



Strategic Review of the Democracy, Growth and Peace for Pastoralists Project

For DFID Ethiopia

By John Morton and Tenna Shitarek, NSCE International

15 December 2008

This report has been prepared for the Department for International Development by John Moreton and Tenna Shiterek, Consultants supplied by NSCE International through the Governance and Social Development Resource Centre Framework. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the view of Coffey International Development, the consortium members of GSDRC or DFID.

CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations	3
Executive Summary	4
1. Introduction and context	6
2. Review process and comments on methodology	7
3. OPA and the Pastoralist Associations	8
4. Progress against output-level indicators	11
A1: Evidence for policy change	11
A2: Pressure for governance change	12
A3: Government motivation and capability	13
B1: Pastoralist institutions: knowledge, voice and inclusion	14
B2: Active political representatives	14
B3: Active, capable civil society organisations	15
5. Cross-cutting activities	15
6. Progress against purpose-level indicators	16
7. Development outcomes	20
8. Partnership issues	20
9. Recommendations for the final months of DGPP	22
10. Considerations on future DFID support to pastoral development in Ethiopia	23
References	24
Annex 1: Terms of Reference	25
Annex 2: Persons Met	30
Annex 3: Persons Attending Project Workshop	31

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AEPDA	Atowoykisi-Ekisil Pastoral Development Association
AFD	Action for Development
APC	Afar Pastoralist Council
AU	African Union
DGPP	Democracy, Growth and Peace for Pastoralists
ETB	Ethiopian Birr
IDS	Institute of Development Studies
IUCN-WISP	International Union for the Conservation of Nature – World Initiative on Sustainable Pastoralism
OPA	Oromia Pastoralist Association
OPADC	Oromia Pastoral Areas Development Commission
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicators
PARIMA	Pastoral Risk Management
PASC	Pastoral Affairs Standing Committee
PBS	Protection of Basic Services
PCDP	Pastoralist Community Development Project
PCI	i) Pastoralist Communication Initiative ii) Pastoralist Consultants International
PFE	Pastoralist Forum of Ethiopia
PSNP	Productive Safety Nets Programme
SOAS	School of Oriental and African Studies
SOREPAC	Somali Regional Pastoralist Council
UNOCHA	United Nations Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Democracy, Growth and Peace for Pastoralists (DGPP) Project DGPP was planned as the second phase of DFID support to the Pastoralist Communication Initiative, based in the offices of UNOCHA Ethiopia, and implemented by Pastoralists Consultants International (PCI), a non-profit company registered in the UK. Following political difficulties in early 2008, the project moved out of UNOCHA and revised management arrangements and revisions to the project logframe were agreed with DFID in July 2008, by which the international team of PCI has become “non-operational” within Ethiopia, delivering project outputs principally through the Oromia Pastoral Association (OPA).

DGPP has six outputs, grouped under (A) “Government Responsiveness” and (B) “Pastoralist Voice”. Project progress is considered against each of the six outputs and their associated OVIs. Levels of achievement of purpose-level OVIs and the projects contribution to them are then reviewed.

DGPP has made a significant contribution on pastoralist voice, including capacity-building for OPA and other pastoral associations. This has contributed to the achievement of project purpose in terms of empowered, knowledgeable and articulate pastoralist citizens and in general awareness-raising. This contribution was recognised by a range of stakeholders. The fundamental logic behind it, the importance of an organisation working on pastoral voice as PCI/DGPP has been uniquely designed to do, was recognised and approved by virtually all, even observers otherwise critical of PCI/DGPP.

However, DGPP has made much less progress on outputs relating to responsive and capable government.

There have been very serious failings in the PCI team’s approach to partnerships with NGOs in particular, and strains in partnerships with UNOCHA and parts of government notably OPADC. Issues include a widespread perception of a lack of transparency around DGPP/PCI, and public statements about NGOs that go beyond differences in development approaches. It is important in Ethiopia to adopt multiple and complementary strategies to create an enabling environment for pastoralists: working directly with pastoralists to increase their voice but also working with multiple stakeholders in focused dialogues on technical policy and practice at different levels. Opportunities for collaboration in influencing policy have been lost as a result of poor approaches to partnership within DGPP.

In its final months, DGPP should:

- Do more to facilitate specific dialogues on pastoral policies between pastoral leaders, government and MPs. The proposed activity milestone on seminars for pastoral leaders with international experts will be a very important step – it should be followed up by actively facilitating pastoralists to discuss what they have learnt with government and MPs.

- Continue capacity-building with the pastoralist associations, paying attention to increasing internal democracy and inclusiveness, and decreasing dependency on external funding.
- Attend as a matter of urgency to partnership issues, and consult with NGOs and projects funded by other donors about working together to influence policy.

For future support to pastoral development in Ethiopia, DFID should:

- Support further capacity-building for OPA and the other associations
- Investigate ways to improve the incorporation of pastoral areas in the large multi-donor programmes such as PSNP and PBS.

STRATEGIC REVIEW OF THE DEMOCRACY, GROWTH AND PEACE FOR PASTORALISTS PROJECT

John Morton and Tenna Shitarek

1. Introduction and context

This report presents the results of a strategic review of the Democracy, Growth and Peace for Pastoralists Project (DGPP), funded by DFID Ethiopia over the period 2006-2009.

DGPP was planned as the second phase of DFID support to the Pastoralist Communication Initiative, based in the offices of UNOCHA Ethiopia. Between 2001 and 2005 this initiative had been managed for DFID, firstly by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), later by Pastoralists Consultants International, a non-profit company registered in the UK (while links with IDS continued). During the second phase of DFID support the project has continued to be widely known as “PCI” which could be taken to refer either to the initiative or the company and the team it fields. The website developed under DGPP is titled “the website of the Pastoralist Communication Initiative” and refers to DGPP “as part of the larger Pastoralist Communication Initiative” while also referencing pastoralist Consultants International as the project’s implementers.¹

In early 2008, the project ran into political difficulties with certain ministries of the Government of Ethiopia. It is not within the remit of the current review to explain those difficulties, but it should be noted that widely different versions have been put forward by various concerned parties. As a result of these difficulties, the international team were required to withdraw temporarily from Ethiopia, though they were able to direct several important project activities from UK and Kenya. Also as a result of these difficulties, the agreement by which the PCI team were based in UNOCHA and given certain support by UNOCHA, was prematurely terminated in May 2008. Revised management arrangements and revisions to the project logframe were agreed with DFID in July 2008, by which the international team of PCI has become “non-operational” within Ethiopia, delivering project outputs principally through the Oromia Pastoral Association (OPA). The international team are able to visit Ethiopia for prolonged periods, on business visas obtained with DFID letters of support, to advise on and monitor the work. The international team were in Ethiopia throughout the review period, assisted the consultants, and accompanied them on field trips.

The goal of DGPP is:

Pastoralist rights, delivery of adequate services, peace and security, political and economic empowerment and inclusion for marginalised pastoralists in Ethiopia.

