National Implementation Guide for Scaling Black Soldier Fly systems in Ethiopia

A practical roadmap for national authorities, development partners, financiers and private-sector actors

Project: Biomass Utilization by Insects for Green Solutions in Africa (BUGS)

Implemented by Africa Circular Foundation, Eawag, Eclose and CARBON TURNAROUND, with the support of the PREVENT Waste Alliance and the Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC)



November 2026

Contents

About this guide	4
Evidence Base	4
Who should read what	5
Executive summary	6
1. The BUGS project and resources available for Ethiopia	8
1.1 BUGS resources to draw on	10
2. Context: BSF in Ethiopia	11
2.1 Why BSF matters for Ethiopia	11
2.2 The current landscape	13
2.3 Key issues to address	14
2.4 Implications of the Ethiopia assessment and subsequent consultations	14
3. Development and intervention options	16
Option A: Integrate BSF with decentralised composting in Yeka Woreda 09, Addis Ababa	16
Why this matters	17
What it involves	17
Expected results and first steps	17
Option B: Create BSF livelihoods for informal waste pickers	17
Why this matters	18
What it involves	18
Expected results and first steps	18

Contents

Option C: Applied BSF research for Ethiopian food systems, feed and soil fertility	18
Why this matters	19
What it involves	19
Expected results and first steps	19
4. Funding routes	21
Funding options at a glance	21
Making projects bankable	29
5. Implementation matrix	30
Potential BSF Stakeholders in Ethiopia	31
6. Coordination and monitoring	33
7. Conclusions and next steps	34
Annex A: Useful links	35
Annex B: Ethiopia evidence and implementation safeguards	36

About this guide

This guide provides a practical roadmap for scaling **Black Soldier Fly (BSF) bioconversion** in Ethiopia. It is intended for government agencies, local authorities, development partners, researchers, farmers, BSF entrepreneurs, industry associations, and investors who play a role in shaping the sector. Its purpose is to help stakeholders understand the potential of BSF technology and identify opportunities for collaboration, investment, and implementation.

Building on the lessons and evidence generated through the **BUGS project**, the guide translates research and field experience into actionable recommendations. It outlines priority interventions, implementation pathways, business models, financing opportunities, and stakeholder roles. Recognizing Ethiopia's diverse conditions, the guide does not promote a single approach. Instead, it encourages the development of context-specific models that align with local waste streams, markets, and production scales, while supporting the expansion of successful initiatives.

The guide places particular emphasis on the links between **organic waste management, agriculture, animal feed production, soil fertility, livelihoods, climate action, and the circular economy**. It aims to strengthen connections between waste generators, BSF producers, and end markets while creating the technical, institutional, regulatory, and financial conditions needed for sustainable sector growth. Ultimately, the goal is to support the transition from isolated initiatives to coordinated, commercially viable, and scalable BSF value chains.

Evidence Base

The guide draws primarily on evidence generated through the **BUGS project in Ethiopia**, including feasibility assessments, stakeholder consultations, field studies, capacity-building activities, and the **PREVENT Waste Alliance Ethiopia Implementation Report**. It also incorporates lessons from the stakeholder's meetings (June-Oct 2026), which involved discussions with government institutions, BSF practitioners, and other stakeholders on opportunities for expanding BSF within agriculture, aquaculture, and organic waste management systems.

The historical evidence establishes feasibility constraints and opportunities at Addis Ababa/Bole Arabsa and Butajira. The proposed Yeka, waste-picker and BETIn pathways are subsequent implementation priorities rather than sites already assessed in 2024

Given the rapid evolution of the sector, this guide should be viewed as a **living framework**. As new evidence, partnerships, financing opportunities, and policy developments emerge, its recommendations should be updated to reflect the changing needs and realities of Ethiopia's BSF industry.

About this guide

Who should read what

Reader	Most relevant sections
National authorities (ministries, regulators, standards bodies)	Section 3, Option C (applied research and evidence for informed decisions); Section 5 (implementation matrix); Section 6 (coordination and monitoring)
Local governments and municipal authorities	Section 3, Options A and B (urban demonstrations); Section 4 (local and municipal finance)
Development partners and climate funds	Section 2 (context); Section 4 (funding routes); Section 5 (matrix)
Banks, investors and private financiers	Section 3, Options B and C; Section 4 (making projects bankable)
Operators, farmers and researchers	Section 2.3 (key issues); Section 3, Options A, B and C; Annex (toolkit links)

Executive summary

Ethiopia faces two connected challenges: rising volumes of organic waste from growing towns, markets, agro-industry and farms, and persistent pressure on the cost and availability of protein for animal feed. BSF bioconversion, in which larvae feed on organic residues and are harvested for feed protein and fat, while the residue (frass) is used as a soil amendment, addresses both at once. Public studies point to a substantial economic opportunity in substituting BSF larvae meal for imported or fish-based protein in Ethiopia's feed sector.

This guide proposes three complementary pathways: (A) integrate BSF with decentralised composting at Yeka Woreda 09, Addis Ababa; (B) create inclusive BSF-related livelihood opportunities for informal waste pickers; and (C) develop applied research with BETIn and Ethiopian research partners on animal feed, frass, soil health and food systems. Research under Option C should generate the local evidence required for informed regulatory and investment decisions; it is not a separate policy intervention.

The time is now to move from interest to coordinated action. Government, research institutions, development partners, investors, private enterprises and producer organisations should use these priorities to align their efforts, close critical regulatory and knowledge gaps, invest in viable business models, and establish demonstration hubs that can be replicated across Ethiopia. The immediate focus should be on testing, learning and scaling what works, rather than creating more isolated initiatives. By working together to build a supportive policy environment, functioning markets and commercially viable production models, Ethiopia can turn BSF from a promising innovation into a practical, investable and scalable component of its circular bioeconomy, creating value from organic waste while supporting affordable feed, agricultural productivity, jobs and enterprise development.

Option	Focus	What it delivers
A	Integrated BSF and composting	Yeka integrated pilot; learning from Seven Lakes Green Solution and Kafa Bio; replicable decentralised model
B	Waste-picker livelihoods	Worker-centred organics collection and BSF demonstration, starting with markets and food businesses
C	Applied research	BETIn/university research on affordable feed, frass, food security and evidence for informed policy decisions

The three pathways combine practical urban demonstration, inclusive livelihoods and locally grounded research. The 2024 assessment sites, Bole Arabsa and Butajira, provide earlier feasibility lessons rather than replacing these proposed priorities.

