

IPP735

Social Assessment Report for RPLRP in Four Regions of Ethiopia: SNNPR, Afar, Somali and Oromia Regions

P.D.R.S.L.P



ድ.መ.ዘ.አ.ኮ.ማ.ፕ

Ministry of Agriculture

Pastoral Drought Resilience and Sustainable Livelihoods Program

May, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENT

	Pages
Abbreviations and Acronyms	iv
Executive Summary	1
1. Introduction	10
1.1 Background and Context.....	10
1.2 Objectives of Social Assessment.....	11
1.3 Scope of the Social Assessment	12
1.4 Methodology of Social Assessment	12
1.4.1 Study Approach.....	12
1.4.2 Data Collection Methods and Tools.....	13
1.4.2.1 Data Collection Methods.....	13
1.4.2.1.1 Secondary Data Collection Methods.....	13
1.4.2.1.2 Primary Data Collection Methods	14
1.4.2.2 Data Collection Tools	15
1.4.2.3 Selection of Kebeles and Study Participants.....	15
2. Review of Institutional and Legal Frameworks.....	16
2.1 Institutional Arrangement Regarding the Implementation of RPLRP	16
2.2 National Legislation and World Bank Safeguard Policies	20
2.2.1 Constitution of Ethiopia.....	20
2.3 Ethiopian Laws on Pastoralists and Minority Groups	20
2.3.1 Environmental and Social Safeguard Policies of World Bank.....	22
2.3 Ethiopian Legislation and World Bank Policies on Public Consultation Requirements	23
2.4 Ethiopian Legislation and World Bank Policies on Social Impacts of Projects	23
3. Key Findings of the Social Assessment	24
3.1 Biophysical Environment of Studied <i>Woredas</i>	24

3.1.1	<i>Hammar Woreda</i>	24
3.1.2	<i>Surma Woreda</i>	25
3.1.3	<i>Nyagatom Woreda</i>	26
3.1.4	<i>Afambo Woreda</i>	27
3.1.5	<i>Moyale Woreda</i>	28
3.1.6	<i>Teltelle Woreda</i>	29
3.2	Socio-cultural and Economic Context	30
3.2.1	Community Institutions	30
3.2.1.1	LocalCommunity Institutions	30
3.2.1.2	Formal Community Institutions	33
3.2.2	Ethnic Relationship and Bondage Among Pastoralists	34
3.2.3	Conflict and Its Causes in Pastoral and Agro-pastoral Areas	36
3.2.4	Traditional Conflict Resolution Mechanisms	38
3.2.5	Grievance Redress Mechanism During Project Implementation	42
3.2.6	Gender Issues	43
3.2.6.1	Gender Roles	45
3.2.6.2	Gender Relations	46
3.2.7	Livelihood Activities	48
3.2.8	Land Tenure System	50
3.2.8.1	Land Use for Grazing	51
3.2.8.2	Land Use for Farming	51
3.2.9	Natural Resource Use	52
3.2.10	Vulnerability Segments of the Population	53
3.2.10.1	Sources of Vulnerability	53
3.2.10.2	Vulnerable Groups	54
3.2.11	Physical Cultural Heritages	56
3.2.12	Challenges of Pastoral and Agro-pastoral Communities	57
3.3	Government Commune and Development Programs	61

3.4	Civil Societies in Pastoral and Agro-pastoral Areas	63
3.5	Community Consultation on RPLRP	65
3.5.1	Consultation Objectives and Process	65
3.5.2	Reflections and Aspiration of the Communities on RPLRP	67
3.5.3	Stakeholders' Concerns	71
3.5.4	Concluding Remarks on Community Consultation	72
3.6	Capacity Building	73
3.7	Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement	75
3.8	Participation of Pastoral and Agro-pastoral Communities During RPLRP Implementation	76
3.9	The contribution of RPLRP for Underserved Groups	77
3.10	Anticipated Risks and Mitigation Measures	79
3.10.1	Impacts and Social Risk Assessment	80
3.10.2	Mitigation Measures/ Strategies	82
3.11	Potential RPLRP Implementation Risks, and Recommended Mitigation Measures	84
	References	91
	<i>Annex 1: Interview and Discussion Guidelines and Observation Checklists for Social Assessment (SA).....</i>	<i>93</i>
	<i>Annex 2: List of People Met during SA.....</i>	<i>95</i>
	<i>Annex3: Number of Community Consultation meetings participants.....</i>	<i>96</i>
	<i>Annex 4: Sample List of Community Consultation Participants.....</i>	<i>97</i>

Abbreviations and Acronyms

BP	Bank Procedures
CPP	Country Programming Paper
IDDRSI	IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience Sustainable Initiatives
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GOs	Governmental Organizations
HHs	Households
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority for Development
KII	Key Informant Interview
MIS	Marketing Information System
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
NGOs	Nongovernmental Organizations
OP	Operational Policies
PA-SACCOs	Pastoral Savings and Credit Cooperatives
PCDP-3	Third Pastoral Community Development Program
PCUs	Project Coordination Unit
RPLRP	Regional Pastoral Livelihood Resilience Program
RPP	Regional Programming Paper
PWD	People with Disabilities
SA	Social Assessment
SCs	Steering Committees
SNNPR	Southern Peoples, Nations, and Nationalities Region
TC	Technical Committees
WB	World Bank

Executive Summary

The Regional Pastoral Livelihood Resilience Project (RPLRP) aims at enhancing resilience to external shocks in the arid and semi-arid communities in Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda. In Ethiopia, this project has been formulated by the Ethiopian National Project Preparation Team (E-NPPT), whose members are selected from the office of the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA). The project development objective (PDO) is regional, based on an agreement reached between IGAD (specifically, Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda) and the World Bank.

As implied in the PDO of the project, the ultimate beneficiaries of the project are pastoral and agro-pastoral communities. In Ethiopia, the pastoral communities in twenty one *Woredas* of four regional states, namely Oromia, SNNPR, Afar, and Somali are the primary beneficiaries of the project. The aim of RPLRP is “*to enhance livelihood resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in drought-prone areas and improve the capacity of the selected country governments to respond promptly and effectively to an eligible crisis or emergency*”. The project will contribute to the poverty reduction priorities of the countries as well as the millennium development goal of eradicating extreme poverty and hunger through the enhancement of livestock and other alternative sources of income. The RPLRP project has the following five main sectors: (i) Natural Resources Management (NRM), (ii) Market Access and Trade (MAT), (iii) Livelihood support (LS), (iv) Pastoral Risk Management (PRM), (v) Project Management and Institutional Support (PMIS).

As part of the preparation process for the RPLRP and as a mechanism which could bridge the gap between the community consultations of the previous SA of the PCDP-3 and RPLRP, it has been found necessary to conduct this social assessment (SA). Hence, this study was conducted with the following objectives in mind.

- Assessing the socio-economic characteristics of local communities and establishing socio-economic baseline information, including determining the existence of underserved groups, sacred and religious sites and places of cultural importance at national, regional and/or local levels in the project areas
- Assessing potential adverse effects of RPLRP and determining whether the project is likely to promote the World Bank’s social safeguard policies on affected people, physical and cultural resources, and involuntary resettlement;

- Undertaking a gender analysis to identify the opportunities and challenges of women and men in participation in pastoral and agro-pastoral community activities; and
- Conducting community consultation with a broader segment of the population and stakeholders.

The SA was conducted in four pastoral and agro-pastoral regions of Ethiopia; SNNPR, Somali, Afar and Oromia. From SNNP Regional State, which was one of the four states selected for this SA study on possible beneficiaries of RPLRP, three *Woredas* (i.e. *Hammar*, *Nyagatom*, and *Surma*) were selected. In the rest of the regions, three *Woredas* (one in each region) were included, i.e., *Afambo Woreda* in Afar, *Moyale* in Somali and *Teltelle* in *Borena* zone of Oromia. The main sources of information for the study were both secondary and primary. The study employed both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Secondary sources were reviewed and primary data were collected using Key Informant Interview (KII), Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and observation.

Key Findings of the Social Assessment: Pastoral and agro-pastoral people have some access to basic social services like water, school, human and animal health. However, these services are inadequate in remote villages in particular, where water shortage, frequent drought, shortage of fodder, lack of market, livestock disease, conflict, and gender inequity are highly prevalent. The livelihood of the pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in both *Woredas* under consideration is based mainly on such activities as livestock rearing and in some areas is supplemented by small scale farming. These activities are the dominant means of earning livelihood among the local households in pastoral and agro-pastoral communities.

There is greater gender disparity among pastoralists in the study area. Women are subordinate members of the society and they have low power and participation in decision making. They have dual roles in the house, i.e., productive and reproductive. It is the duty of women to feed household members. Men have high power and they are family heads. Men take part in all issues that affect the public and the decisions they make are considered right by their wives/ females.

The pastoralists and agro-pastoralists are vulnerable to different shocks. In all of the study areas, there is low infrastructure development, conflict with surrounding ethnic groups, absence of diversified livelihood activities, use of traditional equipment and tools for farming, low work

culture, blood feud, harmful traditional practices (such as female genital mutilation in Afar and Somali, lip and ear mutilation in *Surma*), gender inequality in decision making and access to resources, perception of girls as assets, and a high rate of population growth due to the absence of family planning.

The social relationships of neighboring pastoral and agro-pastoral communities under study have a double facet, i.e., both cooperative and conflictual. There are inter-marriages, a common market place, and good relations. However, conflict is also prevalent between ethnic groups. For instance, there were clashes between *Hammar* and *Dassench*, *Surma* and *Dizi*, *Kara* and *Gnagatom*, *Borena* and Somali (*Garbi* clan), *Borena* and *Burji*. The main causes of conflict are lack of pasture and water resources. In some areas, however, conflicts were instigated by politically interested groups particularly in *Borena* and *Moyale* areas. According to government officials and community key informants the political interest of some groups to secure power and expand territory (particularly in *Moyale* woreda inhabited by both the *Borena* and Somali ethnic groups) is the reason for the eruption of conflict between ethnic groups with a history of peaceful coexistence.

The pastoral and agro-pastoral people have customary systems in place to manage their natural resources and solve conflicts. In SNNPR, “*Denb*” is a customary system which the pastoral and agro-pastoral communities employ to solve conflict. In Afar, there is a conflict resolution system called “*Mebloo*”. Similarly, in Somali ethnic groups the traditional conflict resolution system is referred to as “*Odiyash Deganka*”; while among *Borena* pastoralists, the mechanism is named as *Jarsuma/ Raba Gada*.

In this study, it is confirmed that there are no physical cultural heritages that could be affected by RPLRP. However, the RPLRP should be cautious about impacts on burial places, areas where ‘*Denb*’ is performed, as well as sorcery places (though not erected as statue). These areas are highly valued and respected by local pastoral and agro-pastoral people. These cultural sites can be protected through the involvement of the served communities during identification of project implementation sites and active participation of KDC.

Government commune centers were among the centers visited during the social assessment. Among pastoralists and agro-pastoralists in SNNPR, Commune Program has been under way in

some kebeles of *Nyagatom*, *Surma* and *Hammar Woredas* since 2010/11 and the implementation has gained ground since 2012/13. The intention of the Commune Program program is to enable the pastoral people to access basic services like education, health, water, and so on. Besides, the program aims to help pastoral people to practice some form of agriculture to supplement their livelihood. It is too early to assess the impact of the Commune Program process on the local community because the program is in its infancy. Commune Program in the *Woredas* is still an ongoing program and a number of potentially project affected people are part of it. As the SA results revealed government commune programs are not likely to have negative consequences on RPLRP.

Presently, in the study area there is no loss of cultivable land, grazing land, and water resources as a result of Commune Program program. However, some respondents, including government officials, expressed their worry about the likely future impact of Commune Program program. Their concern is that due to the absence of family planning and high fertility rate in the area, there might be population boom in the commune centers in the near future. Thus, this would result shortage of grazing land, water sources for irrigation and livestock. Shortage of grazing land and water sources might be aggravated by the keeping of livestock nearby commune centers. Thus, this might, in turn, result in conflict among residents and neighbors in government commune centers.

Consultation with a broader segment of the people in the *Woredas* was made with the objective of providing adequate information to the affected communities and stakeholders in RPLRP. The consultation also aimed to reduce the potential for conflict; minimize the risk the project may pose to communities; and promote resettlement related issues as development opportunities. More specifically, the public consultation was aimed at achieving the following objectives.

1. Inform stakeholders of the project and provide them with adequate information on the project, its components and activities for the affected communities.
2. Create a sense of ownership of RPLRP activities and allow the local pastoral communities to give their free, pre-informed consent to the RPLRP.
3. Discuss with the pastoral and agro-pastoral (PAP) communities various options of resettlement and compensation related to RPLRP

4. Obtain vital information about the needs and priorities of affected persons and determine whether the designed project features could address their needs and are in harmony with their circumstances.
5. Get cooperation and support from affected settlements for the project.
6. Find effective grievance and complaint handling mechanisms on the project.
7. If forced relocation is likely to happen, find ways the project can mitigate or avoid any forced relocation and meet the objectives of OP4.10.

Thus, during the consultation, community members were made aware of the RPLRP project objectives and its components. The communities promised and showed their interest to fully cooperate, support, and participate in all the stages of the project (i.e. during its implementation and evaluation). There was no rejection of the five components of RPLRP. In all kebeles, the communities were welcoming and showed significant interest in the project activities; like, range land management, water dam construction and rehabilitation, market center and checkpoint construction and trade, livelihood diversification, animal health care, fodder production, improved breeding, pastoral risk management, project management, and institutional support, etc.

During community consultations, participants reflected on each of the components and expressed their main challenges. The natural resources such as forests and land were under threat due to deforestation, soil erosion, wildfire, and other factors. Solving these problems and ensuring secure access to natural resources through implementing conservation measures was appreciated by all participants. In addition, participants mentioned problems including shortage of potable water, lack of grazing land, and shortage of grasses for fodder, and irrigation to be able to practice farming. Regarding NRM, in Afar and some parts of *Nyagatom Woreda* in SNNPR, community participants revealed high encroachment of *Prosopis* as their primary encountered problem. Bush encroachment was also expressed as a major challenge in *Teltelle Woreda*.

Regarding the concerns and main issues raised during consultations, participants were informed that most of their concerns such as shortage of water, lack of grazing land, shortage of fodder, deforestation, etc, would be addressed by RPLRP. Besides, regarding some of the challenges they currently face such as the rapid expansion of *Prosopis*, and bushes in Afar, Borena, and some Kebeles of SNNPR, participants were informed that through consultation during RPLRP

implementation, they would find ways to deal with the problems. Implementing bodies need to filter out and target these main challenges of the pastoral and agro-pastoral people.

Concerning market and trade, community members indicated the existence of smuggling of livestock and other materials. For instance, there was illegal cross border trade with South Sudan and Kenya in the Kebish area of *Nyagatom* and *Surma Wordas*. In *Teltelle Woreda* of *Borena* zone, due to the absence of market centers, ‘bush market’ was highly expanded. Participants also revealed minimal trans-boundary transaction or the total absence of such business traffic.

During the public meeting, participants were informed that one of the sub-components of RPLRP would ease the problem of illegal trade by helping establish check points to control it, building market centers, raising community awareness on the benefit of trans-boundary trade, etc. Besides, they were informed that to solve all these challenges their active participation (community’s involvement) was mandatory and necessary for the success of the project.

Consultation participants in all *Woredas* under assessment indicated that veterinary health problems and shortage of veterinary drugs were widespread. *Trypanosomosis*, *Pasturellosis* and *CBBP* were the main animal diseases in pastoral areas requiring immediate solution according to discussants. During consultations, participants mentioned that what they were told could be simple government propaganda. During the discussions, community member were emphatically informed that this project would be implemented by MoA with financial support from the World Bank and, that it would be very unlikely for it not to be executed. The implementation of the project depends on the SA report and recommendations that would be forwarded by the study. Concerning animal diseases, participants were told that this would be addressed by RPLRP because it is on the list of elements the project set out to tackle.

Concerning Pastoral Disaster Risk Management, the main disaster identified in pastoral and agro-pastoral communities were recurrent drought the people face in the recent past. Participants strongly demanded the urgent implementation of PRM. Participants expressed that prior and timely awareness and access to information regarding the challenges they will encounter could make them alert and avert the risk ahead of time together with the government and take appropriate mitigation measures that are appropriate.

The demand for pastoral and agro-pastoral communities' active involvement in project implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of activities was welcomed by the participants. However, they cautioned that during committee formation care must be taken to ensure the selection of capable committee members for KDC in full freedom and through transparent mechanisms in a public meeting and through consultation with the concerned *Kebele* residents without the undue influence of politicians.

Summary of recommended mitigation measures for potential risks related with the implementation of RPLRP

Component 1. *Natural Resources Management*

- ✓ RPLRP will start with community consultation to map the human and livestock mobility, and thus, develop well planned spatial development of water infrastructures and rangeland management interventions
- ✓ Providing culturally appropriate capacity building and technical assistance for extension workers and pastoral communities. Also, responsible government offices at all levels will be equipped with the necessary materials and equipment to enhance their capacity to effectively implement the work.
- ✓ RPLRP will emphasize participatory rangeland management approach as a strategy to improve the utilization and management of rangelands. Besides, RPLRP will engage in awareness raising for pastoral and agro-pastoral communities.
- ✓ RPLRP will facilitate cross-border meetings to be attended by border officials (from Ethiopia and other countries) and land management experts. Besides, RPLRP will facilitate discussions between ethnic group representatives (such as clan leader/ *ugas*, *balabats*, kebele chairman, elders, etc) and promote peaceful and harmonious inter-ethnic and trans-boundary relations through supporting forum and workshops that promote positive ethnic relationship. Further, the project will support and strengthen forum at region and zone levels that will allow cross-*Woreda* communication and exchange of ideas among pastoral communities and support appropriate grievance handling mechanisms.

Component 2. *Market Access and Trade*

- ✓ RPLRP will foster cross-border consultations in collaboration with IGAD and promote effective community participation during the construction of primary and secondary markets and the making of benefit sharing arrangements. Also, the project will facilitate

using the *balabats*, *ugas*, sultanate/ clan leaders, and government bodies to discourage and stop blood feuds through traditional as well as formal justice systems.

- ✓ RPLRP should emphasize awareness raising on the value of cash saving to enable the community to market their animals and animal products.
- ✓ Areas where many pastoral and agro-pastoral communities presently reside should be selected for market establishment.
- ✓ RPLRP will conduct continuous awareness raising and there must be introduction of market centers to the residents and neighboring areas including the market day

Component 3. Livelihoods Support

- ✓ The project will provide awareness raising for the local community to enhance their knowledge on the value and importance of modern animal breeding and improve animal feed management and preparation
- ✓ RPLRP consultation process will start through a participatory approach for resource use mapping to show key infrastructures and boundaries and social mapping to identify vulnerable segments of the communities and find ways to benefit these groups of the community. Furthermore, during the consultative process, guiding principles to benefit vulnerable segments of the communities should be put in place so that priority will be given to the identified groups. RPLRP will arrange sensitization and training programs for the community on gender equality, the rights of women and children.
- ✓ In predominantly Muslim areas, in consultation with the community, an appropriate financial circulation system should be introduced. That is, instead of interest rates, using other systems like a service charge, etc, would be a better strategy because due to faith issues the Muslim communities do not want the payment of interest..
- ✓ The RPLRP will support the establishment of grass roots level financial institutions, that is, Pastoral Savings and Credit Cooperatives (PA-SACCOs) to encourage savings and help create access to credit services. Besides, to help cooperatives in financing their activities, through a revolving fund arrangement.
- ✓ Culturally appropriate sensitization and training should be provided to the community on fodder production and its benefits by nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), which should also collaborate in 'fund matching' to expand water development and strengthen existing water sources for both livestock and humans.
- ✓ RPLRP design should include mechanisms to restock veterinary medicines/ vet centers that currently exist but are not functioning to improve livestock health and enhance productivity.

Component 4. *Pastoral Disaster Risk Management*

- ✓ RPLRP will provide technical support and culturally appropriate capacity building to enhance implementation capacity at all levels. Also provide training of trainers (TOT) on disaster risk management related key guidelines and standards such as the Livestock Emergency Guidelines Standards (LEGS).

Component 5. *Project Management and Institutional Support*

- ✓ Introducing and making operational effective and efficient financial management, audit and procurement systems; and design and provide appropriate capacity building for staff at all levels in project planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.
- ✓ At federal and regional levels, RPLRP will also put in place continuous monitoring and follow up, and appropriate reporting systems.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and Context

Ethiopia, which is one of the developing countries of the world, is growing fast though poverty is still a major challenge of the country (MoA, 2013). The number of poor people in the rural areas, especially in pastoral and agro-pastoral settings is much higher than the rest of the country as a result of many factors such as exposure to numerous adversary factors like rangeland degradation, and high population growth which may result in land and environmental degradation, low level of investment, inadequate infrastructure and poor access to basic services, highly vulnerability to shocks (both manmade and natural), etc. As a result, the pastoral and agro-pastoral communities are subjected to different catastrophes that affect their life and livelihood activities. Besides, the pastoralists are facing other trans-boundary and regional challenges which further worsen their lives.

To curb the regional and trans-boundary challenges that pastoralist and agro-pastoralist communities are facing, Ethiopia has designed a Country Program Paper (CPP), a strategy paper aimed at tackling the problems of pastoral communities residing in arid and semi-arid areas of the country such as Southern Nations and Nationalists and Peoples Region (SNNP) and others. The overarching objective of CPP is *“to improve food and nutrition security and enhance resilience to external shocks with particular focus on the arid and semiarid locality communities in Ethiopia”*.

In line with the Ethiopia CPP, RPLRP was designed to enhance resilience to external shocks with a particular focus on the arid and semi arid communities in Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda. In Ethiopia, a component of this project has been prepared by the Ethiopia National Project Preparation Team (E-NPPT), drawn from the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA). The project development objective (PDO) is built on an agreement reached between IGAD countries (i.e., Ethiopia, Kenya, and Uganda) and the World Bank.

As implied in the PDO, the ultimate beneficiaries of the project are pastoral and agro-pastoral communities. In Ethiopia, the pastoral communities in twenty one *Woredas* of four regional states, namely Oromia, SNNPR, Afar, and Somali will be the primary beneficiaries of the project. The aim of RPLRP is *“to enhance livelihood resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral*

communities in drought-prone areas and improve the capacity of the selected country governments to respond promptly and effectively to an eligible crisis or emergency". It will contribute to the poverty reduction priorities of the country as well as the millennium development goal of eradicating extreme poverty and hunger through the enhancement of livestock and other alternatives sources of income.

RPLRP will be funded by the World Bank. MoA will be the executing agent in collaboration with the respective regional, zonal and *Woreda* level government bureaus and offices. A key priority in project design and implementation of the RPLRP is to establish firm linkages with other programs and projects implemented by government. Thus, the proposed RPLRP project has the following five main components: (i) Natural Resources Management (NRM), (ii) Market Access and Trade (MAT), (iii) Livelihood support (LS), (iv) Pastoral Risk Management (PRM), (v) Project Management and Institutional Support (PMIS).

Therefore, as part of the preparation process for RPLRP, this Social Assessment (SA) was carried out in SNNPR, Afar, Somali and Oromia regional states of Ethiopia so as to enhance the successful implementation of RPLRP; identify its possible project impacts; and make recommendations to be taken to address the World Bank social safeguard policies that need to be promoted by the project. The SA was conducted in six potential project *Woredas* selected in the four pastoral and agro-pastoral regional states of Ethiopia as listed earlier. In SNNPR, four *Woredas* in South Omo and *Bench Maji* zones were included, whereas in the rest of the three regions, only three *Woredas* (one in each region was included) were targeted in the SA.

1.2 Objectives of Social Assessment

The overall objective of this SA is to bridge the gap in community consultations of a previous SA conducted for PCDP-3 and RPLRP, and identify the key social issues of concern and significant to the implementation of RPLRP. More specifically, this SA was aimed at the following objectives:

- Assessing the socio-economic characteristics of local communities to establish socio-economic baseline information, including determining the existence of underserved groups, sacred and religious sites and places of cultural importance at national, regional and/or local levels in the project areas.

- Assessing potential adverse impacts of RPLRP and determining whether the project is likely to trigger World Bank social safeguard policies on affected peoples, physical cultural resources, and involuntary resettlement;
- Undertaking a gender analysis to identify the opportunities and challenges of women and men to participate in pastoral and agro-pastoral community activities; and
- Conducting community consultation with the broader segment of the population and stakeholders.

1.3 Scope of the Social Assessment

Geographically, the SA covered six *Woredas*, selected in four regional states. In SNNPR; *Hammar*, *Surma*, and *Nyagatom* were covered. *Afambo Woreda* in Afar, *Moyale Woreda* in Somali and *Teltelle Woreda* in *Borena* zone of Oromia were part of the SA. Within the six *Woredas*, twelve kebeles (two kebeles per *Woreda*) were chosen for the purpose of the SA. These were *Beshada* and *Kara* in *Hammar Woreda*; *Choye* and *Kidole* kebeles in *Surma Woreda*; *Nakriman* and *Naregoye* kebeles in *Nyagatom Woreda*; *Mego* and *Homedoyta* kebeles in *Afambo Woreda*; *Meleb* and *Nakrman* kebeles in *Moyale*; and *Bulie korma* and *Saba* kebeles in Oromia. These groups were selected because they are underserved and have similar characteristics required in OP4.10 and face risks and impacts as those not assessed.