¹ <http://www.pastoralists.org/pages/about-us.php>

The purpose of DGPP is:

An enabling state in Ethiopia, consisting of empowered pastoralist citizens, capable government and more liberal markets for pastoralists.

These objectives are in accord with the widely-held conviction among donors, NGOs and researchers that the problems faced by pastoralism stem very largely from a poor policy and governance environment, which must therefore be addressed by pastoral development. The strengthening of pastoral voice is a key tactic within this approach, and has been the central strategy of the two phases of PCI/DGPP. Unlike some broadly similar initiatives this strategy stresses supporting pastoralist voice *in general* over promoting specific policy positions; “We do not speak for pastoralists, they speak for themselves... We are independent and do not take sides or political positions in debates.”²

DGPP has been funded by an Accountable Grant from DFID worth £4,437,250, to cover the period January 2006 to January 2009. The team convened in March 2006, following receipts of funds in February 2006. When management arrangements were revised in July 2008, a no-cost extension was granted until June 2009. The staff, all provided by Pastoralist Consultants International, number 14, a mixture of British, Kenyan and Ethiopian nationals, of which three British and one Kenyan national make up the International Management Team

2. Review process and comments on methodology

Full TORs are set out in Annex 1. Essentially, we were asked to:

- “conduct an independent assessment against logframe progress, specifically looking for how the project outputs have contributed to progress against the stated purpose” and also to
- draft options for future work with pastoralists in different modes

The review was carried out by the authors over a period of 12 consecutive days, 17.11.08 to 28.11.08. During this time the authors:

- Carried out 16 interviews with key informants in Federal and Regional Governments, parliaments, donors, NGOs, researchers etc (see Annex 2). Almost all of these informants were on lists of contacts provided by the PCI team and DFID Ethiopia.
- Spent one day in Afar Region, where they held meetings with Afar Elders and officers of the Afar Pastoralist Council
- Spent two days (plus travelling time) in Yabello, Borena Zone, Oromia Region, where they observed a large gathering of Borana, Guji and Gabra elders organised by OPA, held discussions with groups of Ethiopian and Kenyan elders, OPA Board Members, and interviewed Zonal and Regional government staff³

² <http://www.pastoralists.org/pages/about-us.php>

³ We were accompanied on the Afar region visit by Cate Turton, Livelihoods Adviser DFID Ethiopia, and on the Yabello visit by Leonard Tedd, Governance Advisor DFID Ethiopia. On both

- Reviewed relevant documents including DGPP publications and quarterly reports
- Held a workshop where provisional findings were presented to stakeholders including the PCI team, OPA, Regional and Federal Government, DFID and NGOs (see Annex 3), and their responses discussed.

Additional time was spent in the following week conducting further interviews (by TS in person, by JM by phone with stakeholders based in the UK and Kenya), and finalising the report.

There are genuine methodological difficulties in reviewing a project like DGPP. The context of pastoral development in Ethiopia is a complex one. There are many actors: regional governments, several different ministries at federal level, donors, regional organisations and NGOs, as well as multiple pastoralist ethnic groups, most of which overlap the country's borders. Pastoral development also involves many sectors and policy themes: policy on land tenure and land use, various policies affecting livestock marketing, conflict management and the establishment of representative institutions. Within this context, important changes in both pastoralist voice and the policies, approaches and attitudes of government can be very diffuse and hard to pin down. During the review workshop there was an important debate on whether differences in government attitudes, and new opportunities for pastoralist voice, should be seen as indicators of project achievement alongside the more conventional indicators of concrete policies and laws (the latter but not the former being explicitly mentioned in the project logframe). Where either attitudes or policies are changed, it can be very hard to attribute these to DGPP or any other development initiative. Additionally, some informants (understandably) discussed with the review team achievements of outcomes of the earlier phase of DFID support to PCI.

3. OPA and the Pastoralist Associations

The Oromia Pastoral Association (OPA), the Somali Regional Pastoral Council (SOREPAC), the Afar Pastoral Council (APC) and the Atowoykisi-Ekisil Pastoral Development Association (AEPDA) of South Omo Zone, Southern Region, occupy a special position within DGPP. Reference to them will be made in discussion of achievements under several of the outputs, and the purpose, of DGPP. They thus require a special introductory note here. Following the revision of management arrangements in July 2008, it was agreed that the PCI team would be "non-operational" within Ethiopia, and would move to a situation where DGPP functions would be delivered entirely by the pastoral associations, principally OPA. At the time of the review, three PCI staff were formally

visits the authors were accompanied by senior members of the PCI team, who contributed greatly to facilitating the meetings. Thanks are also due to OPA for facilitation of the Yabello visit.

seconded to OPA. OPA, and to a lesser extent the other associations, have thus become key to achieving DGPP outputs and purpose.

OPA is an initiative by elders from various of the pastoral sub-groups of the Oromo to establish a mass-membership organisation of Oromo pastoralists. It has a strong ethos of springing from traditional Oromo institutions, and is often referred to as an “elders’ association” (but has also taken steps to include women and younger men – see Output B1 below). It was nurtured in its early stages by the Oromia Regional Government (specifically the Oromia Pastoral Areas Development Commission – OPADC), PARIMA,⁴ AFD⁵ and PFE.⁶ These organisations commissioned a detailed consultancy report, delivered in January 2006⁷, on the potential for establishment of a regional pastoral council, and possible institutional set-ups. The nascent organisation applied for registration with the Regional Bureau of Justice as the “Oromia Pastoral Council”, however they were not allowed to use the word “council”, and were registered in January 2007 as the Oromia Pastoral Association. While leading figures in OPA had previously attended PCI gatherings and were well known to the PCI team, official DGPP involvement started in the first quarter of 2007. DGPP now pays office rent, the salary of the Executive Officer and some office staff, and the operational costs of gatherings organised by OPA, as well as secondment of administrative staff from the PCI team. OPA has also benefitted from support from the World Bank-funded Pastoral Community Development Project (PCDP) and an allied grant from the Japan Social Development Fund, through PFE. These other sources of support need to be considered in attributing OPA achievements to DGPP.

OPA has developed an internal structure of three Sub-Regional Councils and an overall Board. The key decision-making body is the General Assembly, currently of 125-130 members including 75 “founding members”. It is at present envisaged that founding members should remain General Assembly members for life, and procedures for internal democracy are not yet fully developed.⁸ Board members are chosen from General Assembly Members and come up for election every three years. Current plans are to hold workshops in each of the approximately 40 pastoral woredas of Oromia, with a view to attracting an indicative 100 members per woreda. This has so far happened in nine woredas,

⁴ Pastoral Risk Management, a sub-programme of the USAID-funded Global Livestock Collaborative Research Support Programme.