Executive summary

What we suggest to stakeholders:

National authorities: engage with applied research under Option C, identify evidence needs and use locally validated results to inform decisions on feed, frass and organic waste management.

Development partners and climate funds: support the three complementary options, from feasibility and demonstrations to applied research.

Financiers and investors: assess commercially viable integrated composting–BSF models and inclusive livelihoods, informed by pilot performance and research evidence.

Operators, researchers and local governments: co-design pilots, share data and connect research with practical implementation and public decision-making.

1. The BUGS project and resources available for Ethiopia

BUGS (Biomass Utilization by Insects for Green Solutions in Africa), supported by PREVENT Waste Alliance and CCAC, works in Uganda, Ethiopia and Côte d'Ivoire. The Ethiopia inception workshop took place on 24 March 2024 in Addis Ababa. The assessment used stakeholder interviews and the Eawag/Eclose feasibility methodology to examine legal conditions, substrate supply, operations and markets. It focused on Melkam Integrated Farms in Butajira and Soil and More plc at Bole Arabsa on the outskirts of Addis Ababa. These were assessment cases, not evidence that commercial-scale viability has already been established.

The Ethiopia component combined stakeholder consultations, field assessments, technical studies, feasibility analyses, and workshops to evaluate the potential for BSF sector development. Government institutions, researchers, universities, waste-management companies, BSF producers, and private-sector actors participated in the process. The assessment examined key factors influencing sector growth, including regulatory frameworks, organic-waste availability, infrastructure needs, market opportunities, operational requirements, and business viability.

The initial Ethiopia assessment examined two sites: Melkam Integrated Farms in Butajira, approximately 135 km from Addis Ababa, with access to brewery and agro-processing residues; and Soil and More plc at Bole Arabsa, near Addis Ababa, associated with municipal organic-waste management and the proposed Circular Economy Centre of Excellence. The implementation report favoured piloting near Addis Ababa because of proximity to a continuous waste supply, while noting the need to verify sorting, land, utilities and transport economics. Adama is not one of the two sites covered by the 2024 assessment.

A key outcome of the project was the development of an evidence base for BSF growth in Ethiopia. The assessment identified major opportunities and constraints within the sector and highlighted priority areas for intervention, including waste segregation, technical capacity development, market creation, infrastructure investment, research, access to finance, public-private partnerships, and supportive regulations. The project also explored the potential of BSF systems to contribute to climate-change mitigation through improved organic-waste management and resource recovery.

The project further examined several business models suitable for Ethiopia, including waste-to-value enterprises that combine organic-waste collection with BSF production, commercial production of larvae meal and oil for animal feed, outgrower arrangements involving smallholder farmers, and integrated farming systems that utilize both larvae and frass. Hybrid models combining multiple products and revenue streams were recommended to enhance business resilience and profitability.

1. The BUGS project and resources available for Ethiopia

Another important contribution was the development of training and knowledge-sharing resources. These include technical guidance on facility design and operation, training materials, greenhouse-gas savings assessment tools, and platforms that support collaboration among BSF practitioners. Together, these resources provide a strong foundation for capacity building and sector-wide learning.

The project also generated recommendations to support policy development and investment. These include establishing clear standards for BSF products, improving organic-waste collection and segregation systems, strengthening market awareness, investing in processing and logistics infrastructure, supporting research and innovation, improving access to finance, and promoting stronger public-private partnerships. In addition, the CCAC-supported activities aim to help governments and stakeholders develop larger-scale BSF initiatives and connect them with financing opportunities.

Overall, the value of the BUGS project lies in its practical experience and evidence-based approach to sector development. It has demonstrated not only the potential of BSF technology to address waste-management and agricultural challenges, but also provided a roadmap for stakeholder engagement, business development, capacity building, and the creation of an enabling environment for sustainable scale-up in Ethiopia.

BUGS promotes context-appropriate BSF waste bioconversion in Uganda, Ethiopia and Côte d'Ivoire. In Ethiopia the historical evidence comprises the 2024 applicability assessment and subsequent country implementation report; later proposed actions should be validated separately.

In Ethiopia, BUGS has combined field activities, stakeholder exchanges, training, technical workshops and work on the policy and institutional conditions needed for BSF to develop. This guide turns those lessons and resources into a practical roadmap for progressive development that fits Ethiopia's context, particularly at the interface of organic waste management, agriculture, animal feed and the circular economy.

1. The BUGS project and resources available for Ethiopia

1.1 BUGS resources to draw on

Resource	Use in this guide	Link / location
Operators Toolkit	Technical reference for production models and operations	Link
Policy Guide for decision-makers	Reference for the regulatory, institutional, economic and monitoring levers of an enabling environment for BSF	Link
Feasibility assessment template	Guide for Assessing the Feasibility for BSF Waste Processing in Ethiopia	Link
BSF Assessment Report – Ethiopia	BSF Applicability report evaluates BSF's feasibility based on local waste substrates, regulatory frameworks, operational considerations and market demand for BSF products.	Link
PREVENT implementation report – Ethiopia	Main basis for country context, BSF activities, actors, constraints and opportunities	Link
Stakeholder mapping	Institutions, operators, farmers, researchers, local governments, technical and financial partners	Link

2. Context: BSF in Ethiopia

2.1 Why BSF matters for Ethiopia

Black Soldier Fly (BSF) bioconversion presents a practical and sustainable way to manage organic waste by converting biodegradable materials into valuable products instead of allowing them to decompose uncontrollably or end up in disposal sites. Through this process, organic waste can be transformed into insect biomass and nutrient-rich by-products, creating environmental and economic value from materials that would otherwise be considered waste.

Within agricultural and livestock production systems, BSF larvae offer a locally available and sustainable source of protein that can be incorporated into poultry, pig, and aquaculture feeds. At the same time, the frass produced during the bioconversion process can serve as an organic soil amendment, helping to improve soil health and support crop productivity. Beyond its technical benefits, the BSF sector also creates opportunities for income generation and entrepreneurship across the value chain, including waste collection, processing, transport, input supply, training, and production activities. These opportunities are particularly valuable for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), farmers, youth, and women.
In addition, by diverting organic waste away from landfills and uncontrolled decomposition, BSF systems have the potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, contributing to climate change mitigation when supported by appropriate monitoring and verification mechanisms.