This study also included an extensive review of literature on Ethiopian policy, legal and institutional framework of relevance to the RPLRP, and the legal framework applicable to vulnerable nations, nationalities and peoples, and other vulnerable groups in Ethiopia. In addition, documents related to gender inequality; and other SAs conducted in pastoral and agro-pastoral areas were consulted. Besides a RPLRP project document was consulted and development of a research methodology for field research as well as data collection, processing, analyzing, reporting, and documentation, and consultations with broader segment of the community in the six *Woredas* were part of the SA.

1.4 Methodology of Social Assessment

1.4.1 Study Approach

For this SA, two categories of information (i.e., qualitative and quantitative) were collected. As a result the study employed a mixed approach of research. The qualitative approach enabled to

collect subjective and personal information from community members, concerned government officials, and other stakeholders. The quantitative approach was employed to collect background socio-economic data and to document the livelihood activities of the people under study. Thus, these two approaches enabled the researcher to collect both qualitative and quantitative information that supplement one another and ensure the validity and reliability of the information obtained.

1.4.2 Data Collection Methods and Tools

1.4.2.1 Data Collection Methods

In order to obtain qualitative and quantitative data to be used in the SA, both secondary and primary techniques were employed. Through the primary data collection method, qualitative information was gathered. On the other hand, quantitative data was collected through secondary methods of data collection. These two methods were helpful in handling complex issues in the SA. The triangulation helped to address the important issues of validity and reliability.

1.4.2.1.1 Secondary Data Collection Methods

The works of different researchers and well known organizations were consulted to gather secondary data. A documentary research method was employed to gather secondary data. This method helped the researcher to collect both qualitative and quantitative information which could not be obtained through the primary data collection techniques.

Relevant project documents were thoroughly reviewed and analyzed during the preparation of the field data collection tools and final report write up. Books and any other relevant documents, proclamations, and policy documents were consulted and exhaustively used in this SA. Secondary data were also collected from government offices through a desk review. The raw data sets were gathered from the regional, zonal and *Woreda* offices and reanalyzed to meet the purpose of the SA. The raw data obtained from these sources provided basic information on the socio-economic characteristics of the community and livelihood activities of the pastoral and agro-pastoral communities. Thus, detailed analysis was made to examine the lives and living conditions of the people studied. Above all, this study relied on the methodology outlined and benefited from other social assessments conducted for other projects such as PCDP3, SLMP2, WasH2 and GEQIP2.

1.4.2.1.2 Primary Data Collection Methods

The primary data collection methods, which were used in this study, are Focus Group Discussion (FGD), Key Informant Interview (KII), and Observation.

1.4.2.1.2.1 Focus Group Discussion (FGD)

FGD was used because it is a valuable and time efficient method for gathering qualitative data from multiple respondents at a time. It assisted the consultant to gather more reliable data and offered him more than the sum of individual narratives since the participants question each other while explaining issues under discussion. FGDs with different representatives of the population representing community were made at a local level. The primary objective of the FGDs was to explore the status of land/natural resources use; land tenure systems; social networks and community relationships; occupation, stratification structure of women and men, and youth (including gender inequality), and to assess social cohesion or any lack thereof among pastoralists and determine project impacts on the life of the people under study. Moreover, FGDs focus on identifying the existing micro-credit programs and their experience with project activity; finding out government, donor and NGO support for community development; discovering likely social and economic risks and impacts of different project activities on the community in general, and on vulnerable and underserved groups in particular; and exploring factors constraining the active participation women.

Participants in FGD were adults, HH heads, and youth members of the community. Since it is not customary among pastoral and agro-pastoral community women and men to seat and talk with each other, separate men and women only FGDs were arranged. This process also assisted the researcher to establish the level of community support for the project.

1.4.2.1.2.2 Key Informant Interview (KII)

Key informant interviews (KII) were made with different community members and government officials at regional, zonal, *Woreda*, and Kebele levels. KII allowed the consultant to elicit exhaustive data from respondents on such aspects as interviewees' own behavior and attitude, as well as norms, beliefs, and values of their community. Moreover, KII is an effective method in gathering information related to the culture of the community, land tenure systems, physical cultural heritages, vulnerable groups, inter- ethnic relationship, the likely impact of RPLRP, and other information that will be raised in the FGD to validate the result. Interviews were conducted by the consultant using a guiding semi-structured questionnaire.

At the community level, KII was conducted with selected community elders, religious leaders, clan leaders, women, leaders of community based organizations, and stakeholders. The intention was to find out the challenges of the community and to list the expected negative impacts and contributions of RPLRP. In addition, KII was held with selected government officials at all levels, such as Pastoral Community Development Bureau Heads in all regions, and zone and *Woreda* level concerned office heads. This approach is particularly very helpful in establishing the level of support for the project in these traditional societies that are dominated by patriarchic tendencies that empower men and disempower women relative to each other.

1.4.2.1.2.3 Field Observation

Field observation is the third method which was used in this study. The consultant made field visits to the project areas to see the real living condition of the people and observe the physical cultural heritages on the ground. At the sites, discussion was conducted with the service users so as to have first hand information. Note taking and photographing (as permitted by the PAPs) were important tools used to record observation during field visits. Field observations have had a significant value in the analysis and first draft, as well as in the final SA report writing.

1.4.2.2 Data Collection Tools

The consultant prepared and used general guiding questions to collect relevant information during the fieldwork to conduct FGD and KII. This eased the discussion process and allowed the consultant to be focused on the relevant social issues as outlined in the SA ToR. Besides, with the permission of the PAPs, a tape recorder and a photo camera were used to record and capture qualitative information intact, which were later transcribed and integrated during the analysis and finalization of the SA report.

1.4.2.3 Selection of Kebeles and Study Participants

Respondents for the FGD and KII were selected purposively to obtain the required data. Community members who have ample information about the area and their communities were intentionally included. In addition, vulnerable segments of the population such as women, youths, and elderly were selected and included in the SA.

The specific Kebeles from the *Woredas* were selected in consultation with zonal and respective *Woreda* level government officials. This enabled the consultant to be flexible while selecting *Kebeles* and to be certain about the inclusion of sites that truly reflect pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in all four regions. In addition, flexibility helped the consultant to ensure the inclusion of Kebeles which are highly vulnerable to external shocks and which are targeted to be beneficiaries of RPLRP; and those pastoral and agro-pastoral communities that could represent other pastoral groups in the region and *Woredas*. Therefore, ethnic groups visited are closely related and share similar characteristics with other underserved pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in Ethiopia. The overall goal is to select pastoralist and agro-pastoral groups in the region that might be facing comparable risks and experiencing similar impacts as those which are not included in this SA. Thus, to meet his objective, selection of each of the kebeles under study was done in collaboration with responsible government officials at woreda level based on a clear understanding of the objective of the SA.

2. Review of Institutional and Legal Frameworks

2.1 Institutional Arrangement Regarding the Implementation of RPLRP

The implementation of RPLRP will be based on the existing government structure. All concerned government bureaus and offices at all levels and all beneficiary community members will be owners of the project and active participants in executing the project.

At Federal level: the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) will be the Executing Agency of the project with the overall responsibility of coordination and supervision of RPLRP. Besides, other federal organizations such as Ministry of Water and Energy, Ministry of Trade, Ministry of Federal Affairs, Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoFED), Ministry of Foreign Affairs and others will take part in the project implementation.

More specifically, supervision of the project will be done by the Federal Steering Committee (FSC), chaired by the State Minister of Livestock Development of the MoA. The FSC will provide strategic direction and policy guidance; and ensure inter-ministerial coordination, harmonization and alignment among donors.

At Regional level: the Bureau of Pastoral and Agricultural Development (BoPAD) in Afar region, the Bureau of Livestock, Crop and Rural Development (BoLCRD) in Somali region, the

Bureau of Agriculture (BoA) in Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Region and the Bureau of Agriculture (BoA) in Oromia region will oversee the project implementation at the regional level.. Regional Steering Committees (RSCs) will be established at the regional level to ensure institutional coordination and provide overall policy guidance to the project. RSCs will be responsible for: (i) providing overall supervision for project implementation; (ii) approving the overall annual work program and budget; and (iii) reviewing the annual implementation performance report prepared by the Regional Project Coordination Unit (RPCU) in relation to key performance indicators. A Regional Steering Committees will conduct a quarterly meeting to discuss the above activities and resolve *Woreda* level implementation issues as they arise.

Zonal and Woreda level: the Zonal Pastoral Affairs Department offices will supervise the implementation of the project at a lower level. Thus, a Zonal Steering Committee will be established with the responsibility of: (i) providing overall supervision for the project implementation in project *Woredas*; (ii) approving the overall annual work program and budget; and (iii) reviewing the annual implementation performance report prepared by the Zonal Mobile Supporting Team (ZMST) in relation to key performance indicators.

At Woreda level: *Woreda Steering Committee (WSC)* will be set up. The committee will include members from various offices such as Offices of Agriculture or Pastoral Development, Cooperative Promotion, Finance and Economic Development, and Trade. Some activities will be planned at the kebele level. Oversight and guidance will be provided through the Kebele Development Committees (KDCs). The *Woreda* Administrator will chair the WSC while the head of the Agricultural/ pastoral development office will be the secretary. The WSCs shall be responsible for: (i) providing overall supervision in project implementation; (ii) approving the overall annual work program and budget; and (iii) reviewing the annual implementation performance report prepared by the *Woreda* Project Coordination Unit (WPCU) in relation to key performance indicators).

Woreda Offices of Agriculture (WoA) have primary responsibilities for the execution of the Program. Development Agents (DAs) in the *Woredas* will directly support the implementation of the activities. In the veterinary service section, *Woreda* Pastoral Development Office will be involved in vaccination campaigns. The *Woreda* Pastoral Office will also collaborate with Development Partners (DPs) to implement some RPLRP activities.

At the community level: participatory planning to identify the appropriate investments and support to be provided will be carried out by the Kebele Development Committee (KDC) with support from the *Woreda* Office of Agriculture. Pastoral-oriented associations, the livestock exporter associations, drug suppliers and other pastoralist-related societies and the private sector will also contribute to the livestock market facilitation that links to export value chain addition, export market access and supply of veterinary services and drugs. Micro-finance institutions, such as Pastoral Savings and Credit Associations (PA-SACCOs) will be responsible for fees to administer the revolving funds to be provided by the project.

Technical Committees to Support Implementing Agencies: At all levels of the institutional and implementations arrangements, Technical Committees (TC) will be established to provide technical support to the SCs, PCUs and implementing agencies. The TCs will support in technical backstopping for and supervision of lower levels; coordinate the project implementation within their respective institutions (including institutional capacity building as appropriate), provide advice to steering committees on project activities and produce reports on implementation progress.

Project Coordination: At the federal level, a National Project Coordination Unit (NPCU) which is directly accountable to the State Minister of the Livestock Development Sector has been established in the MoA. The NPCU is responsible for all pastoral resilience-related projects and is in charge of such duties and responsibilities as: coordination, annual planning, follow-up and reporting on project activities, fiduciary management, creating a liaison with stakeholders at the federal level, project communication, overall knowledge management, learning, monitoring and evaluation and reporting, strategic staff capacity-building and mobilization.

Under four regional bureaus (i.e. the Bureau of Pastoral and Agricultural Development (BoPAD) of Afar, the Bureau of Livestock, Crop and Rural Development (BoLCRD) of Somali region, the Bureau of Pastoral Affairs (BoPA) of Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples region and Pastoral Commission (PC) of Oromia region), regional PCUs will be established to undertake day-to-day activities. Each RPCU will consist of the following personnel: (a) regional project coordinator; (b) monitoring and evaluation officer, (c) infrastructure engineer (d) rangeland management specialist (e) veterinary expert (f) disaster risk management expert (g) finance

officer; (h) procurement officer and support staff, (i) mobile accountant and (j) safeguard specialist/ focal person (only in SNNPR and Oromia).

At the zonal level, a Mobile Support Team (MST) will be established under the Department of Pastoral Affairs (DoPA) in Oromia and SNNPR regions and under the Department of Agriculture (DoA) in Afar and Somali regions. However, each MST will be established if the *Woredas* included in the project are more than one.. The Zonal MST will be established to assist in the day-to-day activities of the *Woreda* PCU. The staff members in the Zonal MST will include: (a) zonal MST head; (b) infrastructure engineer, (c) procurement officer, (d) administrative assistant; and other supporting staff. Detailed TOR of these staff shall be provided in the Project Implementation Manual (PIM).

The project will also have a project coordinator, an accountant/ finance officer and an administrative secretary in each *Woreda* to facilitate the day-to-day operations of the project in the *Woreda*. The project coordinator will be accountable to the head of the *Woreda* Pastoral/ Agricultural Office.

The institutional arrangement was introduced and the underserved groups were made to reflect on the structure. Discussion was made at all *Woredas* with the local communities. But, due to the low literacy level of the pastoral and agro-pastoral communities, there was very limited important feedback as the consultant had expected. They simply accepted and agreed with the structure as given. However, they emphasized one thing, that is, at the local level (at kebele level) they recommended there should be offices to meet and perform all the duties of RPLRP.

At the regional, zonal and woreda levels discussion was made with government key informants concerning the general structure of RPLRP. In all regions, key informants supported RPLRP arrangements with in government system like the PCDP. Key informants mentioned that filling all positions with capable and well educated professionals should be given due attention. But, regarding the weakness of the institutional arrangement there was no suggestion made and they accepted the proposed structure as good. However, key informants expounded that since the implementation of the project requires cross-ministerial, cross-regional bureaus, inter and intra *Woreda* coordination, collaboration, learning and team work in a highly systematic way, based on their experience of PCDP, delay in the implementation of RPLRP activities will occur that

will result in the completion of the project behind schedule. Capacity building and training recommended by participants are rangeland management and development, project management, monitoring and evaluation, modern ways of animal insemination, ranch development and expansion, conflict resolution, disaster risk management, knowledge management, interpersonal skills, reporting, and others.

2.2 National Legislation and World Bank Safeguard Policies

2.2.1 Constitution of Ethiopia

The Constitution of Ethiopia is the supreme law of the country and all the other policies, regulations and institutional frameworks have to comply with it. In addition, the Constitution is the foundation for human rights, natural resources and environmental management of the country. Article 44; sub-article 2 of the Constitution states that *“all persons who have been displaced or whose livelihood has been adversely affected because of state programs have the right to commensurate monetary or alternative means of compensation, including relocation with adequate state assistance”*.

Regarding environmental protection and natural resource management, the Constitution under Article 92 (2) states that, *“Government and all Ethiopian citizens shall have the duty to protect the country’s environment and natural resources”*. According to the Constitution, a development project must protect the environment. The constitution declares that *“the design and implementation of programs and projects of development shall not damage or destroy the environment”* (Article 92 (2)).

2.3 Ethiopian Laws on Pastoralists and Minority Groups

The Ethiopian constitution recognizes the existence of pastoral groups inhabiting mainly the western lowland of the country. Under article 40 (4), the constitution stipulates the rights of pastoralists. It states that *“Ethiopian pastoralists have the right to free land for grazing and cultivation as well as the right not to be displaced from their own land”*. As discussed above, this article concedes with the World Bank social safeguards policy (OP4.10) that guides provision of development activities to underserved groups with unique physical and sociocultural characteristics. The constitution also recognizes the rights of pastoralists to fair prices for their products. It states that: *“Ethiopian pastoralists have the right to receive fair prices for their products, that would lead to improvement in their living conditions and to enable them to obtain*

an equitable share of the national wealth commensurate with their contribution”. Therefore, the formulation of national economic, social, and any development endeavors is guided by this stipulation of the constitution.

There are minority groups recognized by the Ethiopian constitution as “national minorities”. Article 50 (3) stipulates that “members of the House, on the basis of population and special representation of minority Nationalities and Peoples, shall not exceed 550; of these, minority Nationalities and Peoples shall have at least 20 seats”. The law states that minorities are those groups with fewer than 100,000 members, most of whom live in developing regional states such as Benishanguel-Gumuz, Afar, Somali, and Gambella.

Taking the law as a reference, ethnic groups with a population of smaller than 100,000 members are categorized under minority groups of Ethiopia. Owing to the limited access to basic social services by minority groups, the constitution stipulates a state obligation to support them. It articulates that “Government has the duty to ensure that all Ethiopians get equal opportunity to improve their economic condition and to promote equitable distribution of wealth among them” (Article 89 (2)). Further on this issue, Article 89 of the constitution indicates the responsibility of government to prevent disaster and make available aid, as and when the need arises. Article 89 (3 and 4) states “Government shall take measures to avert any natural and manmade disasters, and, in the event of disasters, to provide timely assistance to the victims”; and “Government shall provide special assistance to Nations, Nationalities, and Peoples least privileged in economic and social development”. To ensure that all nations benefit fairly and equitably from national development activities, MoFA was established with a directorate (Equitable Development Directorate) to monitor the benefit of the ethnic groups.

Thus, the implementation of RPLRP will help the disadvantaged and minority members of the nation and enables them to meet the intents of OP 4.10, OP4.11 and OP 4.12, which are also compatible with the objectives of the constitution of Ethiopia. RPLRP will be implemented in socially and culturally appropriate ways in the pastoral and agro-pastoral areas in a manner that duly recognizes the peculiar characteristics of the underserved nations.

2.3.1 Environmental and Social Safeguard Policies of World Bank

The World Bank Operational Policies (OP) and Bank Procedures (BP) were developed to address environmental and social safeguard issues in World Bank's supported Projects. Among the Ops/ BPs, the following are relevant for the SA and are summarized as follows:

1. OP/BP 4.01 Environmental Assessment

The objective of the policy is to ensure that Bank-financed projects are environmentally sound and sustainable, and that decision making is improved through appropriate analysis of actions and of their likely environmental impacts. This policy will be affected if the project is likely to have potentially adverse environmental risks and impacts on its area of influence. OP 4.01 covers impacts on the natural environment (air, water and land); social, human health and safety; physical cultural resources; and trans-boundary and global environmental concerns.

2. OP/BP 4.10: Indigenous Peoples

The objective of this policy is to ensure that (i) the development processes foster full respect for the dignity, human rights, and cultural uniqueness of indigenous peoples; (ii) adverse effects during the development process are avoided, or if not feasible, minimized, mitigated or compensated; and (iii) indigenous peoples receive culturally appropriate and gender and intergenerational inclusive social and economic benefits.

3. OP/BP 4.11: Physical Cultural Resources

The objective of this policy was to assist countries to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts of development projects on physical cultural resources. For purposes of this policy, "physical cultural resources" are defined as movable or immovable objects, sites, structures, groups of structures, natural features and landscapes that have archaeological, paleontological, historical, architectural, religious, aesthetic, or other cultural significances. Physical cultural resources may be located in urban or rural settings, and may be above ground, underground, or underwater. The cultural interest could be at the local, provincial or national level, or within the international community.

4. OP/BP 4.12: Involuntary Resettlement

The objective of this policy is to (i) prevent or minimize involuntary resettlement where feasible, by exploring all viable alternative project designs; (ii) assist displaced persons by improving

their living standards, enhancing income earning capacity, and production levels, or at least in restoring them; (iii) encourage community participation in planning and implementing resettlement; and (iv) provide assistance to affected people regardless of the legality of land tenure.

2.3 Ethiopian Legislation and World Bank Policies on Public Consultation Requirements

Ethiopia has now a comprehensive framework for assessing and managing environmental impacts of development projects. The constitution states that “*The People have the right to full consultation and expression of views in the planning and implementation of environment policies and projects that affect them directly*” (Article 92 (2)). However, it does not provide clear requirements or guidance on public consultation and disclosure of social and environmental impacts that could have negative localized impacts.

Except for projects that have minimal or no adverse environmental impact, OP 4.01 requires that for all projects, the borrowing organization or agency must consult project affected groups and local nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) about the project's likely environmental and social impacts and takes their views into account. While public consultation and disclosure are indeed addressed by various articles of Ethiopian laws and guidelines (including the constitution), neither of these institutions includes clear requirements or arrangements. In stead, they present simple recommendations. Although Ethiopian legislations do not have clear guidelines, Bank policies can be applied in public consultation without violating Ethiopian law.

2.4 Ethiopian Legislation and World Bank Policies on Social Impacts of Projects

The Constitution takes a human rights approach to the environment; "a clean and healthy environment is a right of every Ethiopian". This may be understood as encompassing both biophysical and human/social aspects in the "environment". However, beyond these general principles, the laws (proclamations) and the technical guidelines available provide little guidance on what measures to take regarding the social impacts of projects and how to assess their impacts. Therefore, OP/BP 4.10, OP/BP 4.11, and OP4.12 Bank policies guide the preparation and complement this SA of the RPLRP.

3. Key Findings of the Social Assessment

This section will give a biophysical description of each of the *Woredas* as well as the economic and socio-cultural profile of underserved groups. The goal is to present the physical and socio-cultural characteristic features of each of the *woredas* under study.

3.1 Biophysical Environment of Studied *Woredas*

As indicated above, the SA was carried out in four regions of Ethiopia. Within the four regions, six *Woredas* were included in the SA. Three of the *Woredas* (*Hammar*, *Surma*, and *Nyagatom*) were from SNNPR, and the rest three (*Afambo*, *Moyale*, and *Teltelle*) were from Afar, Somali, and Oromia regional states respectively. The biophysical description of each of the *Woredas* is presented below.

3.1.1 *Hammar Woreda*

Hammar is one of the six pastoral and agro-pastoral *Woredas* found in South Omo zone. The total area of the *Woreda* is estimated to be 731,565 hectares of land. Of this total area, 9,095 hectares of land is cultivated; 250,709 is covered with bushes; 225,434 is grazing land; 10,000 is covered with forests; 99,260 is irrigable land; and the remaining 137,067 hectares of land is under residential development or construction of office blocks. The altitude of the *Woreda* falls between 371 – 2084 above sea level with an average annual rainfall of 764 mm. The agro-ecology of the *Woreda* includes: 80% semi-dry (*woyina dega*), 37.5% partial dry (*kolla*), 54% dry (*kolla*), and the remaining 0.5% is desert (*beriha*). The highest rainfall in the *Woreda* is recorded between mid-March to mid May. Average annual temperature of the *Woreda* ranges from 30°C to 35°C (Woreda Agriculture Office, 2012/13).

Hammar Woreda shares its geographical boundaries with *Bena Tsmay* in the North, *Dassench* South West, *Nyagatom* in the North West, Kenya in the South, and *Borena* and *Konso* in the East. The data obtained from *Woreda* Pastoral Development Office (2013/14) indicates that the total population of the *Woreda* is estimated to be 71,489, of which 49.9% are males and the remaining 50.1% are females. The main crops produced and consumed in the *Woreda* are maize, sorghum, and pea. Some fruit crops like mango and banana were also produced by the community.

The *Woreda* has rich natural resources like wild animals and forests. The wild animals include Monkey, Ape, Oryx, Greater Kudu, Bush Duck, Cheetah, Dikdik, Fox, Zebra, etc. Forests contain Acacia, Cardia, and other different types of bushes and shrubs. The main river in the *Woreda* is Omo River.

The *Woreda* is divided into 35 administrative Kebeles. Of these Kebeles, 11 are inhabited by pure pastoralists, 21 Kebele by agro-pastoralists and the remaining 3 are occupied by permanently settled farmers. The main ethnic groups in the *woreda* are *Hammar*, *Arebore*, and *Kara*. There are also nonpastoral ethnic groups such as Amhara in a *woreda* town called *Demeka* and other towns such as *Turmi* who are petty traders, working as government employee, and tourist guides.

3.1.2 *Surma Woreda*

Surma Woreda is one of ten *Woredas* found in *Bench Maji Zone*. The agro-ecological zone of the *Woreda* is 15% *Dega*, 80% *Woyina Dega*, and 5% *Kolla* (Zone Agriculture Office, 2013) and the *Woreda* generally has humid tropical temperature. It is about 187 km away from the zonal capital named *Mezan Teferi* and 1014 Km far from *Hawasa* town, the capital of SNNP regional state. The *Woreda*'s average annual temperature is 34°C.

Surma Woreda is among the *Woredas of the region* which shares international boundaries. It is surrounded by South *Omo* in the South, *Bero Woreda* in the North, *Maji Woreda* in the East, and South Sudan in the West. According to the data obtained from *Woreda Administration Office* (2013), the *Woreda* has a vast area coverage of about 4833.3 square kilometers that accounts for 24.2% of the total area of the zone. When we look at the landscape, out of all the land coverage, 10% is mountainous, 35% is terrain and rugged, and the remaining 55% is plain area which is favorable for agriculture. The altitude of the *Woreda* ranges from 501-2500 above sea level with annual rainfall between 400-1800 ml. The weather condition is humid tropical and has loam sand soil.