⁵ Action for Development, a national NGO active in Borena Zone

⁶ Pastoral Forum of Ethiopia, the umbrella group for national and international NGOs concerned with pastoral development

⁷ “Study Report on Establishment of Oromiya Pastoralists Council” submitted to Pastoralist Forum Ethiopia by Rural and Pastoral Consultant (sic), January 2006

⁸ Discussions on representation within OPA tend to revolve around the fact that the different pastoral sub-regions of Oromia are each represented on the Board and General Assembly; however, members and supporters of OPA suggest that this gradualist approach to internal democracy is acceptable and indeed necessary at this early stage of OPA’s development

hence membership is estimated at 900. Members pay ETB5 for registration and an annual subscription of ETB12.

SOREPAC had its genesis at the DGPP-organised regional pastoral gathering at Huded, Somali Region, in late 2007, where each woreda of the region was represented. The OPA chairman was present at the gathering and contributed to the process by sharing OPA's experience. Two founding members for each woreda of the Region, plus one woman representative for each Zone, and the chairman, were elected at that gathering, and a board of eleven chosen from among them. So far those 114 individuals are the only signed-up members, each paying ETB 50 for registration and ETB 240 per year subscription. By-laws have been drafted and the council has been duly registered. There has not been any further formal support from DGPP since the Huded gathering, but discussions continue: the PCI team includes a liaison officer for SOREPAC. OPA has also given advice and support to SOREPAC during its development. APC is less far down the road of establishing itself, but has recently formed a board of 15 members and a general assembly of around 150 people. These make voluntary contributions – there is not yet a set membership fee. APC has been given funding for travel costs by DGPP – it has not yet had support from any other external organisation. AEPDA was not studied by the review team, and its officers not interviewed: we understand it has a slightly different origin as a community organisation set up by Nyangatom to promote peace between Nyangatom and neighbouring ethnic groups in South Omo.

It is important to note that the associations themselves, and other stakeholders interviewed on the issue were unanimous in seeing a real and positive difference between these associations and local NGOs: “we create it, we drive it. NGOs are people who come to us”.⁹

An issue that has been raised is to what extent the associations will fall under provisions of the proposed Charities and Societies Proclamation. The Proclamation is understood to prevent NGOs that receive more than 10% of their funding from foreign sources from engaging in a very wide range of advocacy activities. A very wide range of opinions were gathered on whether the pastoral associations, assuming that they will continue to need substantial external financial support and capacity-building, will thus be prohibited from voice and advocacy work. The PCI team and OPA officers are very clear, on the basis of legal advice received, that as membership organisations rather than NGOs they will not fall subject to the Proclamation, and that in any case their close links to Regional Government will protect their right to advocate. Many others are less optimistic on this point.¹⁰ It will be in the interest of DFID and other donors to

⁹ OPA Board Member interviewed in Yabello. The sentiment was shared by government officials, MPS and NGOs themselves.

¹⁰ For what it is worth, the consultants observe the following: The pastoral associations will be “societies” not “charities” under the Proclamation (Section Four, Article 60, sub-article 1). If they receive substantial external assistance they may well be deemed “foreign societies” (Section

observe how the legislation, and the climate for its implementation, evolves in the coming months.

4. Progress against output-level indicators

DGPP has six outputs, grouped under (A) “Government Responsiveness” and (B) “Pastoralist Voice”. The outputs and the associated Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs), are very general in nature, and lack quantity, quality and time dimensions. There are also strong overlaps between outputs, with some activities contributing to two or more outputs. This section will consider each output in turn, judging on the basis of the review whether the relevant OVI, and the output more broadly, have been achieved.

Output A1: Evidence for policy change

OVI: *Policy briefings actively debated in the policy process*

This output essentially covers the commissioning and dissemination of research under DGPP. Highlights include the dissemination and facilitated discussion of the research report by Steven Devereux “Vulnerable Livelihoods in Somali Region” (the research itself was funded under the previous phase of DFID support to PCI), and the implementation of the research “Risk-Taking for a Living; Trade and Marketing in the Somali Region of Ethiopia” by Abdi Umar with Bob Baulch. There has also been publication of four brief “Issues Papers” distilling the results of this research. More recently the DGPP Researcher has been collaborating with IUCN-WISP on presentation of PCI data in an online database. There is overlap with the government training carried out under output A3 and the subsequent publication of “The Future of Pastoralism in Ethiopia” including the analysis of pastoral trends in terms of four scenarios. Some research activities for which an investment in planning was made have been effectively cancelled (notably research on economic growth in collaboration with SOAS) or reduced in scope (work on small towns in pastoral areas)¹¹, because of lack of government support and/or time constraints.

The research reports, especially “Vulnerable Livelihoods in Somali Region” are impressive (some technical arguments have been raised in respect to “Risk-

One, Article 2, sub-articles 3 and 4 which apply to both charities and societies). If they were deemed to be “foreign societies” they would *not* be subject to the Proclamation (Section Four, Article 60, sub-article 2), and would *not* be prohibited from advocacy activities under Section Three, Article 16, sub-article 3, paragraphs f), j), l) and m). They would presumably be subject to some other, un-stated, law. If they were deemed to be Ethiopian mass-based organizations they would have rights to advocacy which would include “actively participat[ing] in the process of strengthening democratization and election [sic], particularly in the process of conducting educational seminars on current affairs” (Section Three, Article 62, sub-article 7).

¹¹ This component has resulted in a literature review and recommendations for further research, nearly ready for dissemination.

Taking for a Living”) and the issues papers clear and well-produced. Considerable effort was clearly put into the roll-out of “Vulnerable Livelihoods”.¹²

On the basis of interviews with Regional and Federal government officials, and MPs, we found very limited evidence that these documents had been used in debates on policy, as specified in the OVI. An exception was mentioned by one informant that the analyses of livestock trade in Somali region had contributed to the permission for some livestock trade directly between Somali Region and Somaliland to be carried out under a Letter of Credit system, and more broadly to the Border Trade Arrangements for small-scale trading by those close to the borders. However, other observers would ascribe these changes much more to the work of the FAO-funded EXCELEX project.

Issues of DGPP influence over pastoral policies and laws are discussed further under Contributions to Purpose.

Output A2: Pressure for governance change

OVI: *Active debate between African counterparts on pastoralist issues*

This output, which is not optimally worded, is intended to convey the idea that networking between countries will expose both government officials and pastoralists to other and more appropriate ways of governing pastoralists, and thus generate pressure, or perhaps more appropriately provide *peer learning*, on these issues for the Ethiopian government. It is also intended to cover advocacy on a possible AU policy towards pastoralism, and advocacy through the global media.

Highlight activities include the sponsoring of government officials to join visits to Kenya and Niger, as well as engagement with the AU in the first two years of the project. There is considerable overlap in the logframe between activities under this output and output B1.

The visit to Niger was made in the few weeks before the review, so there is a risk of underestimating its impacts. Nevertheless, in interviews with government officials (as with pastoralists) who had visited other countries under DGPP funding, they talked of the benefits in terms of a very general realisation that things could be done differently and in a more pro-pastoralist way, rather than any specific policy changes that could be brought about. Some discussions suggested that the full context of pastoral development in Niger (negative issues such as state ownership of land, and conflict between government and Tuareg, as well as positive issues such as a presumptive right to cross borders in search of grazing) had not been fully understood.