BSF larvae can convert a wide range of organic residues, including market waste, food leftovers, brewery and agro-processing by-products and manure, into protein- and fat-rich biomass in roughly two weeks. That biomass can be processed into feed for poultry, fish, livestock and pets, while frass returns nutrients to soils. Done well, BSF therefore links five agendas that are often handled separately:

- **Organic waste management:** diverting biodegradable waste from dumpsites, waterways and public spaces, with associated health and environmental benefits.
- **Agriculture and animal feed:** a locally produced protein source that can reduce reliance on costly conventional ingredients such as soybean and fish meal.
- **Soil fertility:** frass as an organic fertiliser and soil conditioner.
- **Livelihoods:** enterprise and employment opportunities, notably for youth, women and rural households.
- **Climate:** reduced methane from organic waste and displaced emissions from feed and fertiliser supply chains.

Published research supports this potential: an economic assessment led by ICIPE (Abro et al., 2022, Frontiers in Insect Science) found that substituting insect-based feed for conventional protein sources in Ethiopia could yield strongly positive net economic returns.

2. Context: BSF in Ethiopia

2.2 The current landscape

The sector remains emerging rather than proven at commercial scale. The implementation report identifies Addis Ababa University, icipe, Melkam Integrated Farms, Eden Garden Farms and Thermo House plc among research and enterprise actors. The 2024 assessment focused specifically on Melkam Integrated Farms (Butajira) and Soil and More plc (Bole Arabsa). Relevant public counterparts identified in the implementation report include the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Planning and Development, Ministry of Skills and Labour, and Addis Ababa waste-management authorities. Their present mandates and named representatives should be reconfirmed. Ethiopia should not be described using Ugandan institutional names.

One of the greatest advantages for BSF development in Ethiopia is the abundance of organic waste generated from households, markets, restaurants, educational institutions, agro-processing facilities, and farming activities. This vast resource provides a consistent potential feedstock for BSF production and offers an environmentally sustainable alternative for managing biodegradable waste. However, challenges remain in the collection and handling of organic waste. In many areas, poor source separation practices lead to mixed waste streams that reduce substrate quality and increase processing costs. As a result, improving waste segregation at the source, strengthening collection and aggregation systems, and developing quality-control measures will be critical for establishing efficient and commercially viable BSF production systems.

The expansion of Ethiopia's livestock and aquaculture industries presents a strong and growing market for BSF-derived products. BSF larvae offer a promising alternative source of protein for poultry, pig, and fish feeds, reducing dependence on increasingly expensive conventional feed ingredients. Similarly, BSF frass has potential as an organic fertilizer and soil amendment, contributing to improved soil health and agricultural productivity. Nevertheless, broader market acceptance will depend on the consistent production of high-quality products, reliable supply chains, and clear evidence of performance under local farming conditions.

Concerns related to feed safety, nutritional composition, processing standards, and optimal inclusion rates in animal diets must continue to be addressed through research, validation trials, and the development of industry standards that build confidence among farmers and feed manufacturers.

Beyond its environmental and agricultural benefits, BSF production also creates important socio-economic opportunities. The sector has the potential to generate employment and entrepreneurship opportunities for a wide range of actors, including farmers, youth, women, waste collectors, processors, transporters, input suppliers, and small business owners.

2. Context: BSF in Ethiopia

By creating new enterprises around waste collection, larvae production, feed processing, marketing, and distribution, BSF value chains can contribute to local economic development while supporting sustainable waste management. Decentralized production systems, farmer cooperatives, waste-collection networks, and outgrower models could further enhance participation and enable both rural and urban communities to benefit from the growing industry.

Overall, Ethiopia possesses many of the conditions necessary for scaling BSF bioconversion technologies. The country's abundant organic waste resources, expanding agricultural and aquaculture sectors, growing private-sector engagement, increasing research capacity, and rising interest in circular economy approaches provide a strong foundation for future growth. However, realizing this potential will require coordinated efforts among stakeholders, supportive policies and regulatory frameworks, investments in infrastructure and technical skills, continuous research and innovation, and improvements in waste-management systems. With these elements in place, Ethiopia can develop resilient, commercially viable, and quality-assured BSF value chains that contribute to environmental sustainability, food security, and economic development.

BSF development in Ethiopia is at an early but dynamic stage. Publicly documented activity includes research and training work by [Ethiopian university partner to confirm] (College of Veterinary Medicine, Animal Resources and Biosecurity), [Ethiopian agricultural research institution to confirm] and [Ethiopian university partner to confirm], technical support from the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries ([Ethiopian agriculture authority to confirm]) and its agricultural programmes, international research partners such as icipe, and small and medium enterprises around Addis Ababa and in peri-urban districts. Practitioners consistently report rapid growth alongside open questions on the safety and quality of larvae, nutritional composition and inclusion rates in feed.

Historical evidence to retain: Addis Ababa and Butajira were the two 2024 assessment areas. The assessment reports approximately 3,400 tonnes/day of municipal waste generated in Addis Ababa in 2020 (JICA estimate), with food waste forming 53% of household and 59% of commercial waste; these are historical estimates, not current measured volumes. Mixed waste and contamination, transport costs, competition for agricultural residues, reliable water and electricity, and land costs can determine feasibility. The report notes that rural by-products often have existing uses and should not be treated as freely available.
Historical evidence to retain: Addis Ababa and Butajira were the two 2024 assessment areas. The assessment reports approximately 3,400 tonnes/day of municipal waste generated in Addis Ababa in 2020 (JICA estimate), with food waste forming 53% of household and 59% of commercial waste; these are historical estimates, not current measured volumes. Mixed waste and contamination, transport costs, competition for agricultural residues, reliable water and electricity, and land costs can determine feasibility. The report notes that rural by-products often have existing uses and should not be treated as freely available.

2. Context: BSF in Ethiopia

2.3 Key issues to address

Issue	What needs to be resolved
Substrate supply	Availability, quality, seasonality and logistics of organic substrates from urban, agro-industrial and agricultural flows; secure and safe access to source-separated material
Regulatory framework	Rules for BSF rearing, permitted substrates, animal feed use, insect farming and products (larvae meal, fat, frass); clear mandates across agencies
Markets and acceptance	Demand, pricing and buyer confidence for BSF protein in feed, and for frass as fertiliser; quality assurance
Business models	Models that work for farmers, specialised operators and hub-and-spoke systems, with realistic costs and revenues
Skills and equipment	Technical training, extension and coaching; access to suitable, affordable equipment and quality starter stock
Monitoring and alignment	Tracking economic and environmental performance, and linking results to national priorities such as waste, agriculture, circular economy and climate commitments

2.4 Implications of the Ethiopia assessment and subsequent consultations

The 2024 feasibility assessment and implementation report indicate that BSF operations should be sited near reliable, clean organic feedstocks and verified buyers, with manageable land and transport costs. At Bole Arabsa, integration with composting and existing municipal infrastructure is a promising concept; in Butajira, agro-industrial supply agreements and potential poultry-feed trials illustrate opportunities and dependencies. These findings are a baseline for, not proof of, the newer Yeka and BETIn proposals.