There is no consensus on the total population size of the *Woreda*. The statistics obtained from *Woreda Agriculture Office* indicates the existence of a total of 33,374 people in the *Woreda*. This aggregate data shows no sex/gender variation. However, the data obtained from the *Woreda Administration Office* shows that the total population *is not exactly known*; but estimates range

from 34,000 – 40,000. However, the statistics obtained from *Woreda* Health Office indicates the existence of a total population of 30,008; of which males are 49% and females are 51%.

All people of the *Woreda* are pastoralists who depend for their subsistence on their cattle and goats. However, currently, some segments of the community are practicing some form of farming and traditional gold mining to supplement their livelihoods. The food crops produced in the *Woreda* are maize and sorghum. There are also some types of fruits produced in the area like mango, papaya, banana, and ‘*Gishta*’. Cereal crops are also cultivated; of which, soya bean is the main crop. Regarding the administration structure, *Surma Woreda* is divided into 22 kebeles. Each kebele has its own chairperson. Most of the kebeles have kebele managers who can assist kebele chairpersons and who are responsible for documenting every activity of the kebele, including population and household size.

The *Woreda* is rich in natural resources. Thick natural forests such as *Cardia*, *Ficus vasta*, Fig tree (*Ficus Sycomorus*), *Carisa Edulis*, *Acacia Abessinica*, *Wayne*, *Vernonia Mycrocephala*, Palm tree, ‘*Dokima*’, etc are abundant. . Mineral resources that are found in the *Woreda* include gold, marble, and sand. There are also many wild animal resources like ostrich, lion, leopard, ape, monkey, warthog, hyena, crocodile, buffalo, pig, gazelle, wolf, wild cat, guinea hen, porcupine, antelope, etc. The main water sources in the *Woreda* are *Kibish River*, *Kari River*, *Boke River*, *Julgite River*, and *Koka Rive*.

The *Surma* are the dominate ethic groups in *Surma Woreda*. Besides, there are other ethnic groups like *Dizi*, *Amhara*, etc mainly residing in *Kibish town* (the center of the *woreda*).

3.1.3 Nyagatom Woreda

Nyagatom Woreda is one of the *Woredas* found in South Omo zone of SNNPR, located in the southern part of the region. The *Woreda* has a total area of 205,482 hectares of land. out of which, 60,680 is cultivable land, 71,816 is grazing land, 36,439 is covered with shrubs and bushes, 6,277 is covered with forests and the remaining 4,594 hectares is not favorable for cultivation. The type of soil in the *Woreda* is loam sand soil. The *Woreda* is bordered by *Selemago Woreda* in North, *Bench Maji Woreda* in North West, *Dassench Woreda* in South, *Kenya* in South West, *South Sudan* in West, and *Hammer* in Eastern part. The average annual temperature of the *Woreda* is 34°C with annual rainfall ranging from 400 – 500 ml.

The total population in the *Woreda*, according to the 2013/14 *Woreda* Finance Office Report, is 21,424. In terms of gender, 11,045 are females and 10,378 are males. Hence, there are a slightly larger number of females than males.

The *Woreda* is endowed with natural resources. There are wild animals in the area which are particularly found in national parks and wild animal reserve areas. In the *Woreda* there were two national parks namely Omo and Mago National parks. The wild animal reserve area is Murule Wildlife Reserve. The parks and animal reserve areas are away from residence areas and less likely to be affected by RPLRP. In case where RPLRP has the tendency to impact these areas, environmental impact assessment (EIA) should be conducted before the implementation of the project. The main types of wild animals include: Tiang, gazelle, elephant, giraffe, monkey, zebra, buffalo, wild hog and rabbit. The natural forests are acacia and other local trees which are not yet clearly identified, according to a key informant. The *Woreda* has also some minerals like gold and mineral water, which the local people call ‘mercury water’. There are hot springs in *Nyagatom*, locally named as *Okulan* and *Naruse*.

Nyagatom Woreda has 21 administrative Kebeles. There is only one urban Kebele named *Kangatin*. The remaining 20 kebeles are rural. There are three ethnic groups residing in *Nyagatom Woreda*. These are *Nyagatom*, *Murule* and *Kowegu* ethnic groups. Historically these ethnic groups have had strong bonds and relationships. As key informants indicated, it is believed that *Murule* ethnic group came from South Sudan, where as *Kowegu* and *Nyagatom* ethnic groups moved to Ethiopia from Uganda and Tanzania; *Tosa* in Tazania and Turkana in Kenya are parts of the *Nyagatom* ethnic groups in Ethiopia, according to informants. In addition to these three ethnic groups there are few ethnic groups like Amhara, Konso, etc, who live in the town called *Kangatine* (the center of *Nyagatom woreda*) who are mainly government workers and others are involved in shop keeping, hotel sector, etc.

3.1.4 Afambo Woreda

Afambo Woreda is found in Zone One of Afar Regional State. As part of this administrative zone, *Afambo* is situated in the eastern part of the region sharing international boundaries with Djibouti in the East and regional boundaries with *Dubti Woreda* in the West, *Asaita Woreda* in the North, and Ethiopian Somali region in the South. The *woreda* has seven administrative

Kebeles, of which four Kebeles are inhabited by pure pastoralists, and the remaining three are predominantly populated with agro-pastoralists. With a total area of 1,258.97 square kilometers, the *Woreda* is covered mainly with sand and black loam soil.

The Altitude of the *woreda* ranges from 270 – 300 meters above sea level. Its annual rainfall is 200 – 250 ml. The average annual temperature of the *Woreda* is 35°C. Awash River is the main gift of the *Woreda* and its final destination is this *Woreda*. It serves as the main water source for the people and their livestock.

Based on the 2007 Census conducted by the Central Statistical Agency of Ethiopia (CSA), this *Woreda* has a total population of 24,153, of which 13,312 are men and 10,841 women. In *Afambo*, 99.96% of the population was Muslim. Some segments of the population, which account about 27% of the total population, reside in scattered settlements. The *Woreda* is endowed with many wild animals and natural resources which are potentially great tourist attractions. The wild animals found in the *Woreda* are crocodiles, monkeys, foxes, hyenas, wild hogs, gazelles, wild asses etc. There are three lakes, namely *Gemer* Lake, *Afambo* Lake, and *Abe* Lake, which serve as tourist attractions.

In *Afambo* *woreda*, the Afar ethnic group is dominant. But, in the town, there are other ethnic groups like *Tigray*, *Amhara*, etc, living mainly as government workers and petty traders.

3.1.5 Moyale Woreda

Moyale Woreda is one of the largest *Woredas* of *Liben* zone in Somali regional state. It is located at the Southwest corner of *Liben* zone. *Moyale* is bordered in the South by Kenya, in the West by the *Borena* zone of Oromia region, in the North by *Udet*, and in the Northeast by the *Dawa* River. The *Woreda* has a total area of 22,261 hectares, of which 18,500 is cultivable land.

According to the 2010 data obtained from the *Woreda* Agriculture Office, the total population of *Moyale Woreda* is 237,257, of which 54.6% are males and the remaining 46.4% are females. The majority of the inhabitants of this *Woreda* belong to the *Gari*, *Degodia*, and *Hawadle* clans of the Somali ethnic group. In addition, a small proportion of the population belongs to the *Gabra* clan, which is a small nomadic group with cultural similarities to of the *Borena* ethnic group. The *Woreda* consists of 36 kebeles which five are urban, whereas the remaining are rural.

The ecology of *Moyale Woreda* is arid and semi-arid mainly dominated by lowland. The altitude of the *Woreda* is about 1300 meters above sea level. The climatic condition varies seasonally. Thus, the temperature ranges from 21°C – 35°C. The average annual rainfall is 6000 ml. The major types of crops grown are maize, sorghum, and bean. Vegetables are also grown though in a low scale. A year is locally classified as *guu* (long rainy season), *hagay* (long dry season), *dery* (short rainy season), and *Jiilaal* (short dry season). The *Woreda* has natural resources; such as, gums, incense, etc. There are a number of wild animals; such as, rabbits, dik dik, gazelle, and different varieties of birds that serve as a source of tourist attraction in the area.

Moyale Woreda is inhabited both by the Somali and *Borena* ethnic groups. Thus, the *woreda* is administered both by the Somali and *Oromia* regional states. However, this study was conducted in the part of the *woreda* administered by the Somali regional state. This part of the *woreda* is dominantly inhabited by the Somali ethnic group. There are also other ethnic groups including Oromo (*Guji Oromo*), Amhara, etc.

3.1.6 Teltelle Woreda

Teltelle Woreda is found in *Borena* zone of *Oromia* regional state. The *Woreda* is bordered by South Omo in the West, *Yaballo Woreda* in East, *Konso* in North, and Kenya in South. The *Woreda* has twenty-three administrative Kebeles, of which twelve are inhabited by pure pastoralists and the remaining thirty are dominated by agro-pastoralists. The total area of the *Woreda* is about 1,999.3 square kilometers which is covered mainly with sand and black loam soil. It has 28,882 hectares of cultivable land and 459.5 hectares of forest land.

According to the data obtained from *Teltelle Woreda* Pastoral Office, the total population of the *Woreda* is 72,476. Of this total population, males are about 36,495, and the remaining 35981 are females. The agro-climatic zone of *Teltelle Woreda* is dominantly ‘*kolla*’. The annual rainfall is between 400 – 600 mm. The temperature of the *Woreda* ranges between 17°C – 34°C. Thus, the main economic pillars of *Teltelle Woreda* community are livestock husbandry and crop production. Livestock rearing has been challenged severely by recurrent drought particularly since 2009/10. The scarcity of water and pasture has caused neighboring ethnic groups to compete for these inadequate resources (i.e. water and pasture). Ethnically, *Borena Oromos* are

the major and dominant group in the *Teltelle* district of *Borena* zone. The *Woreda* also has a few other ethnic groups like *Konso*, *Garba*, and others.

The *Woreda* has several natural resources including wild animals like Zebra, hyena, rabbits, dik dik, gazelle, etc. Though they are under threat, there are also different types of forests mainly acacia and bush trees which serve as habitats for wild animals. According to government officials, there are minerals that are not yet well studied and categorized.

3.2 Socio-cultural and Economic Context

3.2.1 Community Institutions

A community institution is understood as a form of local organization that is meant to promote a healthy cultural, social, political and economic life in the course of everyday life of the local people. In light of this, the forms of community institutions in the study area can be essentially categorized into two: local and formal. *Local community institution* refers to any distinct way of community life that is formed and structured purely on the basis of local culture; whereas, *formal community institutions* are any local community organizations that are formed and structured on the basis of written laws by government or any other interested body.

3.2.1.1 Local Community Institutions

Pastoral and agro-pastoral communities have their own local institutions which enable them to organize their life and manage and structure their day-to-day activities. In SNNP Regional State, perhaps the most powerful local community institutions among the *Surma* ethnic group are those which are formed and structured based on sex and age divisions. Traditionally, the *Surma* attach a significant socio-cultural meaning to sex and age. Thus, the formation and structure of various socio-cultural groups are on the basis of these two factors.

Each age group assumes distinct socio-cultural roles. For instance, if we take *tegan*, members of this age group go through the same rite of passage. They are expected to dance together, work together, and discuss together any matters of life they face and so on. Thus, these age groups can be easily used and mobilized in any development program. RPLRP can use the advantages of such well organized local community institutions for effective implementation of the project.

Similarly, in *Hammar Woreda*, there are age groups among the *Hammar* and *Kara* ethnic groups which are called *Anamo* and *Hariya*. Irrespective of their sex, in *Hammar*, any identified socio-cultural group based on age is called *Anamo*. Thus, *anamo* is the generic socio-cultural expression of an age group. Accordingly, there are boys' *Anamo*, girls' *Anamo*, adult men *anamo* or adult women *anamo*. The exact expression for such age groups in the *Kara* community is *hariya*. The *Nyagatom* have also traditional and local ways of grouping based on age. The entire community is divided into six age groups locally known as Mountains, Elephants, Ostriches, *Walia*, antelopes, Buffalos, and Crocodiles. They call such classifications *Anaksiya* or *Alch* or *Bezere*. There is no exact age limit among these age groups. The Mountains are the oldest members of the community followed by Ostriches who are still elderly but younger than the Mountains.

As a rite of passage, leaping over a queue of cattle is one of the renowned cultural activities performed among the *Hammar* young boys. Unless a boy performs this activity properly, he will not be allowed to marry a girl; he could not have a child; and he will not be considered as *Hammar*. If a girl gives birth to a child before the father performs leaping over the cattle, the child will be considered as “*Minji*” and killed, particularly in the *Kara* ethnic group. Leaping over a queue of cattle as a rite of passage is still an ongoing ritual. However, the practice of *minji* is highly condemned by government officials and NGOs in the area who are working to stop the practice for good. Informants indicated that in most areas it was abandoned. But, according to informants, in remote rural areas, it is still practiced. The *Hammar* community has also a cultural practice called *Evan Gadi*. In the local language, ‘*Evan*’ means ‘night’ and ‘*Gadi*’ means ‘dance’. Thus, *Evan Gadi* refers to night dance performed in the presence of the moon light every two days in a week during harvesting seasons. The *Surma* ethnic group has also a popular and celebrated cultural practice of girls’ lip mutilation, which is still practiced. It is done as rite of passage and it indicates that the girl has reached adulthood and she is ready for marriage. Girls put circular clay inside their lips and this is considered a mark of beauty. .

The *Denb* system is one of the main traditional institutions accepted by all pastoralists and agro-pastoralists (except pastoralists in *Nyagatom Woreda*) in SNNPR. *Denb* is not only a traditional way of conflict resolution among pastoralists but also a religious and political practice and a way of relieving pain and healing sickness. Among the *Surma* and *Hammar* communities, *Denb* is performed by the *Balabats* and community elders at specific places reserved for rituals of *Denb*.

The *balabats* are not only political and secular leaders, but also religious fathers of the ethnic group. The *balabats* perform religious rituals or “*denb*” to communicate with and beg their creators. They pray for their super natural power to bring them rain, make their harvest good, have a bright year, get someone cured from disease and sickness, solve interpersonal conflict, etc. In addition, among the *Surma*, sorcery has an important place and the community gives great value to it. Sorcery is practiced in all villages where the community resides to make people confess their wrong act and to expose persons who committed crimes. In addition, it is performed for curing disease and warding off the evil eye.

Similarly, the Afar people are known for their longstanding and well established local community institutions. They have developed a renowned local institution of *the traditional administrative system*. It is the socio-cultural institution through which the Afar people have developed their political life over the years. In particular, the Afar traditional administrative system is organized into five socio-cultural units. The units are hierarchically called the sultanates, clan leaders, *Firma* or *Balabat* (a middle level socio-cultural administrative power that is transmitted across generations), community leaders, and household heads. Such structural units strictly reflect the way people live their daily lives.

In *Afambo Woreda* of Afar regional state, socio-cultural groups among the *Awesa* clan are formed to meet various needs in their daily lives. Our key informants explained three major socio-cultural groups. *Meharu* is the first group. It is the traditional standby army responsible for protecting its clan and territory from any external enemy. The *meharu* traditional group consists of only the young and energetic segments of the community. *Ashab* is the second group. It is through this traditional group that labour is organized for various tasks. *Fi’ema* is the third group. It is a traditional play group formed in same sex and age groups. Hence, there is male *fi’ema* and female *fi’ema*. These various traditional community ties and networks such as the ones explained above are key points to be noted by the RPRLP and good potential opportunities to be used to mobilize people for effective implementation of the upcoming project.

Likewise, Somali pastoralists have an local traditional institution of administration system called *Ugas* System. *Ugas* is the head of all clans and the supreme leader in Somali ethnic groups. He has the supreme power and any decision made by the *Ugas* is automatically accepted by all ethnic groups. He is well educated and has frequent contact with each of the

clan leaders. The *Ugas* has a meeting room and a schedule for discussion with clan leaders on peace and security issues and on any agenda that impacts the community. Under the *Ugas*, each clan has their own clan leader who directly takes orders from the *Ugas* and passes them on to his clan members.

The *Borena* pastoralist and agro-pastoralist communities have also a dynamic territorial social administrative system called the Gadaa system. This system regulates all the social, economic, and political aspects of the life of the people. The people of *Teltelle Woreda* have also a tradition of working in teams and helping each other in times of difficulty. They cooperate in water well digging, pond construction, closing pasture land (locally called *kallo*), etc. The community members have good social ties and the better off help the destitute during disastrous periods (this practice is locally called *Busa Gonofa*). The presence of such traditional arrangements among the people of the zone, in general, and the lowland pastoralists, in particular, provides a unique opportunity for facilitation of development endeavors. It has an added-value to enhance the participation of communities in all aspects of development interventions.

3.2.1.2 Formal Community Institutions

The pastoral and agro-pastoral communities, like communities in other parts of Ethiopia are governed by government structure, which ranges from *Woreda* to Kebele level. Each kebele is run by its respective chairman supported by a Kebele manager. In addition to the formal government structure, all pastoral and agro-pastoral communities under study have their traditional ways of administration. For instance, pastoralists in SNNPR are governed by their *balabats*. The *Surma*, *Nyagatom*, *Kara*, and *Hammar* ethnic groups have their own *balabats*. In addition, each of the ethnic groups in *Nyagatom Woreda* (*Nyagatom*, *Murule*, and *Kowegu*) has their *balabat*. All members of the group are loyal to his/ her respective *balabat*. Therefore, the *Balabat* system is an informal institution found in all pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in South *Omo* and *Bench-maji* pastoralists of SNNPR. The *balabats* perform all traditional rituals and traditional religious practices for their members. They are acknowledged by the community to have some kind of supernatural power. Hence, all of their commands and decisions are accepted without questioning.

In all areas, in addition to government structure, there are other formal institutions, particularly community based organizations (CBOs), which play a pivotal role in various

political, economic and social development issues of the local community. In all pastoral and agro-pastoral communities, local government officials and elders were asked to name the available formal community institutions in the study area. The most common CBOs found in all areas under study are those established by government bodies such as Youth Associations and Women Associations. These institutions have structures up to Kebele level.

However, in some areas, Youth and Women Associations are not as such fully functioning but the structure is nominally there. For instance, interviewed key community informants in almost all areas at Kebele level revealed the absence of youth and women associations in the area. But, government officials and some elders pointed out that these associations existed even though they were not well organized and functional. However, in some *Woredas* like *Hammar*, *Moyale*, and *Afambo*, some forms of Kebele Women's Association and Youth Association were formed, most of whom are not particularly active. This is because the members are busy with other personal business and most of the associations were established through drive from the local government officials rather than the members' own personal motivation.

3.2.2 Ethnic Relationship and Bondage Among Pastoralists

In pastoral and agro-pastoral areas, interethnic relation has a double face: cooperative, and at the same time, conflictual. For instance, the ethnic groups in *Hammar* and *Surma Woredas* have long standing relationships with other neighboring ethnic groups found within and outside the country. The *Hammars* have relationships with *Arbore*, *Kara*, *Dassench*, *Nyagatom*, *Murule*, *Koygu/Mugji*, *Watawa* in *Borena*, *Bena*, *Tsema*, etc. The *Surma* ethnic groups have also historical ties with a number of ethnic groups. They have bonds with *Dizi*, *Nyagatom*, *Maji*, *Meanit*, and Sudanese ethnic groups of *Tobesa* and *Bume*. Key informants and FGD discussants mentioned that *Surma* and *Hammar* have historically good relationships including intermarriage. For example, a *Hammar* boy who has successfully performed the ritual of jumping on cattle queue can marry a *Kara* girl. Men from the *Surma* ethnic group commonly marry women from the *Dizi* ethnic group. However, *Dizi* boys rarely marry *Surma* girls due to cultural factors such as lip mutilation among *Surma* girls.

Similarly, in Afar region *Afambo Woreda*, the pastoralist communities have good relationship and bonds with their neighboring ethnic groups in Djibouti and Somali Regional State. Consequently there has not been any interethnic conflict in the *Woreda*.

However, the general picture of the areas under study shows that interethnic conflicts sometimes break out among the pastoral and agro-pastoral communities. For instance, there were conflicts between *Hammar* and *Dassench*, *Surma* and *Dizi*, *Kara* and *Nyagatom*, and so on. The main cause for the conflict between them was access to natural resources (like grazing land and water) and cattle raid. Sometimes there are cross-ethnic killings among some groups only for the sake of pride and fame. According to the informants, currently, the relationship between *Dizi* and *Surma* ethnic groups is becoming strained and hostility is growing. The main reasons for this as pointed out by discussants are competitions for water and grazing land. But the real factor, according to the key informant, is cattle raids, made when a man wants to marry a girl, without having the required number of livestock to pay as bride wealth. There are also conflicts between *Surma* and *Tobesa*, *Nyagatom* and *Surma* ethnic groups though they are not grave.

Conflict between *Nyagatom* pastoral and agro-pastoral ethnic groups and other pastoralists surrounding them is common. For instance, *Nyagatom* ethnic groups were in a conflict with *Dassench*, *Kara*, and *Turkana* in Kenya. The *Murule* also fight against *Turkana* and *Tobosa* in Kenya. Discussants were asked to indicate the main causes of conflicts between them and others around them. The main causes of conflict were the culture of cattle raiding and competition for pasture and water for their livestock. Cattle raids occur mainly due to the marriage practice of the pastoral and agro-pastoral communities. Among the ethnic groups in *Nyagatom Woreda*, for a man to marry a girl, he has to give about 100 cattle as bride wealth. Thus, it is very challenging for those families and/or individuals who are too poor to afford this requisite bride wealth. Their final option to marry is to loot other nearby ethnic group's livestock. This act is also encouraged and approved by the local elders because after the person or group successfully robs livestock, he slaughters a goat or sheep and invites elders in his ethnic groups to bless him and they readily commend his courage and bravery. Bravery means recognition of the individual by the ethnic group as very strong. He is considered as the hope of the ethnic group and respected by all other members.

Though not frequent, conflict also occurs between the *Borena* and Somali Ethnic groups. *Borena*, *Burji* and *Konso* ethnic groups fight for pasture and water. Shortage of pasture and water is the main source of conflict between *Borena* Oromo and *Burji* ethnic groups in pastoralist Kebeles of *Teltelle Woreda*. Whereas, the main source of conflict between *Borena* Oromo and *Konso* is shortage of farmland in agro-pastoralist areas of the *Woreda*. This is due to the fact that *Borena* pastoralists crave to use the land for grazing whereas the *Konso* want to utilize it for farming.

The situation in Afar region is also the same. Though there is no ethnic conflict in *Afambo* areas, in *Aredaitu* and *Qedamitu Woredas*, there are instances of ethnic conflicts due to pasture and water access for livestock between Afar and Isa Somali ethnic groups. This problem seems to have been resolved recently. In *Afambo Woreda*, Afars have a peaceful and harmonious relationship with other Afars in Djibouti and bordering Somali ethnic groups.

There is an attempt by both government and community elders to settle the interethnic conflicts in all pastoral and agro-pastoral communities under study. For instance, recently, the government intervened to settle the conflict in SNNPR between the *Dizi* and *Surma*; *Hammar* and *Dassench*; *Kara* and *Nyagatom*; *Borena* and Somali (*Garbi* clan), *Borena* and *Burji*, etc. Community elders and discussants expressed great interest and desire to have peace and conciliation between the ethnic groups who are historically intimate and consanguine to each other.

3.2.3 Conflict and Its Causes in Pastoral and Agro-pastoral Areas

Pastoralist and agro-pastoralist areas are the most fragile and conflict prone spots. Major conflicts do not occur within the same ethnic group residing in the same *Woreda*; rather, they usually occur between ethnic groups residing in the bordering *Woredas*. The nature of conflict is both national and cross-boundary due to the fact that pastoralists inhabit boarder areas of Ethiopia. The SA result shows that the main causes of conflict in pastoral and agro-pastoral communities are shortage of water, pasture, and cattle raid. The first two causes (i.e. water and pasture) happen as a result of erratic rainfall that is the result of the climatic condition of the lowlands inhabited by these communities. Pastoralists and agro-pastoralist reside in the arid and semiarid lowland areas characterized by low and irregular rain. This in turn leads to scarcity of water and loss of grass and bushes which are necessary for their livestock. Shortage of water and pasture forces pastoralists to migrate into another area (sometimes crossing borders) in search of

water and grazing land for their animals. Usually, the movement is towards areas believed to have ample resources. However, in pastoral and agro-pastoral areas, since land traditionally belongs to a particular ethnic group and the group claims it by establishing ideal and physical boundaries, conflict between those who own it and the new comers erupts.

