment points out, the improvement and then the sustainable growth of the Ethiopian agriculture or the economy as a whole entails the application of conservation, high payoff inputs, diffusion and induced innovation models in wider and more appropriate ways or mixes than have been tried in the past in this country⁷.

NOTES

1. The paper is mainly written following the works of Steven and Jabara (1988), Hayami and Ruttan (1985) and Eicher and Staats (1984). These writers have widely reviewed many agricultural development models along commenting on each. They also added their new and modified models in addition to recommending for further references on some other related works. They have also indicated sources and authors of further references such as the works of Mellor 1966, 1967, 1976; Arnon 1984; Harwood 1979, Glark and Haswell 1964, Griffin 1974a, T.W. Schultz 1978, Beckford 1972; Johnson and Kilby 1975; Wortman and Cummings 1978; Ghatak and Ingersent 1984. These authors have developed their own models besides wide review of others' mostly of which are related to the induced innovation, high pay off inputs and diffusion models. Others such as J.W. Elder 1968, L.E. Hordcroft 1984 and R.F. Hoeselitz 1960 have extensively treated issues related to the community movement models. J.C.H. Fei and Ranis, D.W. Jorgenson and J.W. Mellor are authors of many development theories as well as the dual economics models. It is also recommended to see the contribution of the new institutional economics by referring to such authors as Hernando de Soto (2000) The Mystery of Capital: Why Capitalism Triumphs in the West and Fails Everywhere Else. Appraisals and critics on this book are various such as Roy Culpepper (2002) Demystifying Hernando de Soto: Review of the Mystery of Capital; Alan Gilbert (2002) "On the Mystery of Capital and the Myths of Hernando de Soto", in International Development Planning Review, Vol.24; Christopher Woodruff (2001) "Review of de Soto's The Mystery of Capital", in Journal of Economics Literature, Vol. 39. (See Note 6 for further references on the Ethiopian case.)

Agricultural Development Models Reviewed (Implied Practices in Ethiopia)

2. Conservation model is explicitly conceived by the conservation-based agricultural development strategy of the country. A central authority is assigned to run the implementation of the strategy with the corresponding regional offices. For more information on the Ethiopian case see FDRE, MOFED (2002) Ethiopia- Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Program

3. The frontier agricultural development model is an approach different from the frontier model used to measure production efficiency in agriculture. It is rather related to new land development, which is sometimes known as land expansion or resource exploitation model.

4. The choice of frontier model as policy instrument for the private agricultural investment in Ethiopia is stated by the investment code of the country. This instrument is initially legalized by the proclamation to encourage, expand and coordinate investment (Proclamation No. 15/1992), explicitly stated in regulation No. 120/1993, by the transitional government and amended later on by FDRE Council of Ministers (Proclamation No. 37/1996) accompanied by the relevant amended regulations.

5. Frontier development model could have been used as a policy instrument had it not been for the physical and /or technological resource necessities to make it applicable. In the case of Urban-Industrial Impact model, there is no possibility to use as policy framework at all since it is the result of the natural course of action of development effected from the urbanization and industrialization process of countries. That is, in the latter there is no intentional interference of policy makers or practitioners for any desired end. Therefore, the two models seem similar but practically they have different significances.

6. For all current Ethiopian statistical values see the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (2002) and Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (2000) of which the latter includes review of the current ADLI & poverty strategies in Ethiopia among others such as 'Economic Reform and ADLI strategy', 'Poverty Reduction Strategy', 'Sector Development Programmes', 'Macroeconomic Setting for 2000/01-2002/2003', 'Indicator and Targets', and finally 'Policy Matrix'. In addition, for any such further interest on the recent Ethiopian case, MOFED (2002) Ethiopia- Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Program is another comprehensive source. More over, for most recent complete references on Overview of Ethiopian Economy in general and for the Agricultural Sector in particular along with for the possible further historical review of the adopted policies and strategies in the country, see Admass College (2003) Ethiopian Economy.