Regulatory evidence requires careful interpretation. The assessment identified no comprehensive insect-specific national framework and discussed a draft dried-insect feed specification and the use of East African fertilizer standards. The implementation report refers to an IES 2021 dried-insect feed guideline/code of practice. Before commercialization, partners must confirm the current legal status, permitted substrates, product testing, licensing, worker safety and environmental compliance with Ethiopian authorities.

Operational feasibility requires source-separated substrates and quantified supply agreements, seasonal characterization, transport distances, water and electricity access, and locally suitable temperature and humidity management. The assessment gives indicative preferred rearing conditions of 25–30°C and 60–90% relative humidity; temperature control can add costs, particularly at cooler sites.

2. Context: BSF in Ethiopia

The assessment notes low awareness and uncertain customer acceptance of insect-derived feed and frass. Demonstration trials, clear product quality specifications and farmer-facing evidence should precede ambitious demand or revenue forecasts. Melkam Integrated Farms' reported agreement with Alema Koudijs Feed plc for a comparative poultry trial is an example of the evidence-building approach, not a confirmed successful trial outcome.

The implementation report proposes two business approaches for further testing: a hub-and-outgrower arrangement in which a coordinating enterprise supplies eggs, training and equipment to growers and purchases larvae; and business-to-business agreements with feed or other product buyers. Both require verified unit economics, contracts and product safety. Combining BSF with composting can diversify revenue and handle feedstock fractions unsuitable for larvae.

The implementation report highlights opportunities for GHG mitigation from avoiding uncontrolled organic-waste disposal. Any emissions or carbon-credit claim should be quantified against a documented baseline, with leakage, energy use, alternative substrate uses and product displacement considered. Carbon revenues should not be assumed in base-case financial projections.

> The three proposed options below should apply these lessons through small, measurable demonstrations, social safeguards and applied research. Their institutional leadership, budgets, sites and outputs remain to be confirmed with Ethiopian counterparts.

Overall, the mission reinforced the view that BSF development should be pursued as part of an integrated value chain that connects organic waste resources, farmers, feed markets, research institutions, government programs, and private investment. Positioning BSF within these interconnected systems, rather than as a stand-alone insect-farming activity, will be key to achieving sustainable, scalable, and commercially viable growth in Ethiopia.

3. Development and intervention options

Three complementary, illustrative pathways are proposed following BUGS consultations and the 8 October 2026 discussion with BETIn and Eco-Justice Ethiopia. They are not an exhaustive inventory or agreed government programme: (A) integrated decentralised BSF and composting; (B) inclusive livelihoods for informal waste workers; and (C) demand-led applied research that also supplies evidence for public decisions. Government institutions can enable and guide development, while entrepreneurs, communities and NGOs can initiate viable demonstrations.

Option	Focus	Proposed outcome
A	Integrated BSF and composting	Yeka integrated pilot; learning from Seven Lakes Green Solution and Kafa Bio; replicable decentralised model
B	Waste-picker livelihoods	Worker-centred organics collection and BSF demonstration, starting with markets and food businesses
C	Applied research	BETIn/university research on affordable feed, frass, food security and evidence for informed policy decisions

Option A: Integrate BSF with decentralised composting in Yeka Woreda 09, Addis Ababa

Objective	**Improve the economic and environmental performance of local organic waste treatment by integrating BSF with planned composting operations.**
Proposed local anchor	Jitu (G2) Compost Manufacturing, Yeka Woreda 09 and Eco-Justice Ethiopia (to confirm)
Potential partners	Africa Circular, CARBON TURNAROUND, Eawag, Eclose, C40, EPA and UMI Fund (all to be confirmed).
First step	Joint feasibility assessment of organic waste streams, facilities, markets and operational requirements.

3. Development and intervention options

Why this matters

Yeka Woreda 09 offers a proposed opportunity to test integrated composting and BSF with Jitu (G2) Compost Manufacturing. The 2024 Bole Arabsa assessment provides relevant design lessons, but it does not establish the Yeka site's feedstock supply, technical performance or economic viability. Combining composting with BSF could accommodate heterogeneous organics and diversify products, subject to sorting and quality controls.

What it involves

- Characterise and source-separate incoming organics: feed appropriate, safe fractions to larvae and compost other biodegradable fractions; avoid assuming all mixed waste is suitable.
- Assess feedstock logistics, contamination risks, biological performance, operator capacity, demand for larvae and frass, and the economics of both composting and BSF.
- Train local waste workers and entrepreneurs in safe BSF rearing, reproduction, harvesting, product handling and integrated composting operations.
- Start with manageable, decentralised pilot units, document results and replicate or expand only where supply and offtake justify it; larger facilities may suit some markets but are not the default.

Expected results and first steps

First undertake a Yeka baseline study covering daily and seasonal feedstock volumes, contamination, current composting operations, land and utilities, market demand and worker safety. Then establish a modest monitored pilot, recording costs, larvae yield, frass handling, compost outputs and customer feedback before replication. Draw on Bole Arabsa lessons without presenting historical projections as verified Yeka outcomes.

Option B: Create BSF livelihoods for informal waste pickers

Objective	**Create safer and more diversified livelihoods for informal waste pickers through organic-waste valorisation and BSF microenterprises.**
Potential partners	Eco-Justice Ethiopia, Africa Circular, CARBON TURNAROUND, Eawag and GGGI
First step	Review and build on Eco-Justice Ethiopia's existing proposal and co-design with waste-picker groups.

3. Development and intervention options

Why this matters

Informal waste workers are already involved in material recovery, but the feasibility reports identify weak source segregation as a major obstacle to BSF. A worker-centred organics collection and sorting pilot could improve substrate quality and create livelihoods if existing rights, income and working conditions are protected. The proposed model has not yet been validated by the 2024 feasibility assessment.