Since recently rainfall in the pastoral and agro-pastoral areas has become unpredictable. When the rains come, it is mostly for a very short period of time (i.e. the rainy season is becoming too short). In most areas under assessment, this has resulted in frequent drought and starvation of the communities. In addition, in some areas, the death of livestock has also become an important issue. For example, according to the information obtained from the *Moyale Woreda* Livestock, Crop and Rural Development Office, the *Woreda* has been stricken by continuous drought for about eight years and this has caused the loss of livestock, which form the livelihood of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists. Recurrent drought has resulted in the death of approximately 490,000 livestock including camels, cattle, and goats. The drought has also caused migration of people and loss of human life due to crop failure and most victims have been rural Kebeles. Within the rural areas, those who suffered the most have been poor families, female headed households and children.

In *Teltelle Woreda*, during the FGD discussions and community consultations, the community frequently referred to the prevailing drought afflicting them and they focused on getting solutions to their immediate challenges of hunger. The local community members indicated that many families, particularly poor and female headed households are stricken by starvation due to the drought in the areas. They indicated that this year there is a shortage of rain and untimely interruption of rainfall which resulted in crop failure for the majority of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in *Teltelle Woreda*. Government official key informants, on the other hand, mentioned that though there is crop failure as a result of shortage of rain, the community is not stricken by starvation.

Cattle raid is the third cause of conflict in pastoral and agro-pastoral communities. In some areas, pastoralists make cattle raid to show their bravery and courage. In other places, the cause of cattle raid is historical intercommunal enmity that has passed from generation to generation. This is prevalent among the *Hammar* and *Dassench*, *Dassench* and *Nyagatom* ethnic groups. However, in some places, cattle raid is the outcome of marriage practices of the community. This

is the case in *Nyagatom* and *Surma* ethnic groups. Among the ethnic groups in *Nyagatom Woreda*, for a man to marry a girl, he has to pay about 100 cattle as bride wealth. Thus, it can be very difficult for those families and/or individuals who are poor to pay the requisite bride wealth. Their only option to get a wife is to go somewhere and steal or loot a nearby ethnic group's livestock. This act is also encouraged and commended by the local elders because after the person or group successfully robs livestock, he prepares a party by slaughtering animals and invites elders in his ethnic group, who afterwards bless him and extol his courage and bravery.

In addition, in some areas, cattle raid is practiced as a compensation strategy. Scarcity of rainfall and pasture in pastoral communities results in drought and hunger. Drought usually leads to the loss of livestock and properties of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities. Thus, to replace their lost livestock, which are their main means of livelihood, these drought stricken groups raid cattle from their historical enemies and/ or other communities.

The SA results also reveal that regional boundary confusions and sometimes unnecessary divisions, in some pastoral and ago-pastoral areas, trigger conflict among ethnic groups. The absence of clear boundaries and unnecessary separation of historically tied ethnic groups through boundary demarcation have resulted in conflict among local pastoral people. Absence of border lines causes contested claims of ownership and leads to tensions between pastoral and agro-pastoral communities. In other areas, the administrative division of ethnic groups, which historically coexisted, intermingled, and shared grazing land and water sources, also brought and aggravated disagreement and conflict among pastoralist and agro-pastoralists. This was indicated by FGD discussants and key informants in *Moyale* and *Teltelle Woredas*. For instance, due to boundary claims, in the recent past, conflict happened between *Borena*, on the one hand, and *Gerbi* and *Gari* clans of Somali ethnic group, on the other side. In addition, there was conflict between *Borena* and *Burji* ethnic groups in *Teltelle Woreda*, due to boundary confusion and claims. FGD discussants and key informants also revealed the existence of frustration and suspicion among these ethnic groups. They are afraid of conflicts since it has a high chance of occurrence and they warned concerned government bodies to take some preventative measures.

3.2.4 Traditional Conflict Resolution Mechanisms

Pastoral and agro-pastoral ethnic groups have their own traditional conflict resolution mechanisms. The way conflict is handled and managed varies from one ethnic group to another

based on the tradition and culture the group. In SNNP Regional State, pastoralists and agro-pastoralists manage conflicts through a traditional mechanism called The *Denb* Institution. *Denb* is performed when some kind of conflict breaks out within the ethnic group. *Denb* is a well known local institution that is common to all pastoral and agro-pastoral communities covered in this SA.

Among *Hammar* and *Surma* ethnic groups, if a person kills a fellow ethnic group member or commits adultery, a traditional court called '*Denb*' involving the *Balabats* together with community elders sees the case. Among the *Hammar* and *Kara* ethnic groups, when a person accidentally kills someone within his own ethnic group, he runs away and hides in other areas to save himself from immediate revenge from relatives of the deceased person. Then, he informs his relatives to protect themselves and through them inform the community elders about the situation so that the elders could make relatives of the killed person calm down until the *balabat* performs the *denb*. The elders inform the *balabat*, and together with him, they fix a date to perform the litigation/ cleaning process, locally called '*Qesh*'. When '*qesh*' is performed, the perpetrator (the killer), his relatives (including his family members), and relatives of the deceased person together attend the ceremony. Among the *Kara* ethnic group, the perpetrator is beaten seriously with a traditional stick and made to pay compensation to family members of the deceased. Finally, the two groups (family members of the killer and victim) are allowed to eat together by slaughtering oxen that is given by the perpetrator.

The *denb* system is also performed to solve enter-ethnic conflicts. Enter-ethnic grievances are handled through the involvement of regional, zonal, and *Woreda* government officials. In order to solve such conflicts, a community committee which is composed of community elders and *balabats* from the two opposing sides is formed by government officials and negotiation is made. Thus, *denb* is a local institution with multiple social, cultural, political, religious, and legal functions in the day to day life of the pastoralists.

The pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in *Nyagatom Woreda* have traditional ways of administration and conflict resolution. Each community member is categorized under a certain age group locally called *Anaksiya* or *Alch* or *Bezere*. The community is divided into six categories named as Mountains, Elephants, Ostriches, *Walias*, Buffalos, and Crocodiles. There is no exact age limit to identify this categorization. But the Mountains are elderly and older

members of the community, followed by Ostriches who are still elderly but younger than the Mountains. The mountains are highly respected and whatever they decide is accepted by the community. Ostrich and *Walia* comprise adult members of the community. The youths and children are categorized under Buffalos and Crocodiles categories. Each of the categories has its own leaders and each year there is celebration and invitation for the leaders by their members. Whatever decision is made by the leaders is accepted by their members. The categorization is found both in males and females. The females have also similar structure and each category has its own leaders.

The leaders of each category have sole power over their counterparts. The structure serves as a system of conflict resolution. When conflict happens between *Nyagatom*, *Murule* and *Kowegu* ethnic groups and other surrounding pastoralist communities, the mountains are responsible to manage it and pass decisions. Their decision is accepted by Elephants, Ostriches, *Walias*, Buffalos and Crocodiles. Such information is passed from the leader of the group to each of the members. Therefore, each of the members in the lower group respects those in the upper group. Order also passes from the mountains down to the Crocodiles.

In Afar ethnic group, there is also a conflict resolution system called ‘*mabloo*’ institution. The Afar have developed this longstanding traditional conflict resolution system though the name given to such a longstanding local institution varies across clans in Afar. *Mebloo* is the term used by the *Awesa* clan to refer to their local conflict resolution system. In the context of *Afambo Woreda*, conflict may arise due to numerous factors such as: *xesso* (grazing land), *akel* (sudden killing of a person), *ger’a* (theft of cattle) to mention but only the major ones. In general terms, conflicts in the *Woreda* can be intra-clan, inter-clan or interethnic. The type of conflict may be as insignificant as temporary disagreement between two friends or it could be as serious as killing of a person outside one’s own clan or ethnic group. In a similar vein, conflict may be among groups of individuals (as in the case of conflict between two pastoral households) or all/most members of a clan (as in inter-ethnic aggression). Our key informant explained:

Most conflicts between members and household units from the same clan are settled through the negotiation between the parties involved or through mediation by neutral members or friends. Nevertheless, cases such as “akel” and “ger’a” (whether it is among the members of the same clan or not) are necessarily referred to the adjudication of “mabloo.” The traditional court of “mabloo” is led by “kedoh abbo” (the elders who

are selected because of their rich knowledge and experience in Afar traditional adjudication system). Thus, after the case is brought in front of the “mabloo” traditional court, the chosen “kedoh abbo” makes the final decision.

Among the Somali pastoralists in *Moyale Woreda*, the traditional conflict resolution system is called ‘*odiyash deganka*’. According to this system, when conflict happens, the community informs the clan leader. If the conflict is inter-clan or intra-clan, the clan leaders manage it through ‘*Ola*’, i.e., they bring the two adversaries face to face and counsel them to forget the conflict and encourage them to stop the case. The duration of conflict settlement varies depending on the seriousness of the conflict. If one of the parties is seriously harmed, the perpetrator should cover the cost of medication and pay compensation to the victim. The type of compensation varies from one clan to another.

However, if the conflict was with other non-Somali ethnic groups, it is handled and settled by the *Ugas*. *Ugas* is the head of all clans in Somali ethnic groups. He has the supreme power and any decision made by the *Ugas* is automatically accepted by the ethnic group. The *Ugas* has a meeting room and a schedule for discussion with clan leaders on peace and security issues and about any agenda that impacts the community. The *Ugas* together with clan leaders are responsible to resolve inter-ethnic conflict.

Among *Borena* pastoralists, the conflict resolution mechanism is called *Jarsuma/ Raba Gada*. It operates under the umbrella of *Gada* system involving community elders known as *Gada mojjii*. The *Gada mojjis* are represented from each of the parties if the conflict is among the *Borena* Oromo clans. The elders of each party have sole power to decide based on the case presented. The structure of the *Gada* system serves as a system of administration and conflict resolution. When conflict happens between *Borena* and other ethnic groups, elders of *Gada mojjii* of *Gada* system have the responsibility to prevail and give decision from the *Borena* side. The other ethnic group, which has conflict with *Borena* Oromo, is also represented by its own elder in line with their traditional conflict resolution practices. The decision of each elder is accepted by the parties to the conflict. Then, information is passed through the elders of each group to each of the members.

In *Teltelle Woreda*, the extent of conflict determines the area from which elders are selected to reconcile the adversaries. For example, if the conflict is between the ethnic groups, the elders are

represented from each ethnic group, whereas if the conflict is within the ethnic group, the elders are picked from clans called *Gosa* or villages called *Rerra* in accordance with the magnitude of the conflict. Accordingly, the reconciliation between the two conflicting parties will be made through the mediation of elders selected from these parties.

3.2.5 Grievance Redress Mechanism During Project Implementation

Strengthening and use of traditional conflict resolution mechanisms during RPLRP implementation is bound to happen. Nevertheless, the way it might be used and implemented in all regions should not be in uniform and standardized ways. This is due to the fact that in some areas like Somali, Afar, and Oromia regional states, traditional management systems were well established and acknowledged and sometimes used by the government structure. For example, the *denb* in SNNPR, *odiyash deganka* in Somali, *jarsuma* in Borena, and *mebloo* in Afar, were used though not always, by government to solve interethnic conflict. Among the Somali and Borena pastoralists and agro-pastoralists, the type of penalty imposed on the perpetrator is set in written form which varies in accordance with the type of offense and the extent of damage inflicted.

Therefore, in these regions, to restore peace and order among pastoral and agro-pastoral communities, the traditional conflict redress mechanisms can easily be institutionalized and their capacities should be strengthened by providing culturally appropriate trainings to the respective actors. In some areas, establishing peacekeeping committees by recruiting the right people from the neighboring pastoral and agro-pastoral ethnic groups who will do surveillance and conflict control before it turns out, needs to be initiated. When conflict occurs, this committee will act as a local judge and settle the conflict through culturally appropriate ways.

However, among pastoralists and agro-pastoralists in SNNPR, the conflict resolution system is more traditional and well established. Though the *balabats* are the main agents in conflict resolution, they are less educated, highly traditional, and important in the day-to-day life of their ethnic group. Hence, it might be highly challenging to involve them in activities intended to solve conflict. For instance, if a peacekeeping committee is formed involving balabats, they may not regularly attend meetings and capacity building trainings offered by RPLRP. Besides, institutionalizing the *balabat* system of conflict resolution could be challenging and might not be accepted by the ethnic group because it is a new system introduced to their culture. Thus, a

culturally accepted conflict redress mechanism should be implemented in consultation with the community at large. One way to solve conflict in SNNPR has to be establishing peacekeeping committees comprised of elders that are recruited based on the recommendation of, and accountable to the *balabats*. The peacekeeping committees can have a regular timetable to meet and discuss issues with the *balabats* within their ethnic group in their respective Kebeles.

In addition to using a traditional conflict mechanism and implementing RPLRP to mitigate conflict in pastoral and agro-pastoral areas, continuous awareness raising and culturally appropriate trainings should be designed and delivered to the communities. RPLRP should also promote and support cross-boundary peace and security forum, and organize events both at international, national, regional, zonal, and *Woreda* levels to foster the solidarity and integrity of pastoral and agro-pastoral ethnic groups in collaboration with IGAD, federal, regional, zonal, and *Woreda* administrators and governors.

In most pastoral and agro-pastoral communities, individual theft of animals could cause interethnic conflict. The individual act of crime can lead to social crisis. Interethnic conflict as a result of individual theft happens where there is hatred between two ethnic groups, political interest of some groups, existence of historic enmity between two ethnic groups, and so on. But the SA indicated that this conflict is due to lack of awareness and low educational status of the pastoral and agro-pastoral communities. Thus, awareness raising and functional adult education need to be encouraged and supported in pastoral and agro-pastoral areas.

Studies which can explore and assess the historical and social solidarity and cooperation of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities should be encouraged and financially supported. A budget needs to be allotted to support research which aims to increase the cohesion and peaceful coexistence of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists. Research themes can include historical ties and cohesions among pastoralists, systems for peaceful coexistence of pastoralists, impact of interethnic conflict on pastoralism, and so on.

3.2.6 Gender Issues

Gender is a social construction, and signifies the relations between men and women, both perceptual and material. It is a central organizing principle of societies, and often governs the processes of production and reproduction, consumption and distribution (FAO, 2004: 1).

Therefore, there are gender roles and gender relations which are social constructs. Gender role is the ‘social definition’ of what women and men should do. It varies among different societies and cultures, classes, ages and during different periods in history. Gender specific roles and responsibilities are often conditioned by household structure, access to resources, specific impacts of the global economy, and other locally relevant factors such as ecological conditions (FAO, 1997). Likewise, The Sociology of Gender defined gender roles as “the expected attitudes and behaviors a society associates with each biological sex” (2008: 4). Gender relations are the ways in which a culture or a society defines rights, responsibilities, and identities of men and women in relation to one another (Bravo-Baumann, 2000 cited in FAO, 2004: 1).

As the data obtained through key informant interviews and FGDs revealed, among the study ethnic groups, the socio-cultural construction of gender strictly reflects both perceptual (identity construction for male and female) and material (economic benefits) understandings. As far as the pastoral communities under assessment are concerned, the material (economic benefits) construction of gender typically came to be understood in two ways. In SNNPR, first, for her family, the girl is thought of as an asset (the girl is just one means through whom her family earns material property). In this regard, the interviewees and FGD participants explained that the prevailing tradition considers girls more suitable for marriage than for school and for further political, social, and economic progress at large. The interviewees and FGD participants pointed out that upon marriage, the girl’s family would receive significant material resources like cattle and/or small ruminants. As indicated above, the number in the case of *Surma* ethnic group was from 20-30 cattle, whereas the dowry payment among the *Hammar* and *Kara* family was about 12 cattle or 127 goats. The number was much higher for pastoralists in *Nyagatom Woreda*. *Nyagatom*, *Murule*, and *Kowegu* ethnic groups pay about 100 cattle as bride wealth. This is enormous property gained by the girl’s family and, hence, cannot be considered secondary to any other concern. Second, after marriage, women are culturally granted to the groom (husband) as his private property. The empirical data from the field showed that following the huge property transaction in the form of dowry, the socio-cultural intention is that the groom (husband) must be repaid through women’s life course services.

Among the *Afar*, Somali and *Borena* pastoralists, there were no such requirements and attachment of high value to girls’ dowry. Thus, the consideration of women as an asset was not

visible; though there is important value attached to girls. Marriage was highly respected and the girls were sexually desired and reproductively needed to bear children after they had married.

There are two further gender related issues, which can serve for planning and implementing, which must be analyzed in light of the pastoral communities under investigation. These are gender roles and gender relations. Of course, any point of discussion associated to gender roles and gender relations is a matter of expanding the empirical analysis of the socio-cultural construction of gender. In other words, any empirical analyses about gender, gender roles and gender relations here reinforce each other.

3.2.6.1 Gender Roles

The empirical data obtained through field observation, key informant interview, and FGD discussion have uncovered a clear presence of gender specific roles in the major everyday life activities (productive, reproductive, and domestic chores) among the local households. Productive activities are those pastoral household tasks undertaken in relation to livestock keeping and farming processes. As far as gender role was concerned, in all pastoralists under study, women perform all the indoor activities alone, like feeding family members and cattle, fetching water, collecting firewood, marketing, and constructing traditional tukuls. In addition to the indoor activities, women also participate in outdoor activities like farming and cattle keeping. Men, however, undertook cattle keeping and participate in clan meetings. Therefore, adult men, young male, and boys were fully responsible to look after cattle and small ruminants. The decision about where to graze on and where and when to move the household livestock population for better management was culturally assumed by the male household head. In terms of livestock activities, mostly, women were culturally expected to undertake only minor tasks such as milking cows and looking after those livestock around residence areas.

Women were culturally responsible for farming in all pastoral and agro-pastoral communities. Men were responsible to help women in selecting good farmland and clearing the land. Afterwards, the remaining tasks and responsibilities (land clearance, hoe digging, sowing seeds, weeding and harvesting) were done by women.

Generally, reproductive activities, such as child rearing, etc, were exclusive to women. Culturally, i) the mother was responsible for protecting a child from any harm that might arise

out of the day-to-day harsh ecological conditions in which the pastoral household found itself, ii) the task of feeding a child as per the food habits prescribed by the norm of the group was socially defined as the role of mothers, and iii) mothers did play a vital role in the process of primary socialization that typically occurred during childhood period. To the contrary, perhaps, the most noticeable role of a husband was to supervise the inculcation of cultural norms during child upbringing. Furthermore, the household reproductive activities entailed the difference of roles based on age. Girls have also the responsibility to take care of children together with their mothers.

To conclude, in some pastoralist areas like *Borena*, at present, there is no such strict gender division of labour and, its cultural significance is getting weaker. Despite the existence of a division of labour within the community, currently men perform indoor activities if they are required to do so and mutual spousal support is becoming the new practice for both men and women.

3.2.6.2 Gender Relations

As discussed above, gender relations are the ways in which a culture or a society defines the rights and responsibilities of men and women in relation to one another in accessing basic resources; that is, the rights to access basic resources and the process of household decision making. With regard to the pastoral communities under assessment, the gathered data have shown that the rules that governed gender relation and the means of its institutions were predominantly determined through customary law.

Based on gender, there was variation among pastoralists to access basic resources, and the process of household decision making in the context of the study area. For the sake of clarity in this report, during fieldwork, key informant interviewees and FGD participants were allowed to explain “*what socio-cultural factors and institutions there were to govern the rules of access to basic resources.*” Household “*basic resources*” are meant mainly to include land and natural resources on it, livestock asset (both cattle and small ruminants), agricultural products, and income. Based on the data obtained, in all pastoral communities covered in this social assessment, *patrilineal* descent system and *patrilocal* residence patterns were the most dominant socio-cultural institutions that governed gender relations and access to basic resources.

Simply defined, a *patrilineal descent system* is a socio-cultural institution whereby a descent is traced through the male line. In *patrilineal* societies, the males are far more important than the females, for they are considered responsible for the group's continued existence (Haviland et al, 2006: 261). Apart from tracing descent group, patrilineal socio-cultural institution has a special significance in relation to gender and access to basic resources. In all the ethnic groups covered, the *patrilineal* system was set up in such a manner that it is only a legitimate son who inherits his father's property and sometimes his position upon the father's death.

Patrilocal residence pattern was another dominant socio-cultural institution through which gender inequality was promoted as far as access to basic household resources was concerned. Haviland et al (2006: 246) defined a *patrilocal residence* as a system of socio-cultural institution in which a newly married woman goes to live with her husband in the households and community in which he grew up. On the basis of the observed data, the implication of *patrilocal* residence pattern for gender and access to basic resources was so obvious. Before marriage, a girl did not claim basic resources that could be obtained from her parents and/or ethnic group. Normatively, it was justified that conferring a girl with a right to own property was useless for she would leave her household and community upon marriage. After marriage, a woman had no right to claim basic resources such as land, and livestock assets of her family of orientation. Instead, the customary system of the pastoral communities under examination only recognized whatever access right was deserved to a woman through her husband.

Yet, there is another vital point that should be analyzed in association to the prevailing gender relations; that is, the process of household *decision making*. In the context of the pastoral households, there were numerous social (for example, who decide family affairs) and economic (e.g. selling livestock asset or agricultural products) matters that basically made it necessary for a given household to pass decision. Overall, the empirical data have revealed that the process of household decision making was highly dominated by the "*rule of patriarchy*." Among the ethnic groups under study, it was corroborated that the existing culture granted men an absolute power of making decision about the life of the household. Such culture of patriarchy perceived a good wife as a woman who could accept whatever decision was made by her husband for granted. Of course, the same rule of patriarchy was uncovered to govern the participation of female members of the household. Consequently, the girl and her mother were not consulted; for instance, with regard to the girl's first age at marriage. In a similar vein, it was not cultural for women to claim

the right to make decision about household's livestock asset or annual produces of the household.

In addition to *Patrilineal* descent and *patrilocal* residence systems, among the Afar and Somali pastoralists, women are subject to Islamic rules and regulations. For instance, if a woman got divorced, she would receive only one-third of the property. Islamic rules have strong influence and acceptance among these pastoralist and agro-pastoralist groups in Ethiopia.

However, among pastoralists and agro-pastoralists in *Borena*, a wife and a husband had virtually equal rights in decision making. In *Teltelle Woreda*, women have equal access to basic resources like livestock. Women's participation in decision making was found to be very high. Women could participate together with men in public meetings and any other social gatherings. If there is conflict between husband and wife, the division of property is done through the informal institution of *Gada* system and the formal institution of courts. Both institutions in *Borena* had special recognition for the empowerment of women and the husband had no sole power to decide over the property. Husbands consult their wives if there was a need to sell livestock and other property.

In conclusion, whatever component of RPRLP dealing with the matters of gender relations, access to basic resources and the process of household decision making, must challenge the impacts of *patrilineal* descent system, *patrilocal* residence pattern, and the rules of patriarchy. Evidently, any intervention or challenge by RPRLP must begin at the structural level/socio-cultural system and work down to the individual level. The project should take into account gender-related issues to economically empower women by developing/targeting locality specific activities in both farm and non-farm activities where women have a comparative advantage, such as management of small ruminant and poultry, livestock rearing, farming activities such as land clearing, ridge /mound, planting, weeding, harvesting, winnowing, and threshing, and preservation.

3.2.7 Livelihood Activities

Livelihood is recognized as humans' inherently developed and implemented strategy to ensure their survival. It comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of earning living (Chambers and Conway, 1991). In all

regions, most of Kebeles in the *Woredas* are pure pastoralists and livestock rearing was the dominant means of earning livelihood. But in some Kebeles, farming was also practiced by the pastoralists. Thus, pastoralism and agro-pastoralism are the key livelihood systems. According to the data obtained from *Woreda* Pastoral Development Office (20013/14) the *Surma*'s were pure pastoralists. Hence, the local pastoral households live on the sources of food, raw material and income obtained from the practice of livestock rearing.

In *Hammar Woreda*, of the total households about 41.9% were fulltime pastoralists who depended on livestock, whereas agro-pastoral and settled farmers accounted for about 55% and 3.1% respectively. In *Nyagatom Woreda*, the *Nyagatom*, *Murule* and *Kowegu* ethnic groups were predominantly pastoralists. They reared livestock and were dependent for their livelihood on their animals. Looking at the livelihood activities of each of these ethnic groups separately, *Kowengo* ethnic groups were practicing mainly farming around the Omo River. The *Nyagatom* and *Murule* ethnic groups engaged in mixed activities (livestock rearing and farming).

In *Moyale Woreda* of Somali region, *Teltelle Woreda* of Oromia region, and *Afambo Woreda* of Afar region, although the exact statistics about the percentage of pastoralists and agro-pastoralist was not available, the number of Kebeles in which pastoralist and agro-pastoralist were living was identified. In *Moyale* twenty-eight Kebeles, in *Teltelle* twelve Kebeles, and in *Afambo* six Kebeles were inhabited by pure pastoralists, whereas the remaining kebeles in all *Woredas* were agro-pastoralists and the main crops grown included maize, sorghum, and pea.

In addition to livestock rearing and small farming activities, there were other supplementary means of livelihood among the local pastoral households in the study area. Among other things, the supplementary activities include traditional bee keeping (in both *Woredas*), fishing along the River *Omo* in *Hammar*, *Nyagatom*, and *Surma Woredas*; traditional gold mining among the *Surma*; charcoal production (mainly in Somali, Afar, and *Borena* pastoralists), collecting and selling of firewood (mainly in Somali pastoralists), petty trading, and the like.