7. By re-organizing the models into other categories and including other specific models, the paper can be a very profound exercise over some of the models. Likewise, the current economic development issues of institutional economists of the Institute for Liberty and Democracy are igniting further considerations of the dimensions of (in-) effectiveness of development strategies from other perspectives. Since these inter disciplinary current issues for practical problems are not yet systematized and concusses among thinkers over some parts are not exhaustively drawn out, they are really new areas of further researches. Such a changed (and in fact enlarged) objective, scope and layout are an intention of the author of this paper for advanced new considerations with initiating others for similar undertakings. This paper, however, concentrates on only tried models/theories that are immediately essentials to comprehensive approaches of the practical problems in formulating and evaluating policies or strategies for actual (agricultural) development challenges of current Ethiopia. It will never be evidence for intellectual exercises over specific development/growth models.

REFERENCES

- Agrawal, A. N. and K. Lal (1993). *Economics of Development and Planning*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
- Admass College (2003), Ethiopian Economy, Addis Ababa.
- Alemayehu Geda 2002, Macroeconomic Policy and Agriculture in Ethiopia. In Proceeding of the Eleventh Annual Conference on the Ethiopian Economy, Gebrehiwot A, Jemal M. and Solomon T. (eds.) Policy Reform, Implementation and Outcome in Ethiopia. Addis Ababa.
- Jhingan, M. L. (1997). *Economics of Development and Planning*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
- Hayami, Y. and V. W. Ruttan (1971). *Agricultural Development: An International Perspective*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkin University press.
- Eicher, E .K. and J. M. Staaz (eds.) (1985). *Agricultural Development in the Third World*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkin University press.
- Dessalegn Rahmatto (ed.) 1994, Land Tenure and Land Policy in Ethiopia After the Derg. In Proceedings of the Second Workshop of the Land Tenure Project. IDR, Addis Ababa.
- Pausewand, S. *et. al.* (eds.) (1990). *Ethiopia: Rural Development Options*. London and New Jersey: Zed Books Ltd.
- Abdulhamed B. K. (1990) 'The Peasant Economy: A Review', *Ethiopian Journal of Economics*, 1(2), IDR, Addis Ababa.
- Alemayehu S. (1993) 'Cereal Producers, Prices and the Supply of Manufactured Goods in Ethiopia', *Ethiopian Journals of Economics*, 11(1).
- Dejene Aredo 1992, The Relevance of the Improvement Approach to Agricultural Growth in Ethiopia. In Proceedings of the First Annual Conference on the Ethiopian Economy, Mekonnen Taddesse (ed.) The Ethiopian Economy: Problems of Adjustment, Addis Ababa.
- _____ 2001, Agricultural Growth, Population and Enterprise Nexus: Highlights of the Debate and Implication for Ethiopia. In Mulat Demeke and Tassew W/Hanna (eds.), Explaining Economic Growth and Development in Ethiopia, in Proceedings of the 10th Annual Conference on Ethiopian Economy, Addis Ababa.
- Mulat Demek 1999, Challenges of Increasing Food Production in Ethiopia. In Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Conference on Ethiopian Economy, Alemayehu Geda and Berhanu Naga (eds.) The Ethiopian Economy Performance and Evaluation, Addis Ababa.
- TGE (1992), Economic Policy Paper. Addis Ababa.
- _____ (1994), Forestry Conservation, Development and Utilization Proclamation, No.94/94, Addis Ababa.
- UNDP and FAO (1984), Assistant to Land Use Planning, Ethiopia: Economic Analysis of Land, Rome.
- Solomon Abate (1984), Land Use Dynamics, Soil Degradation and Potential for Sustainable Use in Metu Area, Illubabor Region, Ethiopia, African Studies Series. University of Berne Switzerland.
- Stevens, R. D. & C. L. Jabara (1988). *Agricultural Development Principles: Economic Theory and Empirical Evidence*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.
- L. Serven & A.Solimano (1992), Private Investment and Macro Economic Adjustment: A Survey, The World Bank Research Observer, Vol. No.1.
- H. P. Bins Wangen and J. V. Brawn (1991), Technological Change and Commercialisation in Agriculture: The Effect on the Poor, The World Bank Research Observer. 6(1).