¹² Perceptions of this effort by parts of government, however, were clearly a contributor to the PCI team’s difficulties in 2008.

The PCI team admit that engagement with the AU has been inconclusive. The review team were concerned at perceptions among Nairobi-based stakeholders that the PCI team wanted to “monopolise” advocacy on the pastoral policy process within the AU, vis-à-vis major NGOs and other actors, and had then abruptly withdrawn from it (at the time of the project’s de-linking from UNOCHA).

Work under this output has included a film made by and about the Mursi of South Omo (which we unfortunately were unable to see). Although this could be regarded as a contribution to empowerment and general awareness-raising, we do not feel that this is likely to contribute directly or meaningfully to achievement of either the output or the OVI on governance change.

Given that the budget for this output was increased in June 2008 to £937,826, 21% of total budget or 33% of running costs,¹³ we have Value For Money concerns about work under the output.

Output A3: Government motivation and capability

OVI: *New ideas being tried out by government in pastoralist areas*

The most important activities under this output have been the training of government officials on “pastoralism, governance and economy”. In this we can include the 2006 seminar at IDS, which gave rise to the publication “The Future of Pastoralism in Ethiopia” and the idea of four scenarios, and individual scholarships for government officials, to IDS and for part-time study within Ethiopia.¹⁴

We found that that understanding of pastoral issues had been increased. The “Four Scenarios” analysis was mentioned by several informants, both those who had been in the IDS seminar and others. While some other informants had clearly missed or not understood the analysis (and therefore saw DGPP/PCI as supporting a very traditional and static view of pastoralism), in general the analysis has clearly been well disseminated and understood. The individual scholarships (both under DGPP and the previous phase) have also been appreciated. One possible piece of evidence for government “trying new ideas” has been the establishment of the Pastoral College in Yabello, and more generally a recognition of the need for specifically pastoralists forms of extension and agricultural education. However, evidence for achievement of the OVI *as it is stated* - new ideas being tried out - is very limited.

¹³ “Running costs” refers here to project expenditure other than “fixed costs”. “Fixed costs” refers to core team consultancy fees, accountancy and bank fees, office costs, team travel and communications, all of which are separated out in the budget as generic and non-attributable to specific outputs

¹⁴ JM declares an interest as one scholarship has been to a course offered in Ethiopia by the University of Greenwich (not however by the Natural Resources Institute).

Output B1: Pastoralist institutions: knowledge, voice and inclusion
OVIs: a) *Discussion in pastoral institutions includes women and young people*
b) *New ideas being tried out by pastoralists*

This output principally covers the activities of DGPP in organizing a range of pastoral meetings and gatherings; including meetings to assist in establishing the pastoral associations, international gatherings of pastoralists and meetings as part of peace processes. The budget was increased in July 2008 to £987,553, 22% of the total project budget, or 35% of running costs.

The DGPP logframe sets out as activities under this output “preparation and post-event follow-up” to insure inclusion. We found good direct evidence of female and youth participation in pastoral gatherings. This was directly observed in Yabello, where several women spoke eloquently to the OPA gathering, and young men were also participating. We were told of high proportions of women members in the three geographical sub-councils of OPA (though not yet on the main board), and some female participation in SOREPAC and APC. However, on the evidence of the publication “The Peace Generation”, the South Omo peace gathering had been almost entirely a male affair, despite the precedents for female involvement in peace activities in neighbouring areas.¹⁵

With respect to the second OVI, we strongly feel that many pastoralists have come to feel themselves empowered by DGPP-funded meetings, gatherings and other activities, that they have become more aware in general terms of alternative approaches to governance and policy, and that they are more ready to engage in a range of ways to influence government, from investing their time in establishing pastoral associations, to personally seeking meetings with government officials up to the level of the Prime Minister himself.

As discussed under purpose-level indicators f) and g), there was lively debate in the review workshop as to what sorts of results were reasonable to expect of DGPP, and many observers feel that changes in attitudes, new processes of representation, and other intangibles could be indicators of achievement. We nevertheless have to report here that evidence for the OVI *as stated* – new ideas being tried out – is extremely limited.

Output B2: Active political representatives
OVI: *Well-informed MPs, councillors, candidates and voters*

“Political representatives” refers to MPs, councillors and candidates. Activities under the output have focussed on support to MPs individually and to the Pastoral Affairs Standing Committee (PASC). Original plans also included programmes of civic education for pastoralist voters.

¹⁵ For example, Turkana-Toposa peace-building facilitated by CAPE in 2002.

From discussions with MPs, we found that the support of DGPP for travel around far-flung pastoral constituencies, and foreign travel, was greatly appreciated¹⁶, but evidence for a real contribution of DGPP-derived ideas was very limited.

The planned support to civic and voter education was cancelled due to a lack of permission from government. In the July 2008 revision it is stated that the pastoralist associations will undertake general civic education. As regards the OVI on well-informed voters, most informants agreed that at present there were very limited opportunities for voters to compare electoral candidates on policy grounds; elections in pastoral areas were still largely uncontested, or contested on clan rather than policy grounds.

Output B3: Active, capable civil society organisations

OVI: *CSOs apply for innovation funds for voice and response activities*

This output covers the direct support by DGPP to OPA, SOREPAC, APC, AEPDA. We felt that OPA (at this stage less so the other associations) was showing very promising progress. OPA's estimated membership of 900 is not yet truly "mass", and internal democratic procedures have not yet been consolidated, but OPA has its own organizational capacity, and is willing and able to reflect and then advocate on policy issues.

The OVI appears to date from an earlier understanding that a greater variety of CSOs might apply actively and competitively for DGPP innovation funds, rather than the current system of the PCI team working with OPA and the others to determine their needs. However, we feel the essence of the OVI has been met and the output is well on the way to being achieved.

5. Cross-cutting activities

Two important sets of activities cut across, and are not entirely captured by, the six outputs, and are considered in more detail here.

Publications

The non-research publications, such as the "glossy" reports on gatherings, were very well-received by most informants, even those otherwise sceptical about DGPP, as doing much to raise the profile of pastoralism with different audiences. Some informants commented favourably on the progression from "Peace, Trade and Unity" which showed a tendency to over-edit and homogenise the views of pastoralists, to the more direct relaying of pastoralist voice in "The Peace Generation". We did find, however, that dissemination of these and other DGPP

¹⁶ Perhaps too much so: one MP requested DGPP support for his personal participation in a visit to Southern Africa under a completely different development initiative

documents to government officials at zonal and woreda level has been very limited.