In the *Nyagatom Woreda* there were some members of the community who engaged in fishing to supplement their livelihood. In the Omo River, some pastoral and agro-pastoral communities engage in fishing only for the purpose of household consumption, but fishing to generate additional income was not identified. In addition to fishing, some pastoral and agro-pastoral

communities engage in traditional bee keeping. They used traditional beehives to produce honey. Key informants and FGD discussants revealed that in *Nyagatom Woreda*, there was a high number of bees and there was potential to produce more honey. Thus, the community promoted the development and modernization of apiculture in the *Woreda*.

In the study *Woredas*, there are huge water sources that could be used for farming. However, due to lack of capacity and awareness, pastoral and agro-pastoral communities were not practicing irrigated farming. In addition, the local communities did not have the experience of growing vegetable and fruit seeds. However, the areas were highly fertile and there were perennial rivers like *Omo*, *Dawa*, *Wabishebele*, and *Awash*, which could be used for irrigation. The pastoral and agro-pastoral communities have an interest to engage in small scale farming activities such horticulture to diversify their livelihoods. They earnestly demanded the construction of small dams for irrigation activities.

3.2.8 Land Tenure System

As is often the case with other ethnic groups, land is the key natural resource for the pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in the process of earning life. Nevertheless, variation always exists across socio-economic groups over how to access and control over land or formally termed as land tenure. The European Union (EU) broadly conceptualized *land tenure* as the “system of access to and control over land and related resources” (European Union 2004: 2). In its conceptualization, the European Union expressed land tenure as the rules and rights which govern the appropriation, cultivation and use of natural resources on a given space or piece of land. Thus, a land tenure system is always made up of rules, authorities, institutions and rights.

Since, the socialist regime’s enactment of the first land reform policy in 1975 that nationalized land tenures system, land has belonged to the State. The constitution of FDRE also confirmed that land is State property and people have only use right over the land they hold. The Constitution of Ethiopia clearly explicates that the right to ownership of land and all natural resources over it is exclusively given to the State and to the peoples of Ethiopia. Article 40 (3) of the Constitution states:

“The right to ownership of rural and urban land, as well as of all natural resources, is exclusively vested in the State and in the peoples of Ethiopia. Land is a common property of the Nations, Nationalities and Peoples of Ethiopia and shall not be subject to sale or to other means of exchange”.

However, in the study areas, there was not a single plot of land certified through formal government system either federal or regional level. Therefore, the land tenure system of the pastoral and agro-pastoral communities was exclusively under the customary land tenure system. To generate relevant empirical data on the prevailing land tenure system, Regional Pastoral Community Development Bureau Deputy Heads, *Woreda* Pastoral Community Development Office Heads, local elders, and household heads were interviewed. In all pastoral and agro-pastoral areas, there were two common types of land use systems: grazing land and farmland uses.

3.2.8.1 Land Use for Grazing

Grazing land in all pastoralist and agro-pastoralist communities was communally owned. The customary law that governs household access was the same among all ethnic groups in the study. The empirical data have also shown that grazing land belongs to all ethnic groups as a whole and hence, the prevailing customary law dictates *Communal Land Use Right*. Thus, all pastoral household members in a given ethnic group had equal access and use to grazing land as long as they were community members. Accordingly, the pastoral household could keep its cattle and small ruminants anywhere within the territory of its ethnic group. Therefore, in all the *Woredas* investigated, ethnic membership was the sole criterion that conferred on local households the right to access pasture land.

3.2.8.2 Land Use for Farming

With regard to farmland, except in the case of the *Surma* ethnic group, all farmland in pastoral and agro-pastoral communities was used privately. In the *Surma* pastoral group, the customary law that governs pasture land and farm land was the same. That is, like pasture land, there was no private farmland. A household can clear woods and farm anywhere within the *Surma* territory. The common practice was that once it harvested the grown product, the household would leave the land and move to other places. Hence, another household might cultivate the land in the next farming season.

According to the customary law of most pastoralist ethnic groups, particularly in SNNPR, there are three common ways through which a private use right over a piece of farm land could be claimed by a given household. First, a household might claim a private use right by clearing

unoccupied land or land that was originally covered by a forest/bush. Second, a father might give a certain proportion of plot (out of the farm land already recognized under the possession of household) to his grown up son (s) upon marriage. Third, the head of the household might share some tract of farm land (out of the farm land already recognized under the possession of the household) to his relatives. In the case of the last two customary practices, if the term of the gift was made on a permanent basis this would automatically confer a private use right. Nevertheless, there is one thing that should always be remembered in association with the private use right over farm land. That is, the means of cultural institution still takes the exclusive criterion of ethnic membership into account. Thus, within a territory of a given ethnic group, the customary law allowed the private land use right only among the members of the ethnic group.

3.2.9 Natural Resource Use

The key natural resources among pastoralists in the *Woredas* under study include water, forests, wild animals, various naturally grown wild edible fruits, minerals, and nutritious aquatic life such as fish. As far as these natural resources were concerned, there was no basic difference among the study *Woredas* in terms of the rules of access. Almost universally, the prevailing customary systems dictate the rules of communal use rights among the pastoral households. Ethnic membership; therefore, was still perceived as the exclusive means of access to these natural resources.

Among these natural resources in pastoral and agro-pastoral communities, forests were mainly under threat. In addition to the erratic rainfall and aridity of the areas, there was high deforestation. Forests were used for different purposes. Among the reasons which caused serious deforestation was the production of charcoal and collection of firewood for sale. Deforestation was highly prevalent in Somali, Afar, and *Borena* areas. In the rainy season, even though it was for short periods, floods resulted in high soil erosion in pastoral areas. Soil erosion was aggravated by the cutting of trees for charcoal production and firewood. FGD discussants and key informants raised this issue as a serious problem in their area particularly in *Moyale* and *Borena* areas.

In Afar, SNNPR (*Nyagatom Woreda*), and *Borena* areas of Oromia, there were new tree varieties which encroached on and expended in the area. In Afar and *Nyagatom Woreda* of SNNPR, *Prosopis juliflora* has covered the majority of the areas in *Afambo Woreda* and a number of

Woredas in the region. Evidence shows that *Prosopis juliflora* was introduced to Ethiopia two decades ago with the aim of controlling soil erosion in the Afar State (UNDP, 1996). According to key informants and FGD discussants, *Prosopis* has huge negative impact on the local communities such as damage on farm and grazing land, killing of indigenous tress, making that soil surface crack and letting water trickle underground, pierces animal's legs, and failing to serve as a shed for both domestic and wild animals, etc. In addition, discussants and informants indicated that people were leaving their original residence places and moving to new areas due to the rapid expansion of *Prosopis*.

In *Teltelle Woreda* of *Borena* zone in Oromia, there was high encroachment of bush called *Acacia comifier*, locally named as “*japalsa*”. It was available in bulk covering wider area. The bush is shorter in height, grew closely, and was thick in density. Informants indicated that there was unusual rapid expansion of the bush. This resulted in the reduction of water levels in the traditional wells (*ellas*) and the complete dry out of ponds and thereafter poor pasture. In addition, the bush deterred movement of cattle under it because of its thorny, and highly thick and dense nature. The bush did not allow grass which was used for pasture for cattle. This bush was not consumed by cattle but by camels and goats. During FGD discussion, the community highly claimed to find ways for the immediate eradication of the bush because their animals were facing shortage of grasses for pasture.

According to FGD discussants the expansion of this bush encroachment on farmland had also become a major problem for the farming communities. The literature indicates that this expansion of *Acacia comifier* occurred after restrictions imposed on traditional methods of clearing unnecessary weeds from the pasture land, which is normally done for the improvement of the natural grazing pasture by burning the field in a year in winter season.

3.2.10 Vulnerability Segments of the Population

3.2.10.1 Sources of Vulnerability

Generally, pastoral and agro-pastoral communities are vulnerable to shocks and drought due to the fact that they inhabit the arid and semi arid areas where rainfall is erratic. The area is highly vulnerable to natural problems like drought. In addition, the area is prone to conflict due to water and pasture for livestock.

In the study area, the sources of vulnerability to pastoral and agro-pastoral ethnic groups were conflicts with the surrounding ethnic groups, poor infrastructure development, absence of diversified livelihood activities, use of traditional equipment and tools for farming and mining, low work culture (full time work was not common), blood feud, harmful traditional practices (like female genital mutilation in Afar, and mutilation of ears and lips among *Surma*), gender inequality in decision making and access to resources, consideration of girls as assets, high rate of population growth due to absence of family planning, and so on.

3.2.10.2 Vulnerable Groups

Pastoralism and agro-pastoralism is the main livelihood of the people in pastoral areas. The literatures and findings of the study revealed that pastoralism as a way of life in Ethiopia is vulnerable. Even though all pastoralists and agro-pastoralists are vulnerable groups compared with others in Ethiopia due to factors indicated above, given the same shock the following segments of the population within the pastoral framework are found to be highly more vulnerable.

1. Poor Families and Female Headed Households

The poor families lack wealth and mainly productive assets. Thus, they are more vulnerable to risk and shocks compared with rich families. They lack the capacity to cope with disasters when, are unable to properly feed their household members, and suffer more. Though access to project outputs was not culturally restricted, the poor might be fewer beneficiaries of the project outputs in case the project demands them to contribute in cash as criteria to benefit from its fruits. FGD discussants in all kebeles under investigation revealed that the poor members of the community did not have the capacity to contribute financially.

Similarly, female headed households are among vulnerable groups because they are not bread winners and are more subjected to shocks and risks. This is because culturally there are some important activities which are not allowed for women and which men only can do, like participation in decision making, public meetings, etc.,. Besides, most female headed households are poor and economically incapable which makes them suffer from risks more than those households with male bread winners.

2. Women and children

Women perform the greatest share of work among the pastoral communities under study. As discussed in the above sections, both the productive and reproductive work rests mainly on their shoulder. They were active members who were responsible to feed the household members. Thus, women and children can be categorized under the vulnerable segment of the population. In all *Woredas* assessed, except in *Borena*, women had limited access to basic productive resources such as land. Men (husbands) had the sole power to decide over the land, though currently there is a move by the government to make women owners of land and other properties. Patriarchal descent system and polygamous marriage arrangements deter women from sharing resources of their family of orientation. These two systems give power to men and make women inferior. Men are entitled to inherit their family's property. Women's participation in decision making was found to be very small. Women could not participate in public meetings and any other social gatherings. They formed their separate groups and discussed issues together. Accordingly, the project should encourage these 'separate groupings' to voice their needs and propose whatever productive activities they think meet their needs.

3. Elderly People

In pastoral and agro-pastoral communities, elderly people are respected and they have more power. They usually act as representatives of their ethnic groups and serve in traditional institutions. They are leaders of the community and provide guidance and advice to their members. They are mainly the decision makers. Since the elderly are physically weak and face some health problems due to aging, the way of life of pastoral and agro-pastoral people is not suitable to them. In addition, the existence of high risks and shocks affects them more than youngsters and adults.

4. People with Disabilities (PWD)

Culturally, pastoral and agro-pastoral communities respect and support people with disabilities. In spite of such support, in most pastoral and agro-pastoral areas, PWD are part of the vulnerable segments of the population. Like older people, PWD do not have the capacity to engage in productive economic activities, and they are weak. Mostly, they are dependent on their family of orientation and other close relatives for their basic needs. Thus, they are dependent on other people and they do not fulfill what they desire by their own. In addition, they have low access to basic social services like school, etc, that would enhance their capacity and become productive.

5. Minorities and Outcast Groups in Pastoral areas

Besides, in pastoral and agro-pastoral areas, those ethnic groups which were small in number compared with the dominant ethnic groups can be categorized under vulnerable groups. For instance, *Hammar Woreda* was basically inhabited by three ethnic groups, namely *Hammar*, *Arbore*, and *Kara*. Among these ethnic groups, *Hammar* were the most dominant ones. According to government official key informants, compared with others, *Arbore* and *Kara* ethnic groups are somehow more vulnerable because, most of the time, they do not benefit from development projects in the *Woreda* due to the fact that they are situated in very remote areas with bad road conditions. According to government key informants, most NGOs do not want to reach them due to the poor infrastructure condition in their area. In addition, in *Borena* and *Somali*, there are minority ethnic groups residing along with them. These are the *Konso* and *Burji* in *Teltelle Woreda* of *Borena* zone, *Garbi* and *Borena* in *Somali* area of *Moyale*.

In addition, in some pastoralists like *Surma*, the most stigmatized population groups are individuals with epilepsy. They face considerable discrimination and people do not even want to eat and drink with them.

In sum, RPLRP should give due attention to the vulnerable segments of the population in pastoral and agro-pastoral communities. During project implantation, their active participation in each and every stage needs to be ensured and achieved. As indicated in the recommendation part, the RPLRP consultation process should start with the participatory approach for social mapping to identify vulnerable segments of the communities, assess their needs, and find ways to provide benefits to them.

3.2.11 Physical Cultural Heritages

Physical cultural heritages are tied with the identity and day-to-day life of the people. In the SA, existence of such cultural heritages was assessed to determine whether the project will be implemented in culturally sensitive areas. The findings indicate that in *Woreda* under study in SNNPR, Afar, Somali, and Oromia, pastoral communities do not have traditionally built monuments and obelisks as part of their cultural heritages.

However, in SNNPR, there are places where *denb* has been performed, the areas where *balabats* were buried (locally called *egene* or *bakjazu* among the *Surma*, *dukur haqe* among the *Hammar*), and places where magic/ sorcery was performed (locally called *balakayin*, among *Surma*), were highly respected and valued by the people. This respect is expressed in the community's relationship with the sites. For instance, the people do not cut trees for fire woods and do not defecate around these areas. In case members of *balabats* leave their original residence and go to other very far places, when they die, they are brought back and buried in their ancestry area . Therefore, these places should be counted as physical cultural heritages and kept intact.

Since Afar, Somali, and some segments of Oromia's pastoralist and agro-pastoralists are followers of Islamic religion,, there are some historical and religious mosques that must be protected, though not found in the *Woredas* under assessment. For instance, among the Afar as indicated in PCDP II SA report, there were magnificent and historic mosques in Chifra areas. In addition to mosques, in *Borena* area, places where the *Gada* system is practiced must be respected and protected. Before RPLRP activities are implemented, deep consultation with community members should be held to further identify and preserve such culturally valued areas in pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in Ethiopia.

3.2.12 Challenges of Pastoral and Agro-pastoral Communities

3.2.12.1 Main Challenges

The major challenges prevalent among pastoral and agro-pastoral communities are summarized as follows:

1. ***Lack of Water for Animals and Humans:*** As discussed in the above section, the pastoralists and agro-pastoralists in Ethiopia reside in arid and semiarid lowlands. The area is characterized by erratic rainfall. Most of the areas are not endowed with permanent rivers which could be used both for human and animal drink. Thus, in all areas covered in this SA, there is a serious shortage of drinking water for both livestock and humans.
2. ***Animal Disease:*** Animal disease was the second biggest challenge to pastoral and agro-pastoral ethnic groups under study. This is further aggravated by lack of animal health posts, clinics and laboratories. In some areas where these animal health facilities are available, there is a shortage of professionals who would provide the required service to

the pastoralists and agro-pastoralists. Trypanosomosis, Pasturellosis and CBBP were the main animal diseases revealed by pastoralists in *Borena* and Somali areas.

3. **Lack of Market Centers:** Market infrastructures are absent in pastoral areas. In many parts, sell and purchase of livestock was not common. In some areas of *Borena* and Somali, bus market is highly expanding. Such market, as discussed above, did not benefit the pastoral and agro-pastoral groups. In addition, the ethnic groups have lack of road infrastructure to reach those market areas found nearby. There is poor network of paved and truck roads which could increase trade and exchange.
4. **Interethnic Conflict:** In pastoral and agro-pastoral areas, conflict between ethnic groups was mainly a result of use of pasture and water for their livestock. Though not frequent, conflict between the neighboring *Woredas* and ethnic groups in bordering countries like Turkana in Kenya, rarely occurs. Besides, there is no guarantee that such conflicts will not happen in the future in pastoral areas where RPLRP will be implemented. Thus, conflict redress mechanisms should be put in place.
5. **Livelihood Vulnerability:** Pastoral and agro-pastoral community's livelihood activities are highly vulnerable to vegetation changes. They are dependent on their livestock to generate income and feed their families. Due to erratic rainfall, drought due to climatic change, deforestation, soil erosion, overgrazing and absence of livelihood diversification, their livelihood was highly vulnerable. Livelihood diversification is not common among the pastoral and agro-pastoral ethnic groups.
6. **Cattle Raid:** in all areas covered under this SA, cattle raid is the main challenge in pastoral and agro-pastoral areas. In some areas, it was the main cause of conflict whereas in other areas, it was the consequence of conflict, as discussed in the above section. It is practiced as revenge; mark of bravery, and, in some areas, to pay matrimonial costs in case the person is poor to cover the bride wealth.
7. **Gender Inequality and Workload on Women:** there is big difference between men and women in decision making and access to resources. In all pastoral and agro-pastoral areas covered in the SA, men had exclusive power over women. This was because of the prevalence of polygamous marriage and patriarchy that gave power to the men. Besides, women have low educational status and awareness of their rights. Women themselves acknowledged and respected the supremacy of men in every aspect of life. Women perform all domestic, child rearing, and most of productive activities in pastoral and agro-pastoral areas.

3.2.12.2 Specific Problems Faced by Women in Pastoral and Agro-pastoral Area

During fieldwork, due attention was also given to identify the specific problems of women in the study area. In particular, women were interviewed to explain major problems the pastoral and agro-pastoral women were facing. The summary of the empirical results are presented as follows.

1. Lack of Potable Water

The lack of potable water is indicated by the interviewees as one of the critical problems typically affecting women. In pastoral areas, the task of collecting water was exclusively assigned to women. In view of this, the lack of potable water further jeopardizes the life of women in the study area. A woman from *Afambo Woreda* expressed the extent of the problem as follows:

As you can see, the River Awash is very near to us but its water is not potable. In this locality, so many children and adult members of the households have got sick because of drinking tainted water from the River Awash. The health experts warn us not to use the River Awash for drinking purpose but without providing adequate means of clean water supply. A few water points have been constructed but their service was not lasting for more than months. The only water point currently serving is not accessible to us. Because (a) it is too far away from our home and (b) we are charged 1 birr/ per a twenty five litter container. In consequence, we are wasting our time and energy to access potable water. My effort to tell you all this is to make you understand the seriousness of the problem in our locality. I hope you are here to report our problem to the upcoming project. Again, it is my hope that our problem of potable water will end with the coming of your project.

Furthermore, in-depth interview was conducted with *Woreda Pastoral Community Development Office Heads* to identify the reason why the problem of potable water is very serious in the area. Though some areas have rich water sources and have perennial rivers like Awash, Omo, etc, *they are naturally not suitable for drinking purpose without undergoing treatment. In addition, most of the woredas do not have sufficient underground water resource. Digging of several deep waterholes was made, but only a few succeeded.*

In SNNPR, among pastoralists bordering Omo River, like *Nyagatom* there were incidences of some women being taken by accidental flood and overflow of the river while fetching water from the river as recounted by the community FGD and key informants.

2. Lack or Inadequate Health Services

Lack or inadequate health service provision was observed as one of the serious problems that specifically affects women in the study area. In most *Kebeles* covered in this report, the existence of both human and animal health posts was personally confirmed by the consultant. Nevertheless, the health posts had no and/or inadequate staff and medical facilities. The following narrative by a woman from *Teltelle Woreda* can illustrate the existing situation of health services:

Both human and animal health posts were constructed near to our locality. The problem is that the health posts are not in a position to provide us with the expected health services. They [the health posts] lack medical facilities and drugs. What is surprising is that, for all households in the “Kebele”, we have only one health worker. Even then, he visits us from Monday to Wednesday only for half a day. For this reason, a pregnant woman still delivers at home without the help of health professionals. In case of prolonged delivery problem, we don’t have ambulance service to get better medical treatment in the nearby health station or hospital. The scenario in the animal health post is even worse. We don’t yet have a single animal health professional to serve in the post. Furthermore, it [the animal health post] lacks any health equipment and animal drugs.

3. Lack of Modern Grain Mills

In most of the *Woredas* visited, the traditional *grinding stone* operated and throughout an intensive woman labor is still the only option available to the pastoral households. Of course, the consultant personally observed a few modern flour mills, but most of them are not functional due to technical problems and lack or inaccessibility of basic inputs. Key informants were asked to explain the extent of the problem. They related that women spent much of their energy and time of the day by grinding grain manually using a traditional grinding stone. Besides, others also travelled long distances to get modern grinding mills. This made their life extremely miserable.

4. Lack of Market for Income Generating Activities

In pastoral and agro-pastoral communities, there are women who attempt to overcome the state of their household poverty by engaging themselves in various income generating activities,

particularly in Afar, Somali and *Borena* zone of Oromia. Nevertheless, these women indicated the lack of market service in their locality as a serious bottle-neck to their livelihood diversification. For instance, a woman from *Moyale Woreda* of Somali region explained:

I used to engage myself in the production of Somali traditional handicrafts. My intension of doing so was to supplement the household's dominant means of substance [livestock and farming]. Nevertheless, in the two years time of my engagement, I failed to sell even some amount and thus, entirely stopped it. As you can realize from your personal observation here, our locality is a remote place. We really need some concerned body that creates market opportunity for our handcraft products.

3.3 Government Commune and Development Programs

Pastoralist areas are frequently susceptible for climatic shocks, like drought and shortage of rainfall, which have aggravated the environmental degradation and led to lower productivity. Due to these environmental and economic shocks, the livelihood conditions and resilience capacity of pastoralist community have been deteriorating. In response to these, the government has planned to conduct a commune program in pastoral and agro pastoral areas. In undertaking the program, government adopts the following as the main guiding principles to ensure benefits of the community.

There is therefore a likely geographic overlap of the commune program with both PCDP-3 and RPLRP in SNNPR, Somali and Afar Regions. In case of any adverse impact due to the program or other interventions, the projects' planning processes should take in to consideration the safeguards policy of the World Bank and should not ignore the needs of the underserved and vulnerable groups, or any emerging issues as they arise.

Overall, the Social Assessment findings indicate that, to date, PCDP's funds have not been used or associated with the commune program. However, it is expected that social relationship and resource utilization patterns will evolve as a result of external developments including but not limited to settlement of pastoralists through the government commune program. The World Bank is undertaking a separate assessment to examine the situation among communities where communes are being established including an assessment of the environmental, social and economic impacts of the changes. The assessment is expected to alert the Bank and other development partners to any potential risks to PCDP-3 and RPLRP interface with the program and to provide guidance on how best to engage in cases where problems emerge. The guidance

will cover issues such as the definition of future project boundaries and criteria for the selection of kebeles for project support.

Community consultation- the resettlement of households is made based on prior consultation with the community members. The program is a voluntary resettlement plan. Only volunteer households and community members will be included in the resettlement process.

Water as entry point- one of the critical problem in pastoralist areas is access to water. Thus, in undertaking the voluntary resettlement plan, due emphasis is taken by government to ensure access to underground or surface water resources prior to implementation.

Access to road network and basic services- limited access to infrastructure in pastoral areas contributed towards aggravating the vulnerability of pastoral communities. Their market access has been limited due to poor network roads making them benefit less from their products. In line with this, the government ensures the voluntary resettlement areas have sufficient access for road networks and market. In addition, provision of basic services, like health centers and posts, veterinary service, and schools are being undertaken in the voluntary resettlement areas.

Environmentally friendly and conflict sensitive- the commune sites are selected in ways that ensure sustainable use of resources. To avoid conflicts in the commune areas, mitigation measures such as pre-assessment of issues that could potentially cause conflict and consultation with host communities as well as with settling communities have been put in place.

Agronomic practice- the resettlement sites were selected depending on availability of land for cropping purpose. The voluntarily settled community members are given certain amount of land where they practice crop production.

In accordance with these principles so far government has been implementing the commune program in Afar and Somali regions. In Somali region, the commune program has been implemented in 18 woredas located in Gode, Liben and Afder zones. So far 150,000 households had voluntarily resettled in the newly prepared sites. In Afar region the commune program has been implemented in 8 woredas. So far 8,000 household heads have been voluntarily resettled. The commune program as well as other developments changes the context in which pastoral communities subsist. It is therefore likely that pastoralists' livelihoods and social relationships will change. The implications of these changes need to be understood better.

This study team has tried to identify the potential implication of the commune program in the implementation of PCDP-3 and RPLRP subprojects activities. The findings from the field indicate that in Oromia there is no plan for resettlement in sampled woredas. In SNNPR, the regional government has not planned the program in the consulted kebeles and the participants are not aware of the program. However, on further consultation with key informants from woreda, the study team learnt that the regional office has planned to conduct the commune program in most of woredas found in the South Omo zone.