What it involves

- Map waste-worker groups, current earnings, rights and working conditions, as well as organic-waste sources and existing collection or feed-use routes.
- Co-design collection and sorting arrangements with worker organisations and municipal authorities, with transparent remuneration for source-separated organics.
- Establish a small BSF demonstration linked to worker-led collection, with practical training on substrate safety, insect biology, hygiene and product quality.
- Test viable offtake for larvae and frass, support entrepreneurship and monitor decent-work, gender and income outcomes without presuming that all workers want to become BSF farmers.

Expected results and first steps

Begin with a participatory assessment of waste-picker groups, current livelihoods, organic waste generators and municipal arrangements. Test paid collection and processing roles, safe working conditions, gender-sensitive training and transparent benefit sharing. Monitor net income, contamination, occupational safety, retention and reliable buyer demand; do not assume that BSF production automatically improves livelihoods.

Option C: Applied BSF research for Ethiopian food systems, feed and soil fertility

Objective	**Build locally relevant scientific evidence to enable BSF adoption by farmers, feed producers and urban agriculture initiatives.**
Proposed research partners	BETIn, Ethiopian universities (e.g. Addis Ababa or Hawassa), other research institutes (to confirm)
Other potential partners	Africa Circular, CARBON TURNAROUND, Eawag and relevant public agricultural institutions.
First step	Agree a demand-led research agenda with Ethiopian farmers, researchers, regulators and potential feed buyers.

3. Development and intervention options

Why this matters

Applied research is central to an informed Ethiopian scale-up. The assessment identifies gaps in product acceptance, feed safety, substrate performance and locally validated markets, while the implementation report notes that commercially proven models are still lacking. BETIn and research partners can generate credible results on locally appropriate feed formulations, frass treatment, agronomic benefits and economic performance, and provide authorities with evidence for proportionate decisions.

What it involves

- Prioritise locally relevant substrates, including selected food-processing and agro-industrial residues, while assessing safety, seasonality, costs and competing uses.
- Test BSF-based ingredients for affordable poultry and fish feeds, including nutritional quality, formulation, farmer performance, market acceptance and commercial viability
- Compare treated frass and frass-derived products with compost and mineral fertilisers for soil health, crop performance, nutrient availability and safe use; study product standards and quality assurance.
- Assess practical delivery models for rural households and urban growers, connecting feed and fertiliser availability to vegetables, eggs, poultry and fish production and nutrition outcomes.
- Translate results into farmer-facing guidance and concise evidence briefs for agriculture, health, environmental and planning authorities. Address evidence needs for biofertiliser regulation, soil health, urban biowaste management and existing waste-sector climate mitigation measures; do not assume BSF must be named separately in Ethiopia's NDC.

Expected results and first steps

Develop a jointly agreed BETIn/university research protocol with priority questions, controls, laboratory testing, animal and crop performance indicators, cost data and dissemination responsibilities. Publish evidence briefs for feed manufacturers, farmers and regulators. Policy and standards decisions should be informed by the results, not treated as a separate fourth implementation option.

Phase	Scope	Outputs
1. Preparation	Stakeholder agreement, baseline and feasibility; define pilots and research priorities	Partner roles, baseline data, site and market assessments
2. Demonstration	Yeka integrated pilot; waste-picker pilot; applied research	Operational learning, product testing and training
3. Consolidation	Refine business models and produce evidence briefs for agricultural, health, environmental and planning authorities	Evidence-based guidance, viable operations and buyer relationships
4. Replication	Extend proven models to other districts and agricultural value chains	Replicable models, finance-ready projects and monitoring

3. Development and intervention options

Options A and B demonstrate practical implementation; Option C generates locally relevant evidence for producers, investors and government. Research findings can inform feed and biofertiliser standards, soil fertility and nutrition programmes, waste management and existing NDC waste-sector measures without a separate policy intervention. All three pathways require feasibility checks, partner consent and locally grounded financing.

Entries are grouped by type of funder. "Passed" means that the last deadline listed in the source has already gone by; where a call recurs each year, the next round has to be checked. Status information is taken from the BUGS funding opportunities list (version of August 2026) and may be out of date. "Not stated" means the list gives no information.

4. Funding routes

Funding options at a glance

Funding source	Type of institution	Focus	Who can apply and key requirements	Amount and status	Link
Bilateral and national government programmes					
IKI Small Grants	German federal government climate initiative	Climate mitigation and adaptation; biodiversity	Local, national and regional non-profit organisations in ODA countries; at least 3 years of experience and annual revenue of €60,000 to €500,000	€60,000 to €200,000; 1 to 3 years. Annual call; last deadline 15 Jan 2026 (passed)	Link
IKI Medium Grants	German federal government climate initiative	Climate mitigation and adaptation; biodiversity	Non-profit organisations and academic institutions with a base in Germany, partnering with one or two local implementers in the project country	€300,000 to €800,000; 2 to 3 years. Annual call; last deadline 20 Jan 2026 (passed)	Link
IKI Large Grants	German federal government climate initiative	Climate mitigation and adaptation; biodiversity	Consortia of NGOs, universities, intergovernmental and UN bodies or companies; partner-country governments cannot apply to the ideas competition; IKI priority countries only	€5 to €20 million; up to 8 years. Annual call; last deadline 17 Feb 2026 (passed)	Link
Mitigation Action Facility	International climate mitigation facility (call for projects)	Climate mitigation in energy, industry, transport and cross-sector	National ministry or legal entity (agency, bank, NGO, company, foundation); priority sector must be in the country's NDC; implementation-ready projects	€5 to €25 million; 36 to 66 months. 2026 call deadline 25 Feb 2026 (passed)	Link
DeveloPPP	German public programme for business partnerships	Sustainable business investment in developing and emerging countries	Company from the EU, EFTA or an OECD DAC country leads. Established firms: at least 8 employees and €800,000 turnover. Start-ups: matching funds, growth potential	Up to €2 million, maximum 50% public share (start-ups up to €100,000). Several calls a year	Link