Peace Building

Peace-building has been a major concern of DGPP and the PCI team, but is not fully reflected in the project logframe (most peace-building activities fall under output B1). There was some concern from outside observers that DGPP peace-building activities did not adequately observe the need for continuous involvement and follow-up at the grassroots level. This was not borne out by our observations in Yabello, or account of peace-building activities among Borana, Guji and Gabra in quarterly reports, which demonstrate a long-term and careful commitment to the peace-building process. Quarterly reports do suggest that the approach in other areas has been less continuous and less focussed. The major peace gathering in South Omo took place with much less preparation than has been shown in the Borana-Gabra-Guji conflicts, and the quarterly report for July-September 2008 talks of an almost bewildering variety of negotiations. We were also concerned, based partly on interviews with Afar elders, that the peace-building approach adopted may be less suited to certain conflicts, in particular the Afar-Issa (Somali) conflict, which appears to be about permanent territorial occupation rather than use of seasonal pastures. Finally, we are concerned that where peace-building is carried across borders or within neighbouring countries (for example the conflict between Borana and Gabra remains a largely intra-Kenyan affair, with minimal spillover into Ethiopia) that those countries' governments should be more carefully and formally informed, if not involved.

6. Progress against purpose-level indicators

DGPP has eleven purpose-level OVIs. This section will review progress against those OVIs, and comment on the contribution of DGPP to that progress.

a) Pastoralist institutions are more representative of and include the voices of the variety of pastoral citizens in society (including traditionally less powerful groups such as poor, young, women, destitute, disabled and certain ethnicities).

As discussed under Output B1 above, the new pastoralist associations are taking steps to include the voices of women and younger men in their deliberations, and we recognise the contribution of DGPP to this process. At the same time, there are other positive trends in pastoralist institutions connected to a wide range of initiatives by NGOs.¹⁷ It is generally recognised that increasing gender equality in pastoral societies is difficult, slow and not yet backed by a body of documented

¹⁷ Muir 2007 discusses critically NGO attempts to involve women in modified local-level resource management institutions, and prospects for improving women's voice through official kebele-level Women's Associations. SOS Sahel Ethiopia has been engaged in other action-research initiatives to increase the voice of pastoral women and youth.

good practice.¹⁸ Also, increasing the representation of the poor and destitute among pastoralists is intrinsically difficult because of the complex linkages between political status, wealth, and the ability to commit time to institutions either customary or exogenous.¹⁹

b) Pastoralist men and women leaders have developed a comprehensive knowledge of state institutions and the policy context.

In discussions with leaders of the pastoralist associations, and to a lesser extent in discussion with “ordinary” Afar elders, we found a reasonably good knowledge of how government at different levels worked and policy was made and implemented. Some policy ideas put forward by pastoralists (e.g. that they should be granted loans backed with livestock as collateral) seemed unrealistic. Had DGPP’s civic education programmes been able to be implemented, this might have further increased progress to this indicator, but we are happy to attribute some progress to the atmosphere of frank discussions, exchanges, and readiness to attempt to influence policy that have sprung from DGPP’s grassroots work with pastoralists.

c) Pastoralist leaders propose a range of policy options on the basis of international experience and (b) above.

As discussed under output B1, we found very limited evidence of pastoralist leaders promoting *specific policy options* (especially on the basis of *international experience*). Some observers implied that this OVI might be missing the point in that policy reform was more likely to come from a more multilateral engagement with pastoralists, government and other stakeholders who were technically well-versed in particular policy areas.

d) They use new and existing forums to engage democratically with the state, such as the regional Gurtis (pastoralist-government advisory councils) or woreda councils.

On the basis of discussions with pastoralist association leaders, and “ordinary” elders, we found pastoralist leaders using multiple strategies to engage with government. In Afar Region certain elders are recognised by the woreda councils for advisory and conciliatory functions, and some woreda council members are themselves “traditional” elders. Pastoralist leaders appear to be ready to approach regional and federal government at levels up to and including the Regional Presidents and the Prime Minister (in the audiences he gives pastoralists on Ethiopian Pastoralists Day). DGPP’s work has undoubtedly contributed to the climate where this is possible.

¹⁸ Morton 2008, p.13

¹⁹ Morton 1990

e) Pastoralist citizen engagement in elections is driven by informed choice about candidates' policy positions and representation capabilities.

As discussed under Output B2, most informants agreed that at present there were very limited opportunities for voters to compare electoral candidates on policy grounds; elections in pastoral areas were still largely uncontested, or contested on clan rather than policy grounds.

f) Pro-pastoralist policies for marketing and land provide incentives to trade, to develop production and to protect the environment by EOY 08

g) Pro-pastoralist laws are under process by EOY 08, for example concerning changes to land or export laws.

The consensus among observers was that it would be very premature to talk of pro-pastoralist policies in operation, or laws in process, at federal level, in the domains of either pastoral land policy or livestock marketing. At regional level, the encouraging, but essentially minor measures taken on regularising cross-border trade developments have been attributed to initiatives other than DGPP. The process of evolving a Land Policy in Oromia Region, including for pastoral zones, has been framed in terms of consultancy reports on technical land-use planning, and does not seem to have been influenced by DGPP. Current policy has so far been unsuccessful in stemming either external encroachment on rangelands or internal encroachment by private grazing enclosures (*kalo*).

There have been positive trends in delivery of health and education services in pastoral areas. One example linked to OPA, and therefore DGPP, was *the subsequent inclusion of Borena Zone* in a policy for the pastoral regions whereby the pass mark for university entrance was set lower: it is unclear when and how the broader policy was made.

An important issue was raised in some interviews, and in the review workshop, on what constitutes a policy shift, and whether processes and intangible results can be as important indicators of success as policies and laws in process. Some pastoralist leaders felt that the shift in government circles to using “pastoralist” rather than a derogatory word for “nomads” was itself an important achievement. Others pointed to the presence of pastoralist representatives in policy circles, the establishment of the PASC, and the establishment of OPA itself. We think such views should be taken seriously; however, after seven years and a considerable expenditure on PCI/DGPP we think that DFID needs to see more specific and tangible policy shifts.

h) Staff of woreda and regional government offices understand the pastoral economy better and actively engage in dialogue with pastoralists about government services.

i) Parliaments and councils at local, regional and national level are more representative of the range of pastoral interests and have better informed and more active membership.

From interviews with woreda and regional staff, elders who were also woreda councillors, and MPs, we feel there is some evidence for a general shift to better information levels among officials and representatives that should be at least partly attributed to DGPP.

j) Civil society advocates for pastoralist interests through the press and through formal and informal mechanisms. They advocate in support of pastoralist rights to land, services, security and livelihoods.

OPA and the other pastoralist associations etc. are clearly engaged in advocacy through both formal and informal mechanisms, supporting the engagements by pastoralists discussed under Purpose OVI d) above, even if they cannot yet be said to be active through the mass media. The increasing national importance of Ethiopian Pastoralists Day²⁰ is one such form of advocacy.

Of course local and international NGOs are also heavily engaged in advocacy, but we are happy to note that OPA and the other pastoral associations represent, at least potentially, a significant and complementary form of “civil society”, that is also more true to the original definition of that term.

k) Pastoralism becomes more widely appreciated by Ethiopian society, becoming part of the mainstream debates about the future of the country's politics and economy in the media.