3.4 Civil Societies in Pastoral and Agro-pastoral Areas

Generally, civil society refers to voluntary organizations, community groups, trade unions, church groups, co-operatives, business, professional, philanthropic organizations, and a range of other NGOs working to serve the community. Although civil society is usually made up of these various groups, there has also been a tendency to view NGOs as primary ‘vehicles’ or ‘agents’ of civil society. But in the SA, NGOs are treated as part of civil societies.

In addition to NGOs, locally organized and established civil society organizations were found in pastoral and agro-pastoral areas under assessment. However, most of these organizations, particularly CBOs were weak and lacked the experience of working with nongovernmental organizations in pastoral areas. The performance of most of CBOs was mainly dependent on the support of GOs and NGOs. That is, why they functioned when there was aid and support from GOs and NGOs, whereas at other times, they were inactive and nonfunctional.

In some visited *Woredas* in SNNPR like *Nyagatom*, *Hammar*, and *Surma*, local community level associations and unions were absent. However, in other regions such as Oromia, Afar and Somali, such civil society organizations were available but were not very strong. Their role and function varies from one area to another. For instance, in Oromia region of *Borena* zone, there were micro associations and unions involved in incense and gum production, marketing of small ruminants, marketing of milk and milk products, and so on. The common denominator of these micro level unions and associations was that they were weak and on the verge of vanishing. The same was also true in *Moyale* area of Somali region. In *Moyale Woreda*, there were Women and Youth associations and unions engaged in milk and milk product marketing, marketing of small ruminants through slaughtering and serving the community members in rural Kebeles, owning and managing grinding mills, and so on.

In *Afambo Woreda* of Afar region, there was *Awusi Gani* Association, a local local organization, having structures down to Kebele level. The association was strongly working with women and youths. As a result, under its umbrella, it established a women's handicraft workers association, women savings and credit association, women association involved in service delivery to Kebeles through the construction of grinding mills, and the like. Of civil societies found in pastoral and agro-pastoral communities, *Awusi Gani* Association in Afar region was found to be very strong and well coordinated. *Awusi Gani* Association had immense experience and relationship with a number of NGOs both local and international operating in the areas.

There were also NGOs operating in pastoral and agro-pastoral areas. Some of these NGOs which had better acquaintance with and experience of the area were consulted during the SA to identify the major challenges of the pastoral communities, and the possibility of working together during RPLRP implementation. For instance, in *Moyale* area, there were three prominent NGOs: Mercy Corps, Red Cross, and Medicine Sun Frontiers. In *Borena* areas, World Vision and *Mekan lysus* were the two main NGOs operating at local level. In SNNPR, some NGOs operating in the areas include AMREF, Save the Children, and Action for Development (AFD). In Afar region there were many NGOs. But in *Afambo Woreda*, the most prominent ones were FAO, Afar Integrated Development Pastoralist and Agro-pastoralist Communities (AIDPAC), and Solidarity for Integrated and Sustainable Development (SDID).

Most NGOs had headquarters at the federal level, that is, in Addis Ababa and only they had branch offices at regional and/or zonal levels. At *Woreda* level, they had only community facilitators who would approach the community and make arrangements for zone level experts. Most of them had lack of well established offices and staff at *Woreda* level. The duration of their project period was very short even though managers expressed their willingness to work in the areas in collaboration with RPLRP during interviews. Most of their projects had lasted for only about one or two years.

According to government key informants, most of these NGOs were working on emergency, rehabilitation of water points, establishment of village banks through cooperatives to make veterinary drugs accessible (the case for Medicine sun Frontiers), relief activities, training on water management and early warning, etc. The work of NGOs was generally short term lasting

for about one or two years only. They mostly focused on relief activities, which informants described as “*esat yematifat sira*”, which literary means “fire control work”. They engaged in restocking of animals during drought, rehabilitation of ponds, work for food, and the like, which could enable pastoral and agro-pastoral community to recover for a short period of time.

In almost all pastoral and agro-pastoral areas, government productive safety net program (PSNP) is underway. It was one of government programs frequently praised by the community during FGD discussions and key informant interviews. The program was implemented in *Moyale*, *Nyagatom*, *Teltelle*, and *Afambo Woredas* where RPLRP would also be implemented. In some *Woredas*, PCDP III is also in progress and was given high recognition and place by the local communities. Generally, it is possible to say that some of the interventions of civil societies were able to create development opportunities for the underserved groups and reduce the suffering and mitigate negative impacts of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities.

Thus, during RPLRP implementation, emphasis should be placed on strengthening local institutions and the project should work in collaboration with NGOs operating in particular areas to avoid resource duplication and for the project’s successful implementation. Although RPLRP can easily use the already formed local associations and unions after strengthening their capacity through training and material support, in some *Woredas* where there are no CBO, the establishment of new CBO is required.

3.5 Community Consultation on RPLRP

3.5.1 Consultation Objectives and Process

Community consultation is a method used to ensure a broad participation of the local communities. In each of the *Woredas* selected, public consultation with the major segment of the population was made with the objective of providing adequate information to the affected communities and stakeholders on RPLRP. Besides, the consultation aimed to reduce the potential for conflict, minimize the risk the project would pose on communities, and enable resettlement related issues addressed as development opportunities. More specifically, the public consultation was targeted to achieve the following objectives:

1. Inform stakeholders of the project activities and provide adequate information on the project, its components and its activities to the affected communities;

2. Create a sense of ownership on RPLRP activities and allow the local pastoral communities to give their free, prior informed consent about the RPLRP;
3. Inform about and discuss with the pastoral and agro-pastoral communities various options of resettlement and compensation related to RPLRP;
4. Determine whether design project features will address pastoralist needs and fit their circumstances, if not obtain vital information about the needs and priorities of affected persons;
5. Get cooperation and support for the project affected settlements on RPLRP;
6. Find effective grievance and complaints handling mechanisms on the project; and
7. If forced relocation is likely to happen, to identify modalities on how the project can mitigate or avoid any forced relocation and meet the objectives of OP4.10.

To conduct community consultation, a formal letter was produced from all regions addressed to the *Woredas* and Zone administrators. Then, each Zone wrote a letter of support to the respective *Woredas* under its administration. With the letters from the zones and regions requesting cooperation, *Woreda* administrators were consulted. In collaboration with *Woreda* officials, and *Woreda* Agriculture and Pastoral Development Office Heads and experts, the Kebeles were selected for community consultation. Community members in selected Kebeles were pre-informed and called to centers in each Kebeles. Participants in the community consultations involved all walks of life such as elders, women, association delegates, household heads, extension workers, and so on. In the *Woredas*, separate community consultations were made with men and women to give opportunity to women to express their feeling and aspiration freely on RPLRP.

In light of the objectives of the consultation stated above, in each of these Kebeles community members were made aware of the RPLRP project objectives and its components (and subcomponents) to be implemented during the five year project period. To sensitize the community, briefing was given to community members on each of the components and sub-components of RPLRP and intensive open discussion was made to get feedback and comments from the community. Participants were allowed to reflect their concerns and worries on the likely social, environmental, and economic impacts of the project.

3.5.2 Reflections and Aspiration of the Communities on RPLRP

The reflections and opinions of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities on RPLRP are summarized, component by component, as follows:

Component 1: Natural Resources Management (NRM)

In all regions, on the three subcomponents aimed to enhance secure access of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities to sustainably managed natural resources, that is, (i) development of water resources, through rehabilitating small dams and construction of new water dams in the project districts; (ii) development of pasture and grazing land (including the rehabilitation of grazing land); and (iii) securing access to natural resources in their areas and border countries, participants wholly supported this activity by indicating that it would solve their pressing problems. Regarding development of water sources, participants in Afar and SNNPR mentioned that they have many water sources such as Omo River, Awash River, etc, that need to be better managed and used for irrigation. Development of grazing land was full-heartedly supported by participants in all Kebeles because their HH members were frequently on the move with their cattle in search of pasture land. They indicated that the pasture factor is one of the main causes of conflict with their neighbors, and the development of grazing and pasture land will avoid inter-ethnic conflict and promote peace and stability in their vicinity.

The natural resources, like forests and land, were under threat among pastoralists due to deforestation, soil erosion, wildfire, and the like. Solving these problems and ensuring secure access to natural resources through implementing conservation measures was appreciated by all participants. Participants pointed out that environmental degradation, wildfire, and deforestation are common in their area and reinstated that early prevention and tackling of these challenges are in their best interest and they will fully support the implementation of the project. Here is how one of the participants, a clan leader, aged 55 years, narrated:

In the past, there were dense trees, bushes and grasses. We kept our livestock not in a far place, but near us. Drinking water is also available. Now, as you can see, the land is covered with fewer forests. Some people are cutting trees for different purposes like house construction, firewood, charcoal, and so on. There is soil erosion, and trees are drying. We need to protect our natural resources. Therefore, we support projects like RPLRP intended to preserve our natural resources.

In addition, participants articulated problems like shortage of potable water, lack of grazing land, and shortage of grasses for fodder, and irrigation to practice farming. For instance, consultation participants in *Teltelle* and *Moyale* areas pointed out shortage of water as their critical problem. In *Borena* area, water shortage is aggravated by the advance of bushes in the majorities of *Woredas* including *Teltelle*. In these areas, traditionally developed ‘*elas*’ and government built water points like ponds and Hand Dung-wells have dried. This has resulted from the rapid expansion of *Acacia comfire* and congregation of livestock in one area where water was available, mainly around river basins. Besides, people were traveling longer distances to access water sources. On the way, diseased animals died, and the livestock and people were tired of traveling the inconvenient route. Shortage of water also caused livestock to become emaciated and sold at lower prices. Thus, the community demanded water development activities that should serve their animals on a sustainable basis. Thus, they requested that natural resource management particularly rangeland and water development be effective.

Regarding NRM, in Afar and some part of *Nyagatom Woreda* in SNNPR, community participants revealed high encroachment of *Prosopis* as their primary problem. They strongly demanded that strategies to curb the spread of the plant be devised and requested RPLRP to address the worsening problem. In addition, the seasonal outflow of Awash River, and lack of roads and bridges to connect all the Kebeles were other major challenges of the pastoral and agro-pastoral people in *Afambo Woreda*. Women participants mentioned shortage of firewood and the use of grasses for house construction due to the expansion of *Prosopis*. They stated that *Prosopis* competes with local lwoods that they had been using for centuries for cooking and grasses for house construction.

Regarding the concerns and main issues raised during consultation, participants were informed that most of their concerns such as shortage of water, lack of grazing land, shortage of fodder, deforestation, etc, would be addressed by RPLRP. Besides, as regards some of the issues like the rapid expansion of *Prosopis*, and bushes in Afar, Borena, and some areas of SNNPR, participants were told that together with the implementing agents, they would find ways to deal with the problems through discussion. RPLRP needs to filter out and target these main challenges of the pastoral and agro-pastoral people. In addition, RPLRP should make the community active participants and empower them to find solutions for their problems by themselves.

Component 2: Market Access and Trade (MAT)

Market was one of the main demands of pastoralists in the study area. Regarding market infrastructure support and information systems, and improving regional trade in livestock and livestock products, which are the two main subcomponents of market access and trade, the community showed their eagerness for an immediate implementation. Among pastoralists and agro-pastoralists in SNNPR and *Borena*, there were no enough market centers, where the people could sell and buy their livestock and livestock products. For instance, participants from *Surma Woreda* indicated that they always came to *Woreda* town, named *Kibish*, to sell such valuables as livestock and buy household items, and for other purposes. More often than not, informants reported that they did not get the things they wanted to buy and buyers for their commodities did not turn up., which wasted their time and energy.

During consultation, community members indicated the existence of illegal trading of livestock and other commodities. For instance, there was illegal trading with south Sudan and Kenya in *Kebish* area of *Nyagatom* and *Surma Woredas*. In *Teltelle Woreda* of *Borena* zone, due to the absence of market centers, ‘bush markets’ were expanding. Therefore, they strongly supported the establishment of market centers, checkpoints, and availability of market information. They demanded the immediate implementation of the RPLRP to encourage legal trade with the boarder countries.

Participants also revealed the absence of (and in some area minimal) trans-boundary trade. They indicated that they did not have such culture of trade across boundaries with other country people. They revealed the need for forum and provision of training which would enhance their trading skills. One of the participants in *Hammar Woreda* said, “We want projects which will change our history from boundary conflict to trade relation”. This idea was appreciated with handclap from participants during the consultation.

During the public meeting, concerning these problems, participants were informed that one of the sub-components of RPLRP would ease the problem of illegal trading through establishing check points to control it, building market centers, doing awareness raising on the benefit of trans-boundary trade, etc. Besides, they were informed that to solve all these challenges their active participation (community’s involvement) was mandatory for the success of the project.

RPLRP should also ensure the active participation of community members to solve market problems, control illegal trade, and enhance the active function of market centers.

Component 3: Livelihoods Support (SL)

The mainstay of the livelihood of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists in the study area was dominantly livestock rearing. Their life and living style was shaped and influenced by their animals. During the discussions, participants indicated that their animals were dying due to epidemic diseases and shortage of fodder particularly during the winter season. During the consultation process, the three subcomponents of livelihood support components were discussed: (i) livestock production and health, (ii) food and feed production, and (iii) livelihood diversification. In all areas, community members welcomed the ideas and urged its implementation. “It seems”, said one of the participant, “You simply talk. I do not think that you will implement it. This is the behaviour of officials. They would come and promise , we will do this and that for you. But they did not translate promise in to practice..” These words demonstrate that all members of pastoral community were looking forward to the implementation of RPLRP because it targets their most critical problems.

In addition, some participants indicated the need for improved cattle breeds that can give more milk and resist disease and drought. Community members showed interest in alternative livelihood activities, like hand craftworks, beekeeping, cultivation of fruits and vegetables, and petty trade which are local practices. Livelihood diversification activities were high in demand among Afar, Somali, and *Borena* pastoralist and agro-pastoralist groups.

Consultation participants in all *Woredas* under assessment indicated that animal health problem/disease and shortage of medicine were rampant. However, the problem was more serious in *Borena*, *Afar* and Somali pastoralist areas. *Trypanosomosis*, *Pasturellosis* and *CBBP* were the main animal diseases in pastoral areas that require immediate solution according to discussants. In some areas like *Moyale*, *Borena*, and *SNNPR*, the community members travelled long distances to get access to treatment for their animals.

Regarding their worry that RPLRP was simple government propaganda, during the discussion, community member were resolutely informed that this project will be implemented by MoA with financial support from the World Bank and, it is very unlikely that the project will not be

realized. The implementation of the project depends on the SA report and recommendations that will be forwarded by the study. Concerning veterinary diseases, meeting participants were told that these will be addressed by RPLRP as an important item on the project.

Component 4: Pastoral Risk Management (PRM)

In SNNPR, since pastoralists have little knowhow of risk management, the discussion was not as such engaging. However, after coming to understand the objective and activities which will be implemented under the subcomponents, like disaster risk management, and pastoral risk early warning and response systems, all participants supported the components. They indicated that knowing ahead of time problems that they will face which affect their life will allow them to prepare themselves and to save some money to use in times of need.

However, due to recurrent drought the people face in the recent past, *Somali* and *Borena* pastoral and agro-pastoral communities strongly demanded the urgent implementation of PRM. Participants noted that early awareness and access to information regarding the challenges they might encounter could make them alert and avert the risk ahead of time together with the government and take local ways of mitigation measures.

Component 5: Project Management and Institutional Support (PMIS)

Participants were made aware of the project management and institutional support to be made by RPLRP and briefing was given regarding the role of the community in project management. They were informed about the establishment of Kebele Development Committees (KDCs) through a participatory approach to effectively achieve the success of the project. Pastoral and agro-pastoral communities' active involvement in project implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of activities was welcomed by the participants. Nevertheless, they cautioned that only capable community members be selected to be members of KDC, though public meetings and consultations with the concerned Kebele residents.

3.5.3 Stakeholders' Concerns

The first concern raised by the stakeholders most emphatically was women as primary beneficiaries of the project. Since women were highly dominated by men, participants indicated

that special attention should be given to women through mainstreaming. During the meeting, the participation of women at KDC was given due emphasis.

Secondly, participants indicated that all activities should be implemented in consultation with the local communities where the project is to be executed. It was noted that undue dependence on high level government officials' recommendations will not be good for the successful implementation and achievement of the target of project objective. Thus, active involvement of a Kebele level task force and prior consultation with the community about the nature and extent of the activities were given special focus during the discussion.

The final concern raised by stakeholders was recruitment and employment of staff for RPLRP. NGOs operating in the area, and government officials at Zone and *Woreda* levels indicated that for the project to be successfully implemented, staff who knew the culture and language need be given priority and employed, particularly those who will be working at zone and *Woreda* levels. They noted that, judging from their experience in different projects, employment of workers who do not know the culture and cannot speak the local language may lead to failure of RPLRP.

3.5.4 Concluding Remarks on Community Consultation

All in all, the community consultation was successful and there was no opposition raised from the side of the community members on the activities that will be put into practice by RPLRP. All participants welcomed and expressed their interest to wholeheartedly support the implementation of the project. They demanded the immediate implementation of the project.

Consultation participants were well informed and have developed full awareness about RPLRP components, subcomponents and the activities that will be made effective. In all Kebeles, all male and female participants welcomed the project and expressed readiness to extend their cooperation and support during the implementation phase. Men participants in meetings revealed that the components of RPLRP were in their best interest and addressed their priority issues. But women participants indicated their priority need was the establishment of a grinding mill to ease their workload at home. They indicated the absence of grinding mills almost in all Kebeles and as such expressed it as their number one pressing need.

Regarding resettlement that might take place due to RPLRP during the construction of small water dams for drinking water, irrigation, and so on, this should be done through discussion with elders and community members. The dams to be built are micro-dams mainly by the use of human power than heavy machinery. Participants indicated that since the community settlement was scattered, it would less likely happen. However, migration might be induced where shortages of water and/ or pasture occur to use the fruits of RPLRP in nearby Kebeles. If the project is likely to cause it, it will be easily solved consensually in consultation with the community elders, clan leaders/ sultans, *balabats*, and government officials. There is no likelihood that the project will incur expense for compensation, which was also supported by government officials during the key informant interviews based on their past experience on the implementation of PCDP. However, for precautionary measures, Resettlement Policy Framework was prepared for the project and will be used if needed to preclude any social risk.

In *Borena* and Afar areas, the biggest challenge frequently faced by the pastoral and agro-pastoral people was rapid encroachment of *Prosopis* and bushes. They demanded that ways to tackle *Prosopis* and bush spread out be found. They indicated their major worry was *Prosopis* invasion and bush encroachment of grazing area, and the project should target their control and eradication. NRM, particularly range land management and pasture development activities would be impossible, because *Prosopis* and bush can easily develop and override it.

Conflict, as a result of RPLRP, has an almost zero chance of occurrence during the implementation period as long as every project activity is implemented in consultation with KDC, clan leaders/ sultans, elders, and *balabats*. Institutionalization of traditional conflict redress systems and provision of capacity building mechanisms need to be emphasized. Formal justice systems should be proposed and used as last resort. To reduce the potential for conflicts and minimize the likely risk of the project, due attention should be given to active involvement of the community. In case grievances arise, traditional conflict resolution systems of the community need to be used so as to meet the objectives of OP4.10 and OP4.12.

3.6 Capacity Building

As indicated in the RPLRP appraisal document, the program, through the capacity building component, will provide support to strengthen both staff and institutional capacity of the executing agency at all levels in targeted pastoral and agro-pastoral areas. It aims to provide

investment funds, besides community contribution, to build infrastructures and improve services delivery for the target communities.

To enhance the successful implementation of the project, RPLRP will build community institutions, which will engage in planning, resource mobilization and implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project activities. The project will undertake capacity building activities which include market management, local utilization of National Marketing Information Systems (MIS), early warning and response as well as use of office equipment and other facilities.

Above and beyond, the project also aims at capacity building of other stakeholders (auctioneers managing auction rings, traders, exporters, and so on) to support the livestock value-chain and MIS. To strengthen knowledge generation and exchange capacity building of relevant stakeholders, the agro-pastoral field schools (APFS) will be addressed.

RPLRP will support government institutions and staff to improve their implementation, monitoring and evaluation capacity of the project. Thus, capacity building will be provided to all stakeholders (government staff, veterinarians) to create awareness and disseminate information on policy harmonization and national legislations. Technical Committees (TC) will be established to provide technical support to the SCs, PCUs and implementing agencies. The TCs will support in technical backstopping for and supervision of lower levels; coordinate the project implementation within their respective institutions (including institutional capacity building as appropriate), and provide advice to steering committees on project activities and produce reports on implementation progress.

RPLRP will invest in capacity building to assist in implementation of participatory planning through participatory approaches of the local community (participatory rapid assessment, development of community development plans, and so on). Capacity building activities in planning, monitoring, evaluation and learning systems as well in knowledge management and communication strategy will be set to strengthen the national public institutions at all levels.

These capacity building activities must be strengthened and delivered to the right and responsible bodies who will actively take part in project planning, implementation, monitoring and

evaluation. Given the weak capacity of implementing agents at all levels, institutional capacity building through training and equipping with required materials is crucial for the successful implementation of the project and provision of better services to the pastoral and agro-pastoral people. Establishment of TC, SCs, PCUs, and Kebele level community implementing committee (KDC) and their training for the successful planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project activities will be mandatory.

3.7 Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement

Land in pastoral and agro-pastoral ethnic groups is a crucial resource. Land particularly grazing land, as stated above, was mainly a common property of the ethnic groups. As discussed above, most of the land, particularly grazing and forest land in pastoral and agro-pastoral areas was communal. This grazing land can be used by all ethnic groups residing in the respective *Woredas*. The pastoralists and agro-pastoralists graze their animals in distant areas in community communal land. Adults and energetic members keep animals taking them in areas where pasture is available.

During community consultations, FGD discussions, and key informant interviews, land acquisition for the construction of small dams and market centers was discussed. In addition, Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) was also introduced, but detailed discussion with the community was not made because participants did not raised any issues for further discussion and provided comments for inclusion during the discussion. Generally during the discussion, the community indicated that land could be acquired through discussion and consultation with community elders, *ugas/ sultan* and clan leaders in Somali, and *balabat* in SNNPR pastoralist, and clan leader/ sultan in Afar. In addition, government officials who are highly recognized and accepted by the local pastoralist community should also take part during the discussion. These main actors need to be consulted, and in the process, the community should be consulted and discussion should be made to access land for RPLRP. The ideas of the important personalities are accepted and respected by community members as they are key actors in the social, political, economic, and spiritual life of the ethnic group.

According to government key informants, there will not be additional cost that the project will incur during project implementation to get land for its activities like market center development, water development, small scale irrigation, etc, as explained based on past experiences on the

implementation of PCDP II. The participants, during community consultation, also indicated that they would be ready to make available land for RPLRP because the objective of the project was in their best interest and will solve their major economic challenges. One of my community key informants, aged 70, in SNNPR, indicated that at any project implementation the community must be first informed and made aware of the benefits, the amount of land needed, and the impact on their life (positive and negative) of the activity that will be implemented. If the community is pre-informed at each phase and/ or activities, no objection will arise as long as the project serves their best interests.

The SA result revealed that the tendency of RPLRP to result in involuntary resettlement, in all areas under assessment was nil. Pastoral and agro-pastoral communities have ample communal grazing land. As long as the project is implemented in consultation with community members, the possibility of inducing involuntary resettlement will not be there. Most pastoral and agro-pastoral communities had extra land around their residence areas that they previously used for common grazing which is currently left open due to shortage of rain and water. As a result, such areas which were not inhabited by people can be used in consultation with the community for rangeland management, and any other project activities.

However, unless careful attention is paid during selection of beneficiary Kebeles and in project implementation, involuntary migration of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities may arise intent on using the infrastructure developed by the project. This may result in case some project beneficiaries get well-developed water resources whilst other neighboring Kebeles do not. Under such conditions, those pastoral and agro-pastoral communities who face shortage of water will automatically migrate to the benefited project areas to share the water. The obvious reality is that pastoralists and agro-pastoralists move from one area to another mainly in search of water and pasture for their animal. Thus, as long as there is shortage of water in some areas but abundance in project areas, the migration of people will be inevitable, which may result in overcrowding of livestock, and then, conflict.

3.8 Participation of Pastoral and Agro-pastoral Communities During RPLRP Implementation

The underserved people rather than mere beneficiaries of the projects, tend to take part in development endeavors taking place in their locality. For instance, key informants and

discussants pointed out that they actively participated in both identification and decision making during project implementation of PCDP. Community members were among members of the project implementation unit in PCDP I and II. This clearly indicates that the involvement of the pastoral and agro-pastoral people as part of project implementation unit in their locality was high. However, effective and intensive involvement of the underserved people requires initiation, continuous awareness raising, sensitization, and follow up.

There was a tendency of the local communities to focus on their own personal/ communal affairs and give more time for these concerns. The underserved people show reluctance to take government projects seriously because they are more absorbed in their day-to-day and routine activities. Thus, strong follow up and establishment of strong KDC would be mandatory. Short and long term trainings need to be arranged for the underserved people to change their attitude towards the project and develop a sense of ownership.