4. Funding routes

Funding source	Type of institution	Focus	Who can apply and key requirements	Amount and status	Link
Fund for Innovation in Development (FID, AFD)	French development agency innovation fund	Innovations against poverty and inequality; priority: education, health, climate, gender	Almost any organisation, alone or in a consortium (research, NGO, company, public agency); not individuals or international organisations; ODA countries (except Burkina Faso, Niger, Mali)	Preparation up to €50,000; pilot up to €200,000; scale-up up to €4 million. Open (continuous)	Link
Canada International Climate Finance Program	Canadian government climate finance	Clean energy, nature-based solutions, climate-smart agriculture, climate governance	Governments, NGOs, multilateral and research bodies, private partners; must be ODA and have climate as principal purpose. $300 million reserved for nature-based solutions in Sub-Saharan Africa	Varies; 3 to 5 years. Call-dependent	Link
Global Affairs Canada, international development funding	Canadian government development funding	Economic growth, climate and environment, gender equality, food security	Legally registered non-profit or civil society organisations with proven project and financial management; ODA-eligible countries	CAD 500,000 to tens of millions; 2 to 5 years. Competitive calls	Link
Norad	Norwegian development cooperation agency	Health, education, human rights, climate, food, environment	Norwegian companies, government agencies, NGOs and universities	Depends on the call. No call at the moment	Link

4. Funding routes

Funding source	Type of institution	Focus	Who can apply and key requirements	Amount and status	Link
French Facility for Global Environment (FFEM)	French environment facility for developing countries	Biodiversity, cities, water, land use, waste	Civil society, governments, local authorities, research bodies, private sector. Co-financing required (2024: at least 50% for NGOs, public actors and research; 70% for companies and international organisations)	Depends on the call. No call at the moment; priority on Africa	Link
Nordic Climate Facility	Nordic climate grant facility	Innovative climate projects in developing countries; has financed BSF projects	A Nordic lead partner is required for every project	€250,000 to €500,000. No further calls planned; current projects continue	Link
Nordic Development Fund	Nordic development fund (concessional finance)	Climate mitigation and adaptation in lower-income and fragile countries; early-stage projects	Nationally prioritised public-sector projects run by public entities, especially multilateral development banks	Grants, loans and equity on concessional terms. Tender-specific; no tender at the moment	Link
Multilateral and climate funds					
Green Climate Fund, Project-Specific Assessment Approach	Multilateral climate fund	Climate mitigation and adaptation aligned with NDCs	Public, private and civil society entities without GCF accreditation; proposal must be endorsed by the country's National Designated Authority	Up to USD 250 million per project; up to 5 to 10 years. Open (rolling)	Link

4. Funding routes

Funding source	Type of institution	Focus	Who can apply and key requirements	Amount and status	Link
Green Climate Fund, Project-Specific Assessment Approach	Multilateral climate fund	Climate mitigation and adaptation aligned with NDCs	Public, private and civil society entities without GCF accreditation; proposal must be endorsed by the country's National Designated Authority	Up to USD 250 million per project; up to 5 to 10 years. Open (rolling)	Link
Green Climate Fund, Project Preparation Facility	Multilateral climate fund	Project design, feasibility, climate, social and environmental assessments	GCF accredited entities and project-specific applicants; endorsement by the National Designated Authority	Up to USD 1.5 million; 12 to 24 months. Open (rolling)	Link
Adaptation Fund	Multilateral climate adaptation fund	Climate adaptation and resilience	Concrete adaptation projects in vulnerable developing countries, submitted through accredited national, regional or multilateral implementing entities	Grants. Open (continuous). Small grants also for readiness and innovation	Link
GEF Least Developed Countries Fund	Multilateral fund managed by the Global Environment Facility	Climate resilience and adaptation priorities of least developed countries	Least developed countries (details not available: GEF website did not work when the list was compiled)	Grants. Status and eligibility to be checked directly	Link
Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP)	Multilateral food security fund	Climate-smart agriculture, smallholders, food and nutrition security, value chains	Country window: national governments with an approved supervising entity (World Bank, IFAD, AfDB, FAO, WFP). Also windows for producer organisations and private enterprises; low-income (IDA-eligible) countries	Grants of up to tens of millions of USD (producer organisations up to USD 3 million); 3 to 5 years. 9th call closed 15 Sep 2026	Link

4. Funding routes

Funding source	Type of institution	Focus	Who can apply and key requirements	Amount and status	Link
IFAD grants	UN agency for rural development	Agriculture, rural economies, food systems	Member states, UN and intergovernmental bodies, civil society, research, producer organisations, foundations, companies legally constituted in an IFAD member state	Grants. Latest grants issued in 2024; probably not ongoing	Link
Common Fund for Commodities	Commodities fund of 101 member countries	Smallholder agriculture, local value addition, trade finance, agtech, women entrepreneurs	SMEs, cooperatives, social enterprises, NGOs and public or private entities operating in a member country; at least 3 years of operating history; priority for least developed countries	Amount not stated. Last listed deadline 1 Apr 2026 (passed)	Link
Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF)	International trade and standards facility	Food safety, animal and plant health (sanitary and phytosanitary capacity)	Developing countries on the OECD ODA list; beneficiaries contribute own resources (money or in kind)	Preparation grants up to USD 50,000; project grants up to USD 1 million. Last listed deadline 1 Mar 2026 (passed)	Link
Innovation, impact and development finance					
Global Innovation Fund	Non-profit impact investment fund	Agriculture and food security, health, education, gender, inclusion	Any type of organisation; innovation must target people living on less than USD 5 a day and have scaling potential; focus on Africa and Asia	Up to USD 230,000 (pilot), USD 2.3 million (test), USD 15 million (scale). Closed; last window ended 15 Jan 2025	Link

4. Funding routes

Funding sources	Type od institution	Focus	Who can apply and key requirements	Amount and status	Link
Development Innovation Ventures (DIV)	Developme nt innovation fund	Agriculture, environment, climate, energy, economic growth, health	Any organisation type operating in a country where USAID works; strong impact evidence, cost-effectiveness and a path to scale	Up to USD 200,000 (stage 1), USD 1.5 million (stage 2), USD 15 million (stage 3). Open (rolling)	Link
Dutch Fund for Climate and Development	Governmen t-funded climate and developme nt fund	Water and land use; climate adaptation and mitigation	Promising early-stage initiatives in eligible countries with commercial potential, benefiting vulnerable groups and aligned with national goals; must co-invest (cash or in kind)	Land-use facility €55 million; water facility €75 million; a further €40 million allocated. Continuous (to be confirmed)	Link
Agri-Business Capital (ABC) Fund	Agricultural investment fund (loans and equity)	Agriculture; smallholder organisations and rural SMEs	Enterprises: at least 2 years active, revenue of €180,000 or more, collateral of at least 50% of the loan, EBITDA of at least 5% of revenue. Also financial intermediaries	€200,000 to €800,000 (€1 to €4 million for intermediaries); 1 to 7 years. Open	Link
IDH (Sustainable Trade Initiative)	Sustainable trade organisatio n	Climate adaptation and resilience; agriculture	Original, innovative impact idea; project cannot be self-financed; no access to other donors or commercial finance; applicant covers 50% of costs	Amount not stated	Link
IDH, AGRI3 Fund Technical Assistance Facility	Blended fund for sustainable agriculture	Deforestation-free agriculture and land use	Farmers and agricultural value chains (details not stated)	USD 2 to 15 million; 10 to 12 years	Link
IDH, Farmfit Fund	Blended fund to de-risk smallholder investment	Smallholder farming; income of smallholders	Investments in developing countries on the ODA list (details not stated)	Up to 10 years. Amount not stated	Link