This OVI is in one sense far from being achieved; pastoralism cannot be said to yet be “appreciated” by wider society, including the urban middle-classes. One informant was dismissive of the need for such wider appreciation, provided that pastoralists were themselves empowered vis-à-vis government, but we feel that this appreciation, not least by classes whose taxes will contribute increasingly to government revenue in future, is something to work for. Pastoralism is however, part of mainstream debate, as shown by coverage in the PASDEP²¹ and awareness of the importance of pastoralism in debates on livestock and meat exporting.²²

To sum up, achievement of the purpose, whereby we can consider the Ethiopian state an “enabling” one for pastoralists, is still far off. The partial achievement of many of the purpose-level OVIs masks the lack of real concrete progress on OVIs f) and g), policies and laws. DGPP’s contribution has been limited by a lack of progress on its Outputs A1-A3 “Government Responsiveness” It is also the

²⁰ Established by a local NGO, PCAE, ten years ago, but certainly developed under DGPP.

²¹ Too early for any influence to be ascribed to DGPP

²² J Morton, unpublished data, research project funded by the Wellcome Trust

case that the two sets of activities have been pursued largely in parallel, without strong linkages, i.e. pastoralists have been involved to a rather limited extent in the activities intended to influence government.

DGPP has made a significant contribution to achievement of the purpose in terms of empowered, knowledgeable and articulate pastoralist citizens and in general awareness-raising. This contribution was recognised by a range of stakeholders. The fundamental logic behind it, the importance of an organisation working on pastoral voice as PCI/DGPP has been uniquely designed to do, was recognised and approved by virtually all, even observers otherwise critical of PCI/DGPP.

However, DGPP has made far less contribution in terms of capable government, and a minimal one in terms of more liberal markets.

7. Development outcomes

The goal of DGPP is “Pastoralist rights, delivery of adequate services, peace and security, political and economic empowerment and inclusion for marginalised pastoralists in Ethiopia”. The goal-level OVIs include not only active citizen-state relations and engagement of women and youth, but also citizen influence over budgets, increase in livestock marketing and progress on MDGs. At the level of pastoralist society across Ethiopia and its contribution to the Ethiopian economy, we feel these are far from being met.

Another way of looking at this is the “livelihood impacts” projected by the PCI team: rights, services, empowerment, inclusion. The team has, in our view correctly, stated that these indicators are beyond the capacity of the present project to deliver.

These comments are not intended to downplay the contribution of DGPP in empowering pastoralists, but to underline how long the road is firstly to an enabling state for pastoralists, and subsequently to concrete indicators of impact on pastoral livelihoods.

8. Partnership issues

While we welcome the close partnerships between the PCI team, OPA and pastoral communities, we feel obliged to comment on the very serious failings in the PCI team’s approach to partnerships with NGOs in particular, and strains in partnerships with UNOCHA and parts of government notably OPADC.

General issues here include:

- A very widespread perception of a lack of transparency over the PCI team's objectives, institutional set-up, and lines of accountability. Even observers very sympathetic to the project commented that the project was opaque and the team uncommunicative
- Linked to this, a perception that the team's decisions over initiating and withdrawing from activities were unpredictable and undisciplined
- More specific comments on the lack of information over whether PCI had a national or regional mandate, and the revised management arrangements of July 2008.
- A concern that the strategy for selecting pastoral partners for DGPP was itself untransparent, and in certain cases divisive within pastoral communities; that the PCI team were known to express the opinion that NGOs were operating as "gatekeepers" with regard to pastoral communities, but were themselves vulnerable to such a criticism.

Issues with regard to partnerships were most felt in regard to NGOs, and revolve especially around:

- Perceived public disparagement of NGO approaches in general, and of specific NGOs, by the PCI team
- A failure to make criticism constructive by sharing knowledge
- Accounts of institutional change which downplay or omit the contributions of NGOs.²³

We accept that there is a genuine issue of development approaches here: OPA and the others as (potential) mass-membership organisations are very different entities from local NGOs. But we feel partnerships where parties at the very least "agreed to differ" should have been possible, and the PCI team could have reached out considerably more to local and international NGOs.

With regard to UNOCHA, there are different accounts of this partnership, and the previous head of UNOCHA Ethiopia was strongly in favour of the original vision of PCI and assistance accorded to the UN by the current team. The present head and former deputy head, however, felt there had been a serious lack of transparency over the mandate, institutional set-up and budget of DGPP both before and after the difficulties with government in early 2008.

With OPADC the picture is also complicated. The Head of the Commission categorically stated he had not had formal communication with PCI/DGPP for several years. Clearly OPADC staff have dealt with OPA on various issues, including in contexts where OPA has been implementing DGPP activities, not least participating in the international visit to Niger, but the formal statement of lack of contact is nonetheless concerning.

²³ For example there are widely different versions of the founding of PASC (during the previous phase of PCI), and we understand (not from PFE staff or Board members) that there has been friction with PFE on this account. Accounts of the establishment of OPA coming from DGPP could have more carefully credited the contributions of PFE and others.

We draw attention to these issues primarily because we feel that in the complex landscape of pastoral development in Ethiopia it will be important to adopt multiple and complementary strategies to create an enabling environment: working directly with pastoralists to increase their voice but also working with multiple stakeholders in focused dialogues on technical policy and practice at different levels. We feel that opportunities for collaboration in influencing policy have been lost as a result of poor approaches to partnership within DGPP.

9. Recommendations for the final months of DGPP

Given that the project logframe was revised with a completely new set of activity milestones in July 2008, that there has been a major shift to delivery through OPA, and that the project now has less than seven months to run, we are making extensive or detailed new recommendations for the remaining lifetime of the project. Following on from the analysis above, we would, though, like to make some general comments.

The project needs to increase linkages between its two main components, building pastoralist voice and building government capacity. These components have largely been pursued so far in parallel with insufficient linkages (though discussion of research findings with pastoralists has been one important exception). The project should do more to facilitate specific dialogues on pastoral policies between pastoral leaders (particularly as represented by the pastoral associations), government and MPs. The proposed activity milestone on seminars for pastoral leaders with international experts will be a very important step – it should be followed up by actively facilitating pastoralists to discuss what they have learnt with government and MPs.

Attention will need to be paid to the fine detail of capacity-building for OPA and the other pastoral associations, including a) agreeing a course for increased internal democracy and increased inclusion of women and youth, and b) maximising revenue to decrease dependence on external funders.

The project should attend as a matter of urgency to partnership issues, and consult with NGOs and projects funded by other donors about working together to influence policy.

10. Considerations on future DFID support to pastoral development in Ethiopia

We feel that the PCI/DGPP approach of increasing pastoralist voice in an absolute, rather than policy-specific, way has been valuable, and that the recent focussing on support to OPA and the pastoral associations has been a useful evolution of that approach.

As overall orientation for the future, we feel there is a need to follow on from this approach by continuing to work with OPA and the other associations, but also a need to work on specific areas of policy, and on increasing the incorporation of pastoralists in existing national-level donor programmes.