3.9 The contribution of RPLRP for Underserved Groups

In light of the pressing problems pointed out by the pastoral people the project has huge benefit for the local people. It will curb the main challenges of the pastoral and agro-pastoral communities such as lack of diversified livelihood activities, shortage of fodder, lack of market centers, natural resource degradation, animal health disease, etc. Besides, the project will expand trade both nationally and across-boarder which will enhance income generating capacity of the people and promote peace and security.

There are some basic social services institutions such as education, health, water points, etc, in pastoral and agro-pastoral areas under study. These infrastructures were built in the *Woredas* both by governmental and nongovernmental organizations. Compared with the size of the population and geographical coverage, these services are insufficient and ill equipped. FGD discussants and key informants indicated that most of animal and human health centers and schools lack man power that will provide the necessary services needed by pastoral and agro-pastoral communities. However, access to these institutions by the local communities was limited because of a number of factors such as distance, scattered settlement patterns of the population, low awareness level of the people, and some cultural influences such as belief in

sorcery. Thus, underserved communities have low access to education, health care, and water. The number of social service centers and their coverage in percent is given in the table below.

Even though the *Woredas* under study have a small number of social service institutions, the existing institutions have a lot of contribution to the pastoral and agro-pastoral communities. As a result of the availability of these institutions, there is some improvement in the health condition of the people, livestock health, children able to attend schools, communities able to access agricultural extension services (in some areas), some people (though not households in the *Woredas*) were able to get potable water, etc. thus, RPLRP should work in collaboration with other NGOs in each *woreda* through identifying their specific roles. Those NGOs which work to alleviate the main challenges of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities, in areas of animal and human health center building, school construction and maintenance, water development, etc should be encouraged and assisted.

Table 1: Basic Social Services in study Woredas

No	Region	Woreda	Type and Number of Social Services														
			Human Health			Animal Health			Schools				Water Points				
			Health Post	Health Center	Coverage	Health Post	Health Centers	Coverage	First cycle	Second cycle	Secondary and High School	Coverage	Hand Dung Well	Shallow Well	Deep Well	Roof Catchment	Coverage
1	SNNPR	Surma	11	3	51%	10	1	-	7	3	1	-	6	3	0	1	-
		Hammar	35	3	75%	18	-	-	25	15	1	-	8	14	0	14	-
		Nyagatom	20	1	70%	11	1	-	13	5	1	97%	-	1	0	17	24%
2	Afar	Afambo	8	2	-	20	1	45.6%	13	3	0	31.8%	17	0	0	0	-
3	Oromia	Teltelle	22	6	75%	7	1	53.3%	18	23	4	80.7%	74	35	21	4	59%
4	Somali	Moyale	29	4	78%	14	0	45%	17	32	2	92%	13	0	18	30	32%

Note: the dash ‘-’ indicates lack of data in the woredas.

Source: *Compiled from Each Woreda Health, Water, and Education Offices, 2012/13.*

As indicated in community consultations, RPLRP was welcomed wholeheartedly in all regions under study. Community members expressed their interest to cooperate and participate actively during its implementation, which can be hoped to increase production and productivity of the people. The SA findings revealed that RPLRP will not result in loss of traditional land use systems of the pastoral and agro-pastoral communities as a source of livelihood and as a basis for their cultural and social system or identity. In addition, there was no tendency at all of RPLRP to cause involuntary resettlement.

All components and sub-components of the project are suitable to the local needs of the community under investigation. However, as indicated above, RPLRP should seek and enhance the active participation of underserved groups for its effective and successful implementation. If implemented in such way, RPLRP will respect the rights, dignity, and culture of these people and offer them equal or better opportunities to reap from the various benefits offered by the project.

3.10 Anticipated Risks and Mitigation Measures

This section discusses the potential positive and negative impacts of the project on pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in the study sites.

3.10.1 Impacts and Social Risk Assessment

RPLRP is designed by the MoA to be implemented in the remote pastoral and agro-pastoral areas of Ethiopia where the way of life involves trans-human and livestock mobility in search of pasture and water for their animals. With a dire consequence for humans and animals, the productivity of the rangelands is declining due to recurrent droughts, population pressure, poor herd and land management practices. The decline in productivity of range lands and the existence of large stocks of animals as a result of the culture of the communities necessitates long distance travel to sell livestock. In previous times, the pastoral and agro-pastoral communities did not have the tradition of selling their livestock, which they considered assets and status and prestige symbols.

The pastoral and agro-pastoral area is highly conflict prone due to movement of the community in search of water and grazing land. Key informants and FGD discussants indicated that there was frequent conflict among the different ethnic groups as a result of competition over resources. Pastoralists have built boundaries among themselves and developed a sense of identity to the land they used. Thus, there were identification labels -*Nyagatom's*, *Borena's land*, *Surma's land*, *Hammar's land*, and so on, and crossing the physical boundary (sometimes ideal boundary) by one ethnic group to graze cattle led to intense conflict. In addition to conflict due to resources, there were killings of people by some adults and youngsters among pastoralists for the sake of pride and symbolism of bravery. These conflicts led to blood feud among pastoral and agro-pastoral communities that deterred and impacted the cross-boundary transaction and trading of one pastoral group with the other.

In SNNPR, particularly in *Surma Woreda*, the prevalence of wildfire was common during winter season. As an adaptive strategy the pastoralists were practicing letting grass grow for their livestock at some point. The pastoral communities ignited wildfire to burn bushes and shrubs so that at a later period new pasture grass could grow for their livestock. Such an act led to damage of forests and rangelands in the area which would affect the implementation of one component of RPLRP, that is, NRM.

The other source of risk might be limited to institutional and implementation capacity of government staff particularly at zone and *Woreda* levels in all regions. The capacity and

experience of government officials at zonal and *Woreda* levels to coordinate, monitor, and evaluate RPLRP is weak. In addition, at *Woreda* level, there was a high rate of staff turnover due to low wages of government civil servants. There is also risk due to the remoteness of most of the Kebeles and lack of well-built roads, close supervision, control, and, hence, provision of technical support would be difficult to project beneficiaries. Looking at service delivery of staff, there was undeveloped extension service and unwillingness of the pastoral communities to accept the advice of extension workers. Extension services in pastoral areas were found to be very weak and ineffective to address pastoral ways of life.

Microfinance and credit programs were weak in pastoral and agro-pastoral areas. There was only one microfinance institution in the study area in SNNPR. Therefore, the absence of and limited access to financial and credit institutions will be another risk factor for RPLRP. There was a shortage of financial and credit giving institutions in pastoral and agro-pastoral communities. The only functioning microfinance in the area was *Omo* Microfinance. As a result, access to financial and credit services was limited in the area and even the existing services were often not appropriate to the pastoralist contexts.

Gender inequality can also be the last, but not least, factor which can deter the equal participation of men and women. Male and female members of the community had varied gender roles that affected their relationships. Usually women were responsible to feed the HH members. The males did not have such a significant role to play in feeding the HH members because they assumed that they married the wife paying a high bride wealth. Such thinking led girls to be considered as wealth, to stay at home, and be subordinate to their husbands. Their participation in project implementation might consequently be very low.

Rapid expansion of *Prosopis* in Afar and some parts of *Nyagatom* in SNNPR and bushes encroachment in *Borena* will have greater impact on RPLRP. The NRM component of the project could be impacted unless systems to curb the encroachment of *Prosopis* and bushes are established. These two plants did not allow grasses to grow under their shades and had high impact on livestock population. In addition, these plants were not consumed by cattle and the throne is toxic. They also caused injuries to livestock with their thorns and damaged pasture

land. Besides, *Prosopis* and bushes had the capacity to destroy local trees forcing them to dry through overusing nutrients and growing dense.

3.10.2 Mitigation Measures/ Strategies

The critical point is that RPLRP will not negatively impact the pastoral way of life of the people in the study areas. Basically, the project should promote the pastoral tradition, rather than destroy it. The project should understand the patterns of transhumance and livestock mobility of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists in Ethiopia, specifically, their seasonal migration with their livestock (sheep, goats, and other livestock) in search of pasture as a survival strategy. RPLRP will alleviate the risks associated with transhumance and livestock mobility starting from project implementation with community consultation so as to map the human and livestock mobility, and thus, develop well a planned spatial development of water infrastructures and rangeland management interventions.

Recurrent conflict between ethnic groups over the use of resources mainly water and grazing land is a common phenomenon in most areas under study. It was discovered that the communities use customary ways of conflict resolution to assure stability. Besides, there are formal government structures in place. The regional government and MoA should work towards enhancing peaceful and harmonious interethnic relationship. Under the RPLRP, efforts will be made to minimize conflicts through facilitating discussion between ethnic groups and supporting forum and workshops that promote cross-*woreda* and trans-boundary peaceful and harmonious relationship. Promoting interethnic forum and trans-boundary trade will enhance social bondage and minimize conflict between ethnic groups. In addition, RPLRP, through its investments in water and rangeland development, market and trade, etc, should create economic and social ties. There should be continuous awareness raising sessions during project implementation phase.

The practice of starting wildfire as a strategy to make pasture/ grass grow for animals should be controlled and/or applied using scientific principles. RPLRP should encourage the application of scientific methods and sometimes control of wildfire through awareness raising sessions to burn grasslands through a controlled system. The risk will also be mitigated through delineating the forest areas from bush and grasslands that the community will use as rangelands.

RPLRP has to provide culturally appropriate capacity building opportunities and strengthen institutional capacities of implementing organizations. These organizations are active participants during project implementation and they should be well equipped with the necessary project implementation strategies such as participatory approaches. Besides, building staff capacity through training, as well as provision of incentives for government staff who will be involved actively in the implementation of RPLRP need to be emphasized. Furthermore, implementation at the local level should be assisted by active technical support mobile support teams.

In case of access to microfinance and credit institutions, not only shortage but lack of interest of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities to use them is highly evident. The communities did not have the experience and the tradition of using microfinance and credit institutions. To address this situation, the project should first put in place an awareness raising session in all selected kebeles to inform them of the importance and value of using these institutions. Furthermore, RPLRP will support the establishment of grass roots level financial institutions, that is, Pastoral Savings and Credit Cooperatives (PA-SACCOs) to encourage savings and help to create access to credit services for their activities thorough implementing carefully managed revolving funds.

Active participation in RPLRP of women as well as other vulnerable groups like female-headed households, poor families, PWD, the elderly, minorities and social outcasts, should be envisaged. Given the high prevalence of gender inequality in pastoral and agro-pastoral areas, unless special attention and focus is given to women, they may not reap benefits from strategies designed to help them. RPLRP consultation process will start through a participatory approach for social mapping to identify vulnerable segments of the communities and will find ways to benefit these groups of the community. Further, during the consultative process guiding principles to benefit vulnerable segments of the communities will be put in place to give priority to vulnerable groups identified.

Scientific ways to control rapid expansion of *Prosopis* and bushes should be designed. Some of the strategies to be used are controlled burning, processing and using of *Prosopis* seeds for livestock feed, using the plants to generate income for the local people (in the form of charcoal, firewood, and so on), continuous and sustainable clearing and using the area for farming, and the

like. In addition, other studies must be conducted to find ways for easy use and control of their expansion.

In the *Woredas* having national parks wild animal reserves such as Nyagatom, persuasions need to be taken. The SA result shows that the parks and animal reserve areas are away from residence areas and less likely to be affected by RPLRP. In case where RPLRP has the tendency to impact these areas, environmental impact assessment (EIA) should be conducted before the implementation of the project.

3.11 Potential RPLRP Implementation Risks, and Recommended Mitigation Measures

The table below summarizes potential risks and challenges and mitigation measures for RPLRP during its component by component implementation.

Components of RPLRP	Potential Risks and Challenges	Recommended Mitigation Measures
Component 1. <i>Natural Resources Management</i>	✓ The pattern of transhumance pastoralism or migration of humans and their livestock may lead to these underserved people not benefiting from the project.	✓ RPLRP will start with community consultation so as to map the human and livestock mobility, and thus, develop well planned spatial development of water infrastructures and rangeland management interventions
	✓ Weak extension service and unwillingness of the communities to accept the advice of extension workers	✓ RPLRP will provide culturally appropriate capacity building and technical assistance for extension workers and pastoral communities ✓ Also responsible government offices at all level will be equipped with the necessary office materials and equipment to enhance their capacity to effectively implement the work ✓ Project will strengthen existing traditional grievance redress mechanism and establish new ones if needed to enhance alternative dispute resolution process.

Components of RPLRP	Potential Risks and Challenges	Recommended Mitigation Measures
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Long tradition of the community members in setting wildfire and the uncontrolled spread of prosopis will reduce the income generating potentials of the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ RPLRP will emphasize the participatory rangeland management approach as a strategy to improve the utilization and management of rangelands. ✓ Also RPLRP will target awareness raising for pastoral and agro-pastoral communities ✓ Project will explore ways to control the spread of prosopis as well as how to use it to generate income.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Pressure on natural resources, particularly on grazing land and water that have trans-boundary implications may lead to resource use conflict which may create a climate of tension and may result in unwillingness of resource users to participate in the project. ✓ Strengthening stakeholders' capacities to manage shared or adjacent rangeland and the rehabilitation of rangeland that has trans-boundary implications could be triggered by inter-ethnic conflict 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ RPLRP will facilitate cross-border meetings to be attended by border officials (from Ethiopia and other countries) and land management experts ✓ Besides, RPLRP will facilitate discussions between ethnic group representatives (such as clan leaders/sultanates, <i>ugases</i>, <i>balabats</i>, kebele chairman, elders, etc) and promote peaceful and harmonious inter-ethnic and trans-boundary relations by supporting forum and workshops that promote inter-ethnic dialogue. ✓ Further, the project will support and strengthen forum at the zone level that will allow cross-Woreda communication and exchange of ideas among pastoral communities and support appropriate grievance redress mechanisms ✓ Project will undertake a careful conflict situation analysis to underpin the planning process and involve key stakeholders in each woreda in the planning process including using resource use mapping to show key infrastructure and boundaries and in agreement with all communities on the nature of inclusive use of infrastructure or natural resources.

Components of RPLRP	Potential Risks and Challenges	Recommended Mitigation Measures
Component 2. <i>Market Access and Trade</i>	✓ Cross-border trade might be deterred by the act of blood-feud among pastoral and agro-pastoral communities	✓ RPLRP will foster cross-border consultations in collaboration with IGAD and promote effective community participation during the construction of primary and secondary markets and benefit sharing arrangements. ✓ Also, the project will facilities using the <i>balabats, ugases</i> , sultanates/ clan leaders, and government bodies to discourage and stop blood feud through traditional systems and establishing the formal justice system
	✓ The tradition of keeping more livestock at their stock rather than selling some to get cash, and existence of poor culture of trans-boundary trade may affect cross-border value chain development	✓ RPLRP should emphasize awareness raising on the value of cash saving to enable the community to market their animals and animal products
	✓ Once markets are built, due to absence of the culture of trading in market centers in some pastoralist and agro-pastoralist communities, market center might be abandoned	✓ Areas where many pastoral and agro-pastoral communities presently reside should be selected for market establishment ✓ RPLRP will conduct continuous awareness raising and there must be introduction of market centers to the residents and neighboring areas including the market day ✓ The establishment of the market centers will be demand driven and site selection will be done with the participation of beneficiary communities.
Component 3. <i>Livelihoods Support</i>	✓ Pastoral and agro-pastoral communities have limited experience of using of improved technologies such as animal breeding and fodder feeding.	✓ The project will provide awareness raising for the local community to enhance their knowledge on the value and importance of modern animal breeding and improve animal feed management and

Components of RPLRP	Potential Risks and Challenges	Recommended Mitigation Measures
		<p>preparation</p> <p>✓ RPLRP design should include mechanisms to restock veterinary medicines/ vet centers that are currently existing but nonfunctional to improve livestock health and enhance productivity.</p>

Components of RPLRP	Potential Risks and Challenges	Recommended Mitigation Measures
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Community consultation, unless properly managed, might reinforce existing gender inequality and exclude women, children and people with disability, poor families, female headed households, epileptic individuals, and so on. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ RPLRP consultation process will start through a participatory approach for social mapping to identify vulnerable segments of the communities and find ways to provide project benefit to these groups ✓ Furthermore, during the consultative process it was indicated that to benefit the vulnerable segment of the communities, the project should develop an inclusive strategy for empowerment that will target the vulnerable segment of the participating communities. . ✓ RPLRP will arrange sensitization and training programs for the community on gender equality and the rights of women and children ✓ Projects will provide equal technical opportunities at the local level that would enable both men and women to benefit equally in the project, including from financial support opportunities or special programs or opportunities as presented by the project as well as from organizational opportunities for women to participate in subproject decision making, in addition to providing culturally appropriate training and participatory monitoring and evaluation systems for them

Components of RPLRP	Potential Risks and Challenges	Recommended Mitigation Measures
	✓ Afar, Somali, and some part of <i>Borena</i> pastoralists are predominantly Muslim and according to relevant precepts, the community might not be able to participate and involve in loan services, that may affect the success of SACCOs	✓ In predominantly Muslim areas, in consultation with the community, an appropriate financial circulation system should be introduced. That is, instead of interest rate, using other systems like service charge, etc, is better because the Muslim communities, due to their religion, do not want any payment of interest.
	✓ Absence of and limited access to the exiting financial and credit institutions (the only functioning grass root level financial institution is Omo Microfinance)	✓ The RPLRP will support the establishment of grassroots level financial institutions, that is, Pastoral Savings and Credit Cooperatives (PA-SACCOs) to encourage saving and help access to credit facilities to run their business ✓ Besides, to help cooperatives in financing their activities, RPLRP will establish a revolving fund arrangement.
Component 4. <i>Pastoral Disaster Risk Management</i>	✓ Low capacity of government staff (most of the staff at <i>Woreda</i> level are diploma holders and certificate-level graduates).and may not come from the project area.	✓ RPLRP will provide technical support and culturally appropriate capacity building to enhance implementation capacity at all levels ✓ Also provide training of trainers (TOT) on disaster risk management related key guidelines and standards such as the Livestock Emergency Guidelines Standards (LEGS) ✓ Project will provide equal opportunity through training and hiring of local staff to assist these underserved groups to preserve their culture and livelihood.

Components of RPLRP	Potential Risks and Challenges	Recommended Mitigation Measures
Component 5. <i>Project Management and Institutional Support</i>	✓ Limited implementation experience of the RPLRP staff members (at regional and woreda level) in implementing, supervising and coordinating projects	✓ RPLRP will establish i) a functional project management and coordination structures; (ii) Integrated planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, Learning (PMEL) system, (iii) integrated knowledge management and communication system; ✓ Introducing and setting effective and efficient financial management, auditing and procurement systems ✓ Design and provide appropriate capacity building for staff at all levels in project planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation ✓ At federal and regional levels, RPLRP will put in place continuous monitoring and follow up, and appropriate reporting systems

References

- World Bank. 2013. Review and Update of the World Bank Safeguard Policies: Objectives and Scope. Retrieved on August 01, 2013 from <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/PROJECTS/EXTPOLICIES/EXTSAFEPOL/0,,contentMDK:23277451~pagePK:64168445~piPK:64168309~theSitePK:584435,00.html>
- FDRE. 1994. The Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.
- Chambers, R. and Conway, G. (1991). *Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century*. Retrieved February 3, 2010, from <http://www.smallstock.info/reference/IDS/dp296>
- CSA. 2007. National Housing and Population Survey. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Economic Commission for Europe. (2004). *Guidelines on Real Property Units and Identifiers*. New York and Geneva: United Nations.
- FAO. (2004). What is Gender?: *Building on Gender, Agro-biodiversity and Local Knowledge*. Retrieved from www.fao.org/sd/links on August 30, 2011.
- Haviland, William. Prins, Harald. Walrath, Dana and McBride, Bunny. (2006). *Cultural Anthropology: The Human Challenge*. New York: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Ministry of Agriculture. 2013. Regional Pastoral Livelihoods Resilience Project (RPLRP) Ethiopia Country Project Document (CPD). Draft for Appraisal. Ethiopia, Addis Ababa.
- Sandra, Steingraber. 2010. Resettlement and Commune Program - Tools of Militarization in SW Ethiopia. Retrieved on August 07/2013 from <http://www.culturalsurvival.org/ourpublications/csqa/article/resettlement-and-Commune-Program-tools-militarization-sw-ethiopia#sthash.2Qhmx9ZB.dpuf>
- The Sociology of Gender. (2008). *Theoretical Perspectives and the Feminist Frameworks*. New York: McMillan Publication.

UNDP. 1996. United Nations Development Programme Emergencies Unit for Ethiopia. Field Trip to *Borena* Zone of the Oromiya Region. Retrieved from http://www.africa.upenn.edu/eue_web/Borena96mar.htm.

Annex 1: Interview and Discussion Guidelines and Observation Checklists for Social Assessment (SA)

1. What are the livelihood activities that the community carries out to make a living?
2. Is there difference in the role that men and women at home and in the economic activities?
3. In the household, who have the right to own land?
4. Do women have culturally the right to save money?
5. Do women sell household products by their own decision?
6. Do both women and men have equal access to resources and services? If women have differential (low) access to resources compared with men, why? Are there cultural factors affecting women's access?
7. What do suggest for improving the participation of women in leadership and community participation?
8. Are there vulnerable nations, nationalities and peoples, and other vulnerable and marginalized groups in the project areas?
 - a. Do specific groups (minorities, women, FHHs, youth) are likely to lose-out from specific types of development in pastoral and agro-pastoral areas?
 - b. How will, for example, the introduction of modern irrigation affect the poorest and landless?
9. Are there religious and/or ethnic biases (if any) against the vulnerable nations by the dominant groups within a *Woreda*, and the subsequent relationship as a result of these biases?
10. What are the types of land tenure? What is the status of land use and the status of land tenure systems? How is the use of natural resources?
11. Where there have been resettlement programs (previous or currently on going)? If so, what are the impact of resettlement:
 - a. on the dynamics of change on the social networks and community relationships and
 - b. On the livelihood and economic wellbeing of resettled and host community households.
12. Are there physical cultural resources in the community? If so,
 - a. The name, type, age, ownership, short description of the cultural resource, etc
 - b. What is the nature and extent of potential impacts on these resources (this should include locally recognized sacred and religious place
 - c. How will it be monitored, and managed?
13. Are there micro-credit programs? If so? What was their experience in the project in terms of their cultural appropriateness? Are they accessible to vulnerable nations, nationalities and people as well as other vulnerable and marginal groups?
14. Is there social cohesion among pastoralist communities, and with other social groups? If no, why not?

15. What should government, donor and NGO support to community development and livelihood improvements in these areas?
16. Is there government's program of "Commune Program"? if so,
 - a. What is the impact of the Commune Program on the traditional and social organizations?
 - b. What are the most significant social and cultural features that differentiate social groups and does these differences will result in exclusion of vulnerable groups?
 - c. What are the social dynamics of the groups, their characteristics, intra- group and enter-group relationships, and the relationships of these groups with public and private (eg. Market) institutions (including the norms, values and behavior that have been institutionalized through those relationships)?
 - d. Are there opportunities and conditions for participation of stakeholders—particularly the poorest, women and vulnerable – in the development process (contributing in sub-project identification, implementation, and monitoring/evaluation)?
 - e. How was the consultative planning process applied by the government's social mobilization teams and the project Mobile Support Teams (MST) in the sub-project identification and implementation? How was the capacity and understanding of the MSTs of the consultative process in the "commune centers"
 - f. What is the impact of the newly settled on the host communities and confluence of large numbers of animals on natural resources?
 - g. What are the drivers of conflict and the influence the sub-projects may have on either exacerbating conflict and or creating cohesion within the communities
 - h. Are there institutions in the area; private and social institutions relevant to the operation?
 - i. What type of adverse social and economic impacts do the project will have in terms of Loss of cultivable land; Loss of traditional livelihood; and Loss of grazing land and other resources, such as water
 - j. How was the communities' awareness and understanding of the government's Commune Program program?