4. Funding routes

Funding sources	Type od institution	Focus	Who can apply and key requirements	Amount and status	Link
Rabo Foundation	Bank-linked foundation	Climate-smart agriculture, post-harvest losses, financial inclusion	Organised farmer cooperatives, producer organisations and agri-social enterprises with a track record and transparent finances	Concessional loans, guarantees, soft grants, €50,000 to €500,000 or more; 1 to 3 years. Open (rolling)	Link
Livelihood Impact Fund	Livelihood-focused grant fund	Agricultural productivity, micro-enterprise, vocational training	Non-profits, social enterprises and research groups; strong evidence of cost-effectiveness; low-income beneficiaries in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia	USD 10,000 to USD 250,000 or more; 1 to 3 years. Open (rolling enquiry)	Link
Hand in Hand Sweden	Swedish non-profit organisation	Micro-enterprise, women and youth, job creation	Micro-entrepreneurs and self-help groups in low-income rural and peri-urban areas, reached through local partner organisations	Amount not stated. Programme and country calls; no open unsolicited portal	Link
P4G Partnerships	Public-private partnership platform	Climate-smart agriculture, food loss and waste, water, clean energy	Partnership of at least one early-stage business and one non-profit in Colombia, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, South Africa or Vietnam (Ethiopia not listed)	USD 100,000 to USD 300,000; 18 to 24 months. Last deadline 7 Mar 2025; nothing ongoing	Link
Foundations and philanthropy					

4. Funding routes

Funding sources	Type od institution	Focus	Who can apply and key requirements	Amount and status	Link
Foundations and philanthropy					
ClimateWorks, Adaptation and Resilience Fund	Philanthropic fund	Resilience to extreme heat; also a food and agriculture programme	Cities and communities with informal labour and housing and high heat exposure, in South Asia, Southeast Asia and sub-Saharan Africa	Up to USD 9 million. Last deadline 19 Sep 2025 (passed)	Link
IKEA Foundation	Corporate foundation	Climate mitigation, renewable energy, agricultural livelihoods, sustainable land use	Registered non-profits, international NGOs and research institutions; unsolicited proposals generally not accepted outside specific initiatives	Several hundred thousand to multi-million; 2 to 5 years. Partner-driven	Link
Rockefeller Foundation	Philanthropic foundation	Climate, energy poverty, regenerative agriculture, health, economic equity	Tax-exempt non-profits, research bodies, international NGOs; unsolicited proposals strictly limited outside specific calls	USD 100,000 to several million; 1 to 5 years. Opportunity-based	Link
Walmart.org, Waste and Sustainability	Corporate foundation	Circular economy, organic waste management, food waste prevention	Tax-exempt non-profits or registered charities with proven capacity	Typically USD 250,000 to USD 2 million or more; 1 to 3 years. By invitation and specific calls	Link
Anglo American Foundation and Impact Finance Network	Corporate foundation	Biodiversity, sustainable livelihoods, green business	Non-profit and academic entities for grants; enterprises registered in target Southern African countries with revenue of at least USD 125,000. Regions listed do not include Ethiopia	Grants USD 50,000 to USD 250,000; 10 to 36 months. Rolling calls	Link
The Audacious Project	Philanthropic collaborative	Climate mitigation, biodiversity, health, economic opportunity	Established non-profits with an annual budget of at least USD 1 to 2 million and a proven track record	Tens of millions of USD; 3 to 5 years. Annual selection	Link

4. Funding routes

Funding sources	Type od institution	Focus	Who can apply and key requirements	Amount and status	Link
Grand Challenges Canada	Grant programme	Not stated	Not stated	No funding opportunity available at the moment	Link
City-focused funding					
City Gap Fund	Multi-partner facility for cities (World Bank, EIB, GIZ)	Climate-smart urban plans and finance-ready projects; feasibility studies	Cities and local governments worldwide (criteria not available: website did not work when the list was compiled)	Feasibility studies. Status to be checked directly	Link
Bloomberg Philanthropies, Cities Idea Exchange	Philanthropic city programme	Urban climate resilience, municipal waste management, circular economy	City governments and local public authorities; proposals replicate or adapt a proven urban solution	Grants plus technical support; 1 to 3 years. City challenge calls	Link
Cities Climate Finance Leadership Alliance	Multi-stakeholder coalition	Closing the investment gap for urban climate projects	Not stated	Nothing ongoing at the moment	Link

Making projects bankable

Financiers of every type will look for the same fundamentals. Projects that arrive with them are funded faster:

- a secured, quantified and contracted substrate supply;
- evidence of demand and expected offtake for larvae products and frass;
- a costed technical design with credible revenues, benchmarked against pilot data;
- clear regulatory status for the operation and its products;
- a qualified operator or management team and a risk register;
- a monitoring plan that measures economic, social and environmental results, including emission reductions.

5. Implementation matrix

The matrix links priority actions to responsible institutions, partners, timing, funding routes and indicators. Entries are **proposed** and should be validated with the institutions named. Timing refers to the phases above.