We would support continued investment in OPA and the other associations as the heirs to the achievements of PCI/DGPP. This investment will take the form of continuing capacity-building:

- To increase general effectiveness
- To strengthen inclusiveness and internal democracy (with due recognition that these must be long-term processes)
- To negotiate the new environment for externally supported organisations, of which the Charities and Societies Proclamation will be one very obvious aspect.

A careful assessment of these needs for capacity-building and the best way to continue delivering them will be important. It may well be that some of the most pressing needs will be shared with civil society organisations outside the pastoral areas, and that capacity-building can be delivered under generic programmes such as the proposed Civil Society Support Programme (CSSP), appropriately modified to recognise the particularities of the pastoral context.

The other need and opportunity for DFID will be to improve the way in which the pastoral areas are incorporated in the large multi-donor programmes. There is undoubtedly a current impasse in the development of viable and appropriate models for delivery of the Productive Safety Net Programme in pastoral areas. Models of support to the chronically poor that involve useful investment and that do not undermine the still too poorly understood indigenous social protection mechanisms of pastoral society have simply not been identified and scaled-up. We believe DFID could be well placed to contribute to resolving this through the provision of appropriate expertise and facilitation of appropriate dialogues. Similar considerations could apply to the Protection of Basic Services programme, the proposed CSSP, and evolving multi-donor discussions.

As set out above, influencing pastoral policy requires multiple and complementary strategies, including support to the “absolute” increase of pastoral voice, but also:

- More technically-focussed and research-based dialogue on specific policies

- Action research and practical pilots
- Capacity-building of various kinds for regional governments.

There are many opportunities here for a donor such as DFID.

REFERENCES

Morton, J. (1990) "Aspects of Labour in an Agro-pastoral Economy: The Northern Beja of Sudan" *ODI Pastoral Development Network Paper 30b*

Morton, J. (2008) "DFID's Current and Potential Engagement with Pastoralism: A Scoping Study", NRI Report for DFID

Muir, A. (2007) "Customary Pastoral Institutions Study" Report to SOS Sahel and Save the Children US under the Pastoral Livelihoods Initiative.

PCI/DGPP publications are referred to by title in the text and can be found at <http://www.pastoralists.org>

Annex 1

<p style="text-align: center;">TERMS OF REFERENCE Strategic Review of the Democracy, Growth and Peace for Pastoralists Project (Managed by Pastoralist Consultants International)</p>

OBJECTIVE:

1. This strategic review will:
 - undertake an independent assessment of progress of the Democracy, Growth and Peace for Pastoralists (DGPP) Project
 - complete DFID annual review requirements
 - assess synergies with larger joint donor-GoE development programmes.
 - recommend options for future directions of DGPP.

BACKGROUND:

2. The purpose of DGPP is to promote an enabling state in Ethiopia consisting of empowered pastoralists citizens, capable government and more liberal markets for pastoralists. PCI work towards this through providing evidence for policy change in the Ethiopian Government, strengthening pastoralist institutions' knowledge voice and inclusion, and promoting active political representation. DFID allocated £4,438,710 for a three year project which started in January 2006. DFID recently agreed a no-cost extension to a new end date of June 2009.
3. There have been some changes in DGPP management. PCI were housed within UN OCHA and based in Ethiopia. The programme is now being managed by PCI remotely, through building the capacity of local pastoralist associations, especially the Oromo Pastoralist Association, and by increasing the international component of the programme.
4. DFID also supports two smaller pastoralist programmes, a conflict mitigation project through Oxfam GB, and support to pastoralist resource planning through Farm Africa.
5. DGPP follows earlier DFID support to PCI "Communication and Capacity Building Programme" which started in August 2002.
6. This review is an opportunity for a stock-take of the activities and outputs under DGPP, and the impacts that it has had on pastoralists in Ethiopia. This study will also make recommendations to DFID for how donors should engage with pastoralism in Ethiopia more broadly.

RECIPIENTS:

7. The main audience for this report is DFID Ethiopia, to inform future directions on programmes which impact on pastoralists in Ethiopia. The report will be useful for Pastoralist Communication Initiative (PCI) and their partner regional pastoralist associations in guiding the remaining year of DGPP.

SCOPE OF WORK:

8. The consultants will review all of the programme documentation including the programme memorandum, inception report, previous reviews and progress reports and other reports produced by PCI.
9. The consultant will meet with a broad range of programme stakeholders including: beneficiaries (via a field visit, potentially linking with a planned pastoralist gathering); other donors and NGOs working on similar issues; the Ministry of Federal Affairs and UN OCHA. Meetings will also be held at regional level (in Oromia and/or SNNPR) to meet regional government representatives and pastoralist association leaders.
10. The consultant will:
 - (i) Assess the overall achievement of the DGPP programme to date against the logical framework and other undertakings and provisions within the project memorandum (following standard DFID annual review methodology).
 - (ii) Assess whether the communications activities of PCI under DGPP have met their objectives
 - (iii) In the light of the new emphasis within DFID on capturing results, the consultant will consider whether any improvements can be made to the logical framework and the results monitoring process.
 - (iv) Present findings at a workshop in Addis Ababa with key stakeholders (government, donor, and civil society) working on pastoralist programmes.

OUTPUT:

11. The consultant will complete the assessment in the standard DFID annual review format (attached). Achievements should be rated in terms of work achieved to date, bearing in mind the planned end date. This will involve gathering evidence to make an informed scoring of the outputs stated in the DGPP logframe.

12. The consultant will provide a separate report on additional findings and recommendations to DFID Ethiopia and PCI.

13. The report must be written in clear UK English with minimal use of acronyms and technical jargon.

SPECIFIC TASKS/ ACTIVITIES

14. Conduct an independent assessment against logframe progress, specifically looking for how the project outputs have contributed to progress against the stated purpose.

15. Assess the pastoralist linkages with flagship programmes of GoE and donors including PSNP, PBS, and sector programmes. What is the synergy between pastoralist voice projects and larger joint donor-GoE development programmes?

16. In consultation with others, and with reference to relevant studies, draft options and recommendations for future work with pastoralists. This should include recommending analysis to better understand the links between pastoralists and economic growth in Ethiopia.

17. DFID is not committed to future work in this project mode. Options can include:

- Exit.
- a separate multi-donor pastoralist programme.
- pastoralist support activity is mainstreamed in the joint donor-government flagship programmes²⁴.

18. To guide this work (and within the scope of work above), the following questions could be addressed:

- Do we have a better understanding of Pastoralist numbers in Ethiopia? What is the “12 million pastoralists in Ethiopia” figure based on?
- What development outcomes can be related to DGPP activities? What has been the impact on pastoralists?
- What has been the relationship between the project operating mode of raising voice and understanding (via gatherings and publications) and the development benefits intended?
- How successful has DGPP been on addressing / preventing conflict?
- Have there been any unintended impacts?
- Can the DGPP approach be validated? Can it be scaled up?

²⁴ Large joint GoE/donor multi-sector programmes include the Protection of Basic Services, and the Productive Safety Nets Programme.