Agricultural Development Models Reviewed (Implied Practices in Ethiopia)

- Areid Angersen (1994), Shifting Cultivation Expansion and Intensity of Production. The Open Economy Case, Development Studies and Human Rights Working paper, 3 Bergen; Chr. Michellien Institute.
- Elder, J. W. (1968), Cultural and Social Factors in Agricultural Development. In Development and Changes in Traditional Agricultural Focus on South Asia. South Asian Occasional Paper 7. East Lansing, Michigan State University. Asian Study Paper.
- FAO (1986), Ethiopian Highland Reclamation study. Rome
- Hagen E. E. (1962). *On the Theory of Social Change – How Economic Growth Begins*. Homewood. Ill Dorsey.
- Holdcroft, L. C. (1984) 'The Rise and Fall of Community Development: A Critical Assessment. In *Agricultural Development in the Third World*', C.K. Eicher & J.A. Staarz (ed.) Baltimore & London. The John Hopkin University Press.
- Hoselitz (1960). *Sociological Aspect of Economic Growth*. Glencoe. Ill Free Press.
- Jorgenson, D. W. (1961) 'The Development of a Dual Economy', *Economic Journal* 71.
- McClelland, D. C (1961). *The Achieving Society*. New York: Van Nostrand.
- Mellor, J. W. (1966). *The Economics of Agricultural Development*. Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press.
- Myrdal, G. (1968). *Asian Drama*, Vols 3. New York: Gelencoe.
- Schultz, T. W. (1964b). *Transforming Traditional Agriculture*. Yale University Press. New Haven.
- Wharton, C. R. Jr. (1968). *The Organization of a Unified Agricultural Development Programme*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Befekadu Degfe, Berhanu Nega and Getahun Tafese (2001), Second Annual Report on the Ethiopian Economy, Volume2, 2000/2001:EEA/VEERI, Addis Ababa.
- FAO/WFP (2001), Crop and Food Supply Assessment Mission to Ethiopia: FAO Global Information and Early Warning System on Food and Agriculture/World Food Program, January, Rome.
- MOA (1993E.C.), Production and Market Surveys in Ethiopia. In Workshop on Grain Price and Its Impact on Extension and Farmers Production Incentives, Addis Ababa.
- G.O.I. Abalu, Structural Adjustment in African Agriculture: Some Lessons for the Future, ECA/FAO, *Food and Agriculture in Africa*, ECA/FAO Agriculture Division, Staff Paper No.3, Addis Ababa.
- FDRE (1990) Council of State Special Decree on Investment, Decree No. 17/1990, Addis Ababa.
- _____, (1990), Council of Ministers Regulations to Provide for the Participation of Foreign Investors, Regulation No.10/1990, Addis Ababa.
- _____, (1990), Council of Ministers Regulations to Provide for the Issuance of Licenses for Agricultural Activities, Regulation No.7/1990, Addis Ababa.
- Imperial Government of Ethiopia (1960), Farm Workers' Cooperation Decree No.44/1960, Addis Ababa.
- _____, (1965), State Forest, Private Forest Conservation and Protective Forest Proclamations No.225, 226 & 227/1965, Addis Ababa.
- _____, (1966), Investment Decree No.242/1966, Addis Ababa.
- _____, (1999), Investment Proclamation No. 37/96.
- _____, (2002), Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MOFED) Ethiopia-Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Program, Addis Ababa.
- _____, Council of Ministers, Investment Incentives Regulations No.7/96, No.9/96 and No.36/98.