Observation Checklists

- A. Physical cultural heritages of the local community
- B. Living condition of the community and their livelihood activities
- C. Community based organizations like micro-financial institutions, etc

Annex 2: List of People Met during SA

No	Name	Region	Zone/ Woreda	Position	Cell Phone
1	Ato Mohamed Kedir Hassen	Afar	Afambo	Woreda Animal and plant control and Inspection Head and Woreda Agriculture Office Head Delegate	0911042695
2	Ato Habtamu Yimer	Afar	Regional Level	DRSLP Finance Head	—
3	Ato Ali Geda	Afar	Afambo	Woreda Finance Office head and Pastoral Development Office head delegate	—
4	Sheik Amin Kasadi	Afar	Afambo	Awsi Gani Association Chairman and Clan leader	—
4	Ato Girma Hagos	Afar	Afambo	Head of Solidarity for Integrated and Sustainable Development (SISD)	—
5	Ato Mekonen W/Gebriel	Afar	Regional Level	Afar Region DRSLP Coordinator	0911797219
6	Ato Abkiyo	Oromia	Teltele	Community Elder	—
7	Ato Melecha	Oromia	Regional Level	Oromia Pastoral Development Office Head	
7	Ato Tilahun Amare	Oromia	Teltele	Woreda Pastoralist Office Deputy Head	—
8	Ato Petros Wako	Oromia	Borena zone	Zone Agriculture and pastoral Development office Delegate	0921716568
9	Ato Mehmade Abdi	Somali	Moyale	Moyale Woreda Livestock, Crop and Rural Development Office Head	—
10	Ato Mahamed Me'alim Hassen	Somali	Moyale	Moyale Woreda Environment Protection Expert	0916325417
12	Ato Abera	SNNPR	Regional Level	Regional Pastoral development Bureau Head Delegate	0916851740
13	Ato Dawit kusie	SNNPR	Regional Level	Regional Pastoral development Bureau Head	
14	Ato Hutina Aere	SNNPR	Hammar	Woreda Vice Administrator	0913183626
15	Ato Feyisa Babore	SNNPR	Hammar	Woreda Early Warning Team Leader	0920113802
16	Ato Iko Gudre	SNNPR	South Omom Zone	South Omo Zone Pastoral Development office Head	0916030072
17	Dr. Seyfu	SNNPR	South Omom	Zone Agriculture Development	—

			Zone	Coordinator	
18	Ato Bharu Burji	SNNPR	Surma	Woreda Pastoral Development office Head and Woreda Vice Administration	–
19	Ato Barduda Olebusin	SNNPR	Surma	Woreda Administration	–
11	Ato Tesfay Addis	SNNPR	Surma	Woreda Infrastructure Development Officer	0917114881
20	Ato Abera Luperniyahi	SNNPR	Nyagatom	Woreda Security Head	0926162356
21	Ato Derejie Kapuwa	SNNPR	Nyagatom	Woreda Natural Resource Office Head and Delegate of Pastoral Development Office	–
22	Ato Iyasu Legrewi	SNNPR	Nyagatom	Woreda Health Office Head	–

Annex3: Number of Community Consultation meetings participants

No.	Region	Woreda	Participants		Total
			Male	Female	
1	SNNPR	Surma	72	63	135
		Hammar	43	32	75
		Nyagatom	72	18	90
2	Afar	Afambo	75	35	100
3	Oromia	Teltele	35	30	95
4	Somali	Moyale	62	23	85
Total			359	201	560

Annex 4: Sample List of Community Consultation Participants

Humedoyta kebele Administration

List of Community Consultation Participants in Afambo Woreda, Afar Region

No	Name	Age	Sex	Remark
1.	Hamza Rusae	65	M	
2.	Ashamin Kaza	56	M	
3.	Ali Mohammed Hashim	24	M	
4.	Ibrahim Kabir	54	M	
5.	Husen Abdulkadir	30	M	
6.	Burahaba Kama	21	M	
7.	Jilani Abdulkadir	38	M	
8.	Ayfarah Jawhar	20	M	
9.	Abdullahi Saad	19	M	
10.	Kabir Ridwan	40	M	
11.	Amru Asado	35	M	
12.	Kabir Muhidin	65	M	
13.	Ayfarah Burahaba	20	M	
14.	Kaji Kabir	21	M	
15.	Amru Hamza	38	M	
16.	Jubak Ibrahim	18	M	
17.	Abdo Hamza	23	M	
18.	Ali Saad	20	M	
19.	Hamza Sharif	30	M	
20.	Ridwan Aydor	31	M	
21.	Abdulkadir Mahmud	41	M	
22.	Kabir Asado	39	M	
23.	Abdulkadir Abdurazak	40	M	
24.	Muhidin Abdulkadir	33	M	
25.	Mohammed Burahaba	19	M	
26.	Ali Dawud	44	M	
27.	Ridwan Hamza	32	M	
28.	Saad Hassen	30	M	
29.	Jilani Saad	25	M	
30.	Saad Abdu	38	M	
31.	Aydor Macammed	43	M	
32.	Kadir Kutbi	30	M	
33.	Macamud Abdulkadir	31	M	
34.	Omer Abdulkadir	40	M	
35.	Macammed Sai	38	M	
36.	Macammed Abdulkadir	33	M	
37.	Kazali Hando	60	M	
38.	Ali Kabir	30	M	
39.	Omer Saad	28	M	

List of Community Consultation Participants in Afambo Woreda, Afar Region

No	Name	Age	Sex	Remark
1.	mohammed Ayerah	33	M	
2.	mohammed Abdu	20	"	
3.	Asefa Abdulkader	34	"	
4.	Ayfrak Abdu	30	"	
5.	Yacen Abdu	28	"	
6.	Hassen mohammed	41	"	
7.	Melif Humdi	50	"	
8.	Abdulkader Sedik	61	"	
9.	mohammed faber	70	"	
10.	Hamza Rufai	24	"	
11.	faber mohden	31	"	
12.	Aden duna	32	"	
13.	musssa Aden	30	"	
14.	Ali Abdel	39	"	
15.	Seli mohammed	20	"	
16.	Habib mehamed	21	"	
17.	Hamdin mohden	25	"	
18.	Ki Hamza	29	"	
19.	Abdulkadir Hamza	29	"	
20.	Ude Abdulkadir	30	"	
21.	Awol Ayfrak	40	"	
22.	Abdulkadir Mithumen	39	"	
23.	Kalob Osman	35	"	
24.	Abdulkadir Terib	36	"	
25.		34	"	
26.	Ali Hassen	32	"	
27.	Dawed Ki	39	"	
28.	Abdulkadir Omer	40	"	
29.	Mehamed Omed	42	"	
30.	Abdulkadir Omer	39	"	
31.		30	"	
32.	Hamedan Ki	33	"	
33.	Abdulkadir Ayfrak	34	"	
34.	Said Mohamed	29	"	
35.	Hassen Senu	23	"	
36.	Mohamed Sedik	41	"	

Hamadaya Kessale Administration

List of Community Consultation Participants in Afambo Woreda, Afar Region

No	Name	Age	Sex	Remark
37.	Hasna Sadore	38	F	
38.	Gisti mohammed	43	F	
39.	Zayneba macammed	45	F	
40.	Hasna Ayduris	25	F	
41.	Husena batah	28	F	
42.	Zaynu abdukkadir	18	F	
43.	Abahina Husen	19	F	
44.	Esie Menie	30	"	
45.	Fatie Estie	25	"	
46.	Mefamei Mohamed	31	"	
47.	Amina Sedika	36	"	
48.	Beini Yalete	33	"	
49.	Hadya Lake	23	"	
50.	Rujaie Mehani	30	"	
51.	Fatoma Mehamed	24	F	
52.	Amina bedir	38	F	
53.				
54.				
55.				
56.				
57.				
58.				
59.				
60.				
61.				
62.				
63.				
64.				
65.				
66.				
67.				
68.				
69.				
70.				
71.				
72.				
73.				
74.				

List of Community Consultation Participants in Moyale Woreda, Somali Region

No	Name	Age	Sex	Remark
37.	Alima Hassan	75	F	Chamur.
38.	Madara Shoramo	65	"	"
39.	Fade Eden	70	"	"
40.	Alima Mohammed	80	"	"
41.	Amarori Hassan	65	"	"
42.	Alima Aden	25	"	"
43.	Fatuma Ibrahim	36	"	"
44.	Kadija Eden	30	"	"
45.	Nadifo Mohammed	30	"	"
46.	Adori Ibrahim	25	"	"
47.	Muna Ilo yi	38	"	"
48.	Fady Hassan	55	"	"
49.	Faduma Ali	50	"	"
50.	Ado yi Hassan	30	"	"
51.	Habiba Dula	50		male
52.	Yare Hupa	100		"
53.	Sharu Hassan	25		"
54.	Abdiye Shabbe	20		"
55.	Alima Abdi	21		"
56.	Duba Malabdi	36		"
57.	Maqaye Wariyo	56		"
58.	Sadiya Abdi	37		"
59.	Kadija Salat	30		"
60.	Kadija Eden	30		"
61.	Shaga Abdullehi	25		"
62.	Samay Mohamed	30		"
63.	Amira Eden	37		"

List of Community Consultation Participants in Moyale Woreda, Somali Region

No	Name	Age	Sex	Remark
1.	Dedina Abdi	40	m	Chamuk Kebele
2.	Ibrahim Huka	60	"	"
3.	Adam Ibrahim	50	"	"
4.	Hasan Issa	25	"	"
5.	Ali Mohammed	22	"	"
6.	Abdi Edi	49	"	"
7.	Isak Hero	23	"	"
8.	Ibrahim Ada	23	"	"
9.	Hussen Gero	30	"	"
10.	Moga Konsole	32	"	"
11.	Ali Abdurahman	26	"	"
12.	Omar Ali	26	"	"
13.	Abdi Mohammed	26	"	"
14.	Suleman Isak	53	"	"
15.	Ali Adio	20	"	"
16.	Adan Nuro	40	"	"
17.	Mohammed Issa	58	"	"
18.	Adan Ibrahim	30	"	weleb
19.	Mohammed Edin	23	"	"
20.	Ali Mellin	39	"	"
21.	Hasan Abdullah	38	"	"
22.	Edin Hassan	37	"	"
23.	Adan Muro	30	"	"
24.	Hasa Abdurah	25	"	"
25.	Aliyo Arari	60	"	"
26.	Abdul Ahmed	70	"	"
27.	Abdikadir Malm Ibrahim	43	"	"
28.	Abdi Issak	40	"	"
29.	Ali Habiha	80	"	"
30.	Hasan Kula	56	"	"
31.	Ibrahim Abdullahi	40	"	"
32.	Issak Aden	36	"	"
33.	Ibrahim Eden	34	"	"
34.	Mohammed Ibrahim	34	"	"
35.				
36.				

List of Community Consultation Participants in Moyale Woreda, Somali Region

No	Name	Age	Sex	Remark
37.	faduma Huko	22	F	Malab
38.	Abi Adan	30	"	"
39.	Dahabo Zashir	28	"	"
40.	Habiba Abdur	30	"	"
41.	Farima Edin	30	"	"
42.	Dunira Abdur	30	"	"
43.	Asili Issak	25	"	"
44.	Hammadi Aliyo	20	"	"
45.	Safiya Dubi	20	"	"
46.	Alima Usma	60	"	"
47.	Shale 110 Aliyo	50	"	"
48.	Sadiya Hassan	20	"	"
49.	Adoyi Abdullahi	30	"	"
50.	Nuri Ahmed	34	"	"
51.	Dahabo Abdinasir	26	"	"
52.				
53.				
54.				
55.				
56.				
57.				
58.				
59.				
60.				
61.				
62.				
63.				

List of Community Consultation Participants in Teltele Woreda, Oromia Region

No	Name	Age	Sex	Remark
1.	Guracha Boru	75	M	
2.	Sarba Nura	45	M	
3.	Golliche Guyo	25	M	
4.	Guyyo Galgalo	71	M	
5.	Abkiyyo Sharif	60	M	
6.	Kararsa Gojjo	40	M	
7.	Wariyo Godana	90	M	
8.	Roba Galgaloo	70	M	
9.	Guyo Suko	36	M	
10.	Duga Wako	20	M	
11.	Galma Elema	31	M	
12.	Shame Katela	35	M	
13.	Hachune Ashena	27	M	
14.	Kasahun Mekuriya	30	M	
15.	Haru Jataai	30	M	
16.	Jadi Gane	90	M	
17.	Barako Jilo	35	M	XX
18.	Dolo Boru	46	M	
19.	Jarso Guyo	47	M	
20.	Shada Abakedo	45	M	
21.	Kanchora Dalaydo	46	M	
22.	Galgalo Elema	25	M	
23.	Debaro Bonaya	70	M	
24.	Dida Kadp	60	M	
25.	Wamo Cheha	80	M	
26.	Dida Kanashe	88	M	
27.	Murru Dalayi	50	M	
28.	Usman Jirinu	30	M	
29.	Jarso Jilo	65	M	
30.	Boru Sora	32	M	
31.	Haridofa Kilato	28	M	
32.	Dida Moku	30	M	
33.	Dida Doti	90	M	
34.	Badhane Sora	50	M	
35.	Kuli Guyyo	52	M	
36.				

List of Community Consultation Participants in Nygnagatom Woreda, SNNPR

No	Name	Age	Sex	Remark
1.	NADO AYUBOY	40	M	
2.	LORENZO ELEM	50	M	
3.	LOPodo lopINAT	38	M	
4.	LOKAY lopoda	55	M	
5.	AMBASSA KURAZ	45	M	
6.	LOSURU ETUKO	35	M	
7.	LONGOKO LOTIBU	20	M	
8.	LOKARA EREMAN	20	M	
9.	LOTORIO LOKUAT	15	M	
10.	LOKOM MOROTO	45	M	
11.	LOKITELO LOKALE	50	M	
12.	LOJIME AMERIS	25	M	
13.	LOGNOSIYA EKURU	19	M	
14.	KUTELE LOKURU	18	M	
15.	LOTAK LOPEYOK	20	M	
16.	LOKUMMA LOSIKIRIA	16	M	
17.	LORICHA LOKALE	15	M	
18.	SALUME LODIKTO	18	M	
19.	LOKAY LOCHAM	12	M	
20.	NATOMEY LOCHAM	19	M	
21.	LOTUMUSEY ANAMUYA	40	M	
22.	LOKOLONGO LOKURUKA	45	M	
23.	AYUBOY ANGELA	46	M	
24.	LOKALE lopoda	50	M	
25.	LOTORIO LODIKTO	36	M	
26.	NADIYEABUS	26	M	
27.	LOBENGO BATAHA	16	M	
28.	LOBIE EKENO	27	M	
29.	EKENO LOKALE	18	M	
30.	LOMOY EDOME	15	M	
31.	LONGOKO LOKORE	14	M	
32.	LOSENG KURAZ	25	M	
33.	LOCHOMEN LOJERE	30	M	
34.	LOSIKIRIA ADUNGURU	40	M	
35.	LOCHERE ARUBOY	26	M	
36.	MABUR LOSILIMA	60	M	

List of Community Consultation Participants in Nygnagatom Woreda, SNNPR

No	Name	Age	Sex	Remark
37.	LOTABO LODIKIO	20	M	
38.	LOLILSA LOKAPITEY	26	M	
39.	PETER LONGECH	16	M	
40.	ENOK EKURU	17	M	
41.	ALINGA HOJERE	18	M	
42.	KAKELAY LOCHILIA	40	M	
43.	ALEMAN HODWOS	25	M	
44.	LOKALE NAKORA	16	M	
45.	NAPET HOTURUKUANA	17	M	
46.	NAGILAY LOBUN	26	M	
47.	NABUTURU NAPEKALE	19	M	
48.	ARO LOKOM	27	M	
49.	ENGIRO ASEWUNYA	38	M	
50.	NAMARIKO HOBUTEY	40	M	
51.	DEYE LOBOTIKOL	28	M	
52.	LOKULAN ESINGEN	26	M	
53.	NAKOM LOTUKOY	27	M	
54.	NATOGO ALINGA	28	M	
55.	NABUKE MACHER	26	M	
56.	NATABO MACHAR	16	M	
57.	LOGE AYUBOY	18	M	
58.	NADIKSO LOGILAY	23	M	
59.				
60.				
61.				
62.				
63.				
64.				
65.				
66.				
67.				
68.				
69.				
70.				
71.				
72.				

List of Community Consultation Participants in Nygnagatom Woreda, SNNPR

No	Name	Age	Sex	Remark
1.	ሐጋርሐጋር ንጋር		♂	
2.	ኔባት ሐይቃዐን		♂	
3.	ሐሉዝ ሐሙዲ		♂	
4.	፲፯ ነጋር		♂	
5.	ክንፍ ሐደርቱ		♂	
6.	ኤጌደሻ ፍጥ		♂	
7.	ሐዋ ሐሃሌ		♂	
8.	ሐሃዝ ሐሃዲራ		♂	
9.	ሐሃዝ ሐቻይ		♂	
10.	ሐገረ አቲክ		♂	
11.	ሐጋገን ንጋር		♂	
12.	ጌቴ ሐሃዳ		♂	
13.	አሳከን ኔባት		♂	
14.	ናጌይ አዲሴ		♂	
15.	ናፍንገ ሐገሪ		♂	
16.	ገተረ ነጋር		♂	
17.	አሳንድ ነጋር		♂	
18.	ሐጋደጋ ሐገሪ		♂	
19.	ሐሳንገላ ደደዖ		♂	
20.	ወሐቲ ሐሃዲደደደ		♂	
21.	፯፻፳ ሐሃዝ		♂	
22.	ናገሪ ሐሐደ		♂	
23.	ናዋላዳ ሐገሪዳ		♂	
24.	ናዋሪላዳ ፑሎ		♂	
25.	ኔጋር አሳከን		♂	
26.	ሐገሪ አዲሴ		♂	
27.	ናገሪ ሚሪ		♂	
28.	ናገሪ አዲሴ		♂	
29.	ክላንጋ አፑላ		♂	
30.	አሰላ ገላከን		♂	
31.	ሐገሪደደደ አዲሴ		♂	
32.				
33.				
34.				
35.				
36.				

25/04/08

page 1

Idole lebe community consultation
participants (ccp)

No.	Name	Age	Sex	Status	Signature
1	Barkoro				
1.1	Tenikoro Chetutula	45	F	Elder	
2.1	Namuni Olebuseni	40	F	Elder	
3.1	Nakolobay Olechaga	45	F	Elder	
4	Alonquni Olesurati	60	F	Elder	
5	Namuguni Oleqolequni	40	F	Young	
6	Naragay Chermora	35	f	cc	
7	Neseroti Oletula	25	F	cc	
8	Nabapu Chermora	18	F	cc	
9	Nepokula Olekoro	40	F	Elder	
10	Naduo Oletula	50	F	Elder	
11	Nababu Olebuseni	45	F		
12	Natu Bolekoro	15	F		
13	Nadi Olekoro	12	F		
14	Nafala Birin	20	F		
15	Nadosa Zogé	50	F		
16	Naboheshih Uniyó	30	F		
17	Nakaka Olechaga	40	F		
18	Nakosino Oleqolequni	30	F		
19	Nasade Olekore	15	F		
20	Natuto Nealueni	50	F		
21	Nackurlishi Rampuyo	40	F		
22	Naadogibi d. Dolo	35	F		
23	Naadakali Olechaga	10	F		
24	Naamugiya Arsikibo	30	F		
25	Nachobosa Oligidengé	40	F		
26	Nagoyine Mlelelubo	30	F		
27	Naasade Olekoro	30	F		
28	Naangasin Olebuseni	15	F		
29	Noole Nulikori	12	F		
30	Naggu Banbu	25	F		

25/04/063, 10

fidole keble Community Consultati on.

Participant

No.	Name	A	Age	Sex	Status	Signature
31	- Alagoyine Olikoro	20		Female	Young	
32	- Maasede Sogoto	20		"	"	
33	Maaluguro Oletula	20		"	"	
34	Maasuni Barshay	20		"	"	
35	Maamuroy Oligidangi	15		"	"	
36	Maakera Dene	50			Elder	
37	Maakunay Olikoro	45		"	Elder	
38	Maqanin Mele	40		"	Elder	
39	Maakogini Banbu	20		"	Young	
40	Maasede Oletula	16		"	Young	
41	Maatogi Gnakeke	48		"	Elder	
42	Maakodochinyi Olikori	45		"		
43	Maabolochichi Dhamura	40		"		
44	Maadukuba Olekibo	32		"		
45	Maarewo Olekoro	50		"		
46	Maabongwe Marekoro	56		"		
47	Maabume Olekibo	22		"		
48	Maagu Olechaghi	43		"		
49	Maadeholi Sabakana	40		"		
50	Maadara Olesurui	16		"		
51	Maakomoni Olechaghi	19		"		
52	Maakierleshi Barjoi	40		"		

pedola kebele Community consultation
participant (CCP)

No.	Name	Age	Sex	Status	Signature
1.	Gomay Dere	40	M		
2.	Olechari Darseli	56	M	elder old	
3.	Olekoro Kaberchici	46	M		
4.	Jeunte Formutafa	50	M	elder old	
5.	Olignaqidang Baraq aguu	46	M		
6.	Bargaba Buegoni	46	M		
7.	Betula Zogi	45	M		
8.	Olibuseni Dere	50	M	elder old	
9.	Barkotu Olenege	20	Young		
10.	Barbenti Olenege	16	Young		
11.	Kibish Olibidanz	16	Young		
12.	Olegotegai Ele	30	Young		
13.	Olekibo Banbu	15	Young		
14.	Gomay Dere	40	Young		

2010/06/06 3:00 EGP - participants (Choyi kebele)

<u>Name</u>	<u>kebele</u>	<u>AGE</u>	<u>SEX</u>
1. አልገንግ : ለገሰ	ገንግ	45	F
2. ያኩርጽላ : ለጽጋ	ገ	32	F
3. አረጋላጽ : አረጋላጽ	ገ	39	F
4. አሰጋጽ : ለሰጋ	ገ	35	F
5. አሰላሳ : አሰላሳ	ገ	28	F
6. አሰላሳ : አሰላሳ	ገ	42	F
7. አሰላሳ : አሰላሳ	ገ	46	F
8. አሰላሳ : አሰላሳ	ገ	37	F
9. አሰላሳ : አሰላሳ	ገ	39	F
10. አሰላሳ : አሰላሳ	ገ	48	F
11. አሰላሳ : አሰላሳ	ገ	42	F

Community Consultation Participants

	kebele	Age	Sex
1. ሰሌዳ፡ አሰካሪ		36	F
2. ሰገጉ፡ አሰገጋ		41	F
3. ሰሌዳ፡ አሰሰርዋ		33	F
4. ሰተሮ፡ አሰሰረዋ		23	F
5. ሰሰተ፡ አሰሰሰረዋ		38	F
6. ሰገጉ፡ አሰሰሰረዋ		39	F
7. ሰገጉ፡ አሰሰሰረዋ		40	F
8. ሰሌዳ፡ አሰሰሰረዋ		30	F
9. ሰሌዳ፡ አሰሰሰረዋ		39	F
10. ሰገጉ፡ አሰሰሰረዋ		37	F
11. ሰሌዳ፡ አሰሰሰረዋ		35	F
12. ሰተ፡ አሰሰሰረዋ		38	F
13. ሰሌዳ፡ አሰሰሰረዋ		35	F
14. ሰገጉ፡ አሰሰሰረዋ		33	F
15. ሰሌዳ፡ አሰሰሰረዋ		30	F

Participants of public consultation
in Hammer kloreda, Bashada kebale

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Sex</u>
1.	Kole Shello	48	M
2.	Odo Wado	62	"
3.	Walle - Hami	61	"
4.	Dore - Muko	49	"
5.	Sego - Baylana	42	"
6.	Gupa - Shawu	50	"
7.	Marile - Gachi	43	"
8.	Dore - Ayko	40	"
9.	Belayneh - chaka - 41	41	"
10.	Alma - Wado - 43	43	"
11.	Oyta - Shela - 56	56	"
12.	Muda - Algo - 39	39	"
13.	Damo - Bonko - 40	40	"
14.	Bulko - Berē - 41	41	"
15.	Godo - Munka - 39	39	"
16.	Hailu - Gura - 40	40	"
17.	Sego - Kale - 39	39	"
18.	Pita - Gushari - 35	35	"
19.	Tupa - Gelle - 38	38	"
20.	Mana - Budi - 42	42	"
21.	Dore - Ali - 43	43	"
22.	Damo - Arbala - 39	39	"
23.	Bume - Berē - 41	41	"
24.	Zind Oyta - 40	40	"
25.	Beshire - Mayto - 39	39	"
26.	Ware - Sodo - 45	45	"
27.	Gaya - Kabini - 39	39	"
28.	Hili - Pita - 43	43	"
29.	Gesāre - Arbalo - 39	39	"
30.	Gele - chaka - 49	49	"

Community Conservation Participants					Hamar
Name	Age	Sex	Married	Karo	Leble
1. Wale - Lochuch	40	M			
2. Hailu - Ari	30	M			
3. Hale - Sime	29	M			
4. Lale - Babu	29	M			
5. Algo Wale	23	M			
6. Einti - pala	27	M			
7. Bacha - Kurcha	21	F			
8. Mero - Dore	18	M			
9. Duka - Gadi	18	F			
10. Keri - Antini	18	F			
11. Hama - Antini	17	M			
12. Kayo - Girjo	41	F			
13. Kayo - Hamo	43	F			
14. Bacha - Kulanko	39	F			
15. Xlagor - Mero	27	F			
16. Antini - Murale	50	M			
17. Damo - Ayko	31	M			
18. Toro - Wale	18	F			
19. Turmi - Bero	19	F			
20. Bero - Dankasha	51	M			
21. Dami - Ayko	20	M			
22. Bokolo - Dello	21	M			
21. Dawo - Lale	41	F			
22. Sula - Loytaga	28	F			
23. Skile - Keke	29	F			
24. Gullu - Haila	29	F			
25. Gado - Muncha	42	F			
26. Goba - Zino	20	F			