- What has been the impact of PCI communications products paid-for through DGPP?
- What has been the impact of the international gatherings (Niger and Kenya) been on DGPP objectives?
- How effective have partnerships created through DGPP been at meeting the DGPP objectives?
- How influential has the international component of DGPP been? How has this contributed to DGPP objectives?
- How will DGPP and DGPP-type approaches be affected by the CSO legislation?
- What have been the impacts of the large gatherings funded under PCI?
- What is the exit strategy for DGPP-type interventions?

19. Research questions can be clarified in advance in consultation with DFID, pastoralist representatives in Ethiopia, and/or a meeting with PCI representatives based in Brighton, UK.

REPORTING

20. A draft report, including issues and options, will be required for a stakeholder workshop.
21. DFID can accept an annotated contents script for the report, and provide comments, before the final report is prepared.
22. The consultant will provide DFID with an electronic copy of the final report. DFID will also require the consultant to submit a report in DFID annual review format.
23. The consultants will also be requested to present a short seminar to DFID Ethiopia staff.

SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE:

24. It is envisioned that this work will be undertaken by one international consultant and one national consultant. Both consultants will be able to demonstrate:
- extensive skills and at least seven years experience in appraising and reviewing development programmes in the area of governance;
 - an understanding of the context of governance reform in Ethiopia, including citizen-state relations.
 - an understanding of governance issues facing pastoralist communities in the Horn of Africa (desirable);

- good interpersonal and negotiating skills, and the ability to present ideas and concepts clearly and concisely both verbally and in writing.

DURATION AND TIMING:

25. The international consultant will spend 12 productive days in Ethiopia from with a further 3 days outside Ethiopia for preparation of the assignment and finalising the written output. The national consultant will have up-to 30 days input, which can precede the international consultants arrival. These indicative days include field visits.

26. Tentative dates for the component based in Ethiopia work are between 1st to 20th November 2008. A draft report is to be submitted before the consultant's departure from Addis Ababa. A final report must be submitted to DFID within one week of the assignment ending.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

27. The following documents are available:

- DGPP Programme Memorandum
- DGPP Logframe
- Revised Project Management Arrangements (PCI, July 2008)
- PCI 2008 "The Peace Generation", report from a 2007 pastoralist gathering in Ethiopia.
- DFID Annual Review format

28. Publications prepared by PCI produced in the period under review include:

- *Vulnerable Livelihoods in Somali Region* (Stephen Devereux, IDS) Research Report in English and Somali
- *Risk Taking for a Living: Trade and Marketing in Somali Region* (Abdi Umar & Bob Baulch), Research Report and Policy Briefing;
- *Peace, Trade and Unity*, the Report of the Regional Pastoralist Gathering at Qarsa Dambi, Oromia;
- *The Future of Pastoralism in Ethiopia*, the IDS-Government of Ethiopia-Pastoralist Leader Policy Seminar, Report and Policy Briefing
- *21st Century Pastoralism*, report of the PCI Advisory Group on African Pastoralism
- *Shooting with Mursi*, a film by and on the Mursi Pastoralists of SNNPR;
- *Small Town Development in Pastoral Areas: A Literature Review and Identification of Key Issues and Challenges* (in preparation)

Useful websites

www.pastoralists.org

www.dfid.gov.uk

Annex 2: Persons Met

Government and MPs

Aklweg Negatu, Department Head, Coordination Team for the Emerging Regions,
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Mohammed Hagos, formerly Federal Co-ordinator, PCDP
Mesfin Abebe, Deputy Head of Administration and Security Bureau, Oromia Regional
Government
La'oitia Konte, Woreda Administrator, Awash Woreda, Afar Region
Ahmed Shidi, Member of Somali Region Parliament and Development Adviser to
Regional President
Tuke Liban, MP for Moyale
David Ruach, Minister of State for Transport and MP for Gambella
Bido Jisso, MP for Guji
Habtamu, Head, OPADC
Ali Mohammed Ahmed, Chair, PASC
Belayhun Hailu, Knowledge Management and Programme Learning Officer, PCDP

Pastoralist Associations and Elders

Sultan Mohammed, Chairman, SOREPAC
Nura Dida, Chairman, OPA
Fekadu Abete, Executive Officer, OPA
Hassan Mohammed, Chairman, APC
Mohammed Ali Umar, Treasurer, APC
Seiko Mohammed Said, Vice-Chairman, APC
Pastoral elders, Dudah Kebele, Awash Woreda, Afar Region
Pastoral elders from Borena and Guji Zones, Oromia Region
Gabra and Borana elders from Kenya
Board members of OPA

NGOs and Researchers

Wondessen Gulilat, and Honey Hassan, Pastoralist Forum of Ethiopia
Beruk Yemane, Pastoralist Programme Co-ordinator, Oxfam-GB
Adrian Cullis, Pastoralist Programme Co-ordinator, Save the Children-US
Andy Catley, Feinstein International Centre, Tufts University
Abdi Abdillahi, Director Pastoralist Concern Association of Ethiopia and Chair, PFE (by
phone)

Donors

John Graham, Food Security Adviser, USAID
Vincent Lelei, Head, UNOCHA Ethiopia
Paul Hebert, formerly Head, UNOCHA Ethiopia (by phone)
Jonathan Davies, Regional Drylands Programme Co-ordinator, and WISP Co-ordinator,
IUCN Nairobi (by phone)
Walter Knausenberger, Regional Adviser, USAID Nairobi (by phone)

British Embassy

Norman Ling, British Ambassador
Gavin Cook, Second Secretary Political/Information

As well as the PCI Team and DFID Advisers and Programme Officers

Annex 3: Persons Attending Project Workshop

DGPP/PCI

Alastair Scott-Villiers, Team Leader
Patta Scott-Villiers, Programme Manager
Jarso Mokku, Pastoralist Liaison Manager
Sarah Wilson, Head of Finance and Administration
Daresalam Bereda, Events Organiser
Murha Abeker, Afar Liaison Officer
Guleid Ismail, Pastoralist Networker

Government and MPs

Ali Mohammed Ahmed, Chair, PASC
Eyasu Workeneh, MP and PASC member
Akloweg Negatu, Department Head, Coordination Team for the Emerging
Regions, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Mesfin Abebe, Deputy Head of Administration and Security Bureau, Oromia
Regional Government
Assefa Tewodros, Federal Co-ordinator PCDP
Belayhun Hailu, Knowledge Management and Programme Learning Officer,
PCDP
Work Afetohu H/Michael, Forestry Department, Afar Pastoral Bureau

Pastoralist Associations

Sultan Mohammed, Chairman, SOREPAC
Nura Dida, Chairman, OPA
Fekadu Abete, Executive Officer, OPA
Hassan Mohammed, Chairman, APC

NGOs

Beruk Yemane, Pastoralist Programme Co-ordinator, Oxfam-GB

Leonard Tedd, Governance Adviser, DFID
John Morton, NRI, University of Greenwich
Tenna Shitarek, Independent Consultant