Priority action	Lead	Partners	Timing	Possible funding	Indicator
Set up national BSF coordination platform	Ethiopian agriculture authority, MWE	Ethiopian environmental authority; Ethiopian standards authority, research bodies	Phase 1	Cooperation / technical assistance	Platform established; meetings held per year
Research on evidence needs for informed regulatory decisions	BETIn, Ethiopian universities and research partners	Relevant environmental, agriculture, standards and health authorities	Phase 1	Cooperation / technical assistance	Evidence gaps identified; research findings shared with decision-makers
Applied research on larvae meal, fat and frass safety and quality	BETIn and university research teams	Ethiopian agriculture authority, Ethiopian agricultural research institution, universities	Phases 1–3	Cooperation; agricultural funding	Local testing results and evidence-based recommendations available
Feasibility studies for priority models and sites	Operators, municipalities	BUGS partners	Phase 1	Cooperation; climate project preparation	Number of feasibility studies completed
Demonstration units with performance monitoring	Operators, farmer groups	Universities, municipalities	Phase 2	Grants; climate funds	Verified conversion, cost and product data
Training and coaching programme, including trainers of trainers	Ethiopian agriculture authority extension, universities	Associations, BUGS partners	Phases 1–3	Cooperation; agricultural funding	Persons trained; operators reaching target performance
Substrate supply arrangements with markets, agro-industry and municipalities	Municipalities, operators	Market authorities, agro-processors	Phases 2–3	Municipal budgets; service contracts	Tonnes diverted per year; contracts signed
Bankable project pipeline and investor engagement	Project developers	DFIs, impact investors, Ministry of Finance	Phases 2–4	Blended finance; guarantees; private capital	Projects reaching financial close; capital mobilised
Emissions accounting and MRV approach	MWE, Ethiopian environmental authority	Research bodies, BUGS partners	Phases 2–3	Climate funds	Method agreed; tCO2e avoided reported
Documentation and dissemination of lessons	Universities, BUGS partners	Associations	Ongoing	Cooperation	Publications, events, network members

5. Implementation matrix

Potential BSF Stakeholders in Ethiopia

The list below prioritise contacts that can be linked to current BSF projects or current institutional roles. It maps stakeholders with critical roles ranging from policy, regulation and standards; organic waste and circular economy; BSF production, research and technology; feed, fertiliser and markets; and investment, climate finance and enterprise development.

National Government and Regulatory Bodies

- Ministry of Agriculture (MoA)
- MoA Livestock Development Sector
- MoA Agricultural Extension Sector
- MoA Plant and Animal Health Sectors
- Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), formerly EFCCC
- Ministry of Water and Energy (MoWE)
- Ethiopian Standards Institute (ESI)
- Ethiopian Conformity Assessment Enterprise (ECAE)
- Ministry of Innovation and Technology (MInT)
- Bio and Emerging Technology Institute (BETIn)
- Ministry of Trade and Regional Integration (MoTRI)
- Ethiopian Investment Commission (EIC)
- Ministry of Revenues (MoR)
- Ethiopian Customs Commission (ECC)
- Ethiopian Statistics Service (ESS), formerly CSA
- Ministry of Finance (MoF)
- Addis Ababa City Administration
- Addis Ababa Cleansing Management Agency (AACMA)
- Yeka Woreda 09 Administration
- Gurage Zone / Butajira Administration

Research and Higher Education Institutions

- Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research (EIAR)
- Ethiopian Forestry Development (EFD)
- Addis Ababa University (AAU)
- Addis Ababa University – College of Veterinary Medicine and Agriculture, Bishoftu
- Haramaya University
- Hawassa University
- Jimma University
- International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), Ethiopia Campus

Potential BSF Stakeholders in Ethiopia

Private Enterprises

- Eden Garden Farms
- Melkam Integrated Farms
- Seven Lakes Green Solution
- Kafa Bio
- Thermo House PLC

Relevant Locations and Facilities

- MoA Headquarters, Gurd Shola / Kazanchis, Addis Ababa
- EIAR Headquarters, CMC, Addis Ababa
- EIAR / EFD Research Centres, Holeta, Debre Zeit and Bishoftu
- EPA Headquarters, Arat Kilo, Addis Ababa
- Addis Ababa University, P.O. Box 1176, Addis Ababa
- ILRI Ethiopia Campus, Gurd Shola, Addis Ababa
- Kaliti Industrial Area, Addis Ababa
- Bole Lemi Industrial Park, Addis Ababa
- Refugee settlement areas in Gambella, Melkadida and Tsore
- Agro-processing corridors in Oromia, Sidama and SNNPR
- ESI Headquarters, Megenagna / CMC, Addis Ababa
- MInT / BETIn Headquarters, Arat Kilo, Addis Ababa
- EIC / MoTRI Headquarters, Bole / Kazanchis, Addis Ababa
- Ministry of Revenues Headquarters, Megenagna, Addis Ababa
- Ethiopian Statistics Service Headquarters, Arat Kilo, Addis Ababa
- Ministry of Finance Headquarters, King George VI Street, Addis Ababa

6. Coordination and monitoring

Scaling a new sector across several ministries and many small actors requires clear ownership. We recommend that national authorities designate a lead agency and a light multi-stakeholder coordination platform, and that the platform reviews progress at least annually against a small set of shared indicators:

- waste tonnage treated and diverted from dumpsites;
- feed and frass volumes produced, and the share meeting national quality standards;
- enterprises supported, jobs created and share of women and youth;
- financing mobilised by source and instrument;
- estimated greenhouse gas emissions avoided.

7. Conclusions and next steps

This guide is intended as a practical framework for moving from BUGS lessons to consolidation and growth of BSF in Ethiopia. It connects technical lessons, stakeholder needs, institutional conditions and funding opportunities, while recognising initiatives that are already under way in the country.

This guide presents options for consideration. Whether and how they are taken forward will depend on the interest, mandates and resources of the institutions concerned. Should stakeholders wish to pursue them, the next steps could include validating the proposed Yeka, waste-picker and BETIn pathways with their Ethiopian proponents, confirming site readiness, counterpart mandates and regulatory requirements (Options A–C), and clearly distinguishing the historical baseline sites assessed in 2024 (Bole Arabsa and Butajira) from the proposed implementation pathways. A coordination mechanism and a small set of shared indicators could support alignment among these efforts, and the outcomes of stakeholder consultations could be used to refine the options.

Funding routes will need to be assessed for each option as plans become more concrete. This guide is intended as a basis for discussion and does not commit any institution to specific actions.

Annex A: Useful links

Document	
Policy Guide	Link
Implementation Guide / Operators Toolkit	Link
PREVENT implementation report, Ethiopia	Link
Stakeholder mapping	Link
BSF TEAP by the CCAC	Link
Related projects on organic waste by the CCAC	1. Waste to Wealth: Using innovative gender-responsive business models to turn organic market waste into organic fertiliser and animal feeds (WAWE) | Climate & Clean Air Coalition 2. FLOWERS - Facilitating Local Organic Waste Exchange for Regenerative Systems | Climate & Clean Air Coalition 3. Uganda – Sector strategy for organic waste management | Climate & Clean Air Coalition