

DREAM II First Pre-Conference [Coordination]

FULL PROCEEDINGS

(03/11/2020)

[Welcome]

[Dr Kaba Urgessa Dinssa \(GIZ\) opening remarks](#)

This year we have decided to have three key DREAM pre-conference topics: coordination (03/11), cooperation (12/11) and capacitation (26/11).

The overall theme of the conference is the creation of a critical mass around the dry lowland valley approach. And the second one is the practical development of alliances and partnerships and joint-programmes/investment programmes in the lowlands with the private sector and civil society organisations. This follows from the statement signed after the DREAM I Conference in September 2019 and also the emergence of 2020 locust flood and COVID-19 pandemic which emphasised the need for an alignment between the stakeholders active in the Ethiopian low lands.

The first pre-conference about coordination will map the main initiatives for the lowland areas and will explore the scope for better coordination. In the second pre-conference, the specific opportunities for cooperation will be discussed, and in the final pre-conference a shared approach to capacitation of pastoralist and agro-pastoralist communities in the lowlands of Ethiopia will be discussed as a contribution to regional policies.

[H.E. Ato Awol Elias \(Ministry of Agriculture\) opening remarks](#)

Dear attendees at today's first Pre-Conference:

On behalf of the Ministry of Agriculture, I have the pleasure of inviting you to a series of Pre-Conferences. We organize these Pre-Conferences to strengthen the coordination, cooperation and capacitation for pastoralist and agro-pastoralist communities in the lowlands of Ethiopia.

Last year the Ministry of Agriculture with support of the Regional Governments of Afar and Somali Region and the GIZ-Strengthening Drought Resilience Programme organized the DREAM-1 Conference – attended by 250 persons and concluding with a Joint Declaration. The Joint Declaration mentioned among other the intention to communicate, network and bring on-board all stakeholders acting in the lowlands.

This year in particular has underlined the need to strengthen resilience in the arid lowlands. On top of the long term challenges, the present situation has been extraordinary critical with floods, locust infestation and Covid-19 pandemic. This has all affected the lowland communities severely. We may address this with immediate relief but we also need to contribute to long-lasting prosperous and shock-resistant pastoralist and agro-pastoralist communities in our dry lowland areas.

In this we need to put the ideas and priorities of the lowland communities central with their engagement and their unique culture and strengths. We need to come to joint direction that looks at the longer term prospect in the lowlands and take into account the climate change, the invasive species and the access to resources.

We should avoid that with the best intentions we undertake programme that are silo-ed and that we miss the opportunities to learn from each other and create the critical mass for positive change that comes with coordination and cooperation. In this first Pre-Conference today we want to learn from the on-the-grounds programme of regional governments and from civil society. We also want to discuss how we can build links and bridges for coordination. The next two Pre-Conferences, respectively on 12 November and 26 November will discuss co-operation and capacitation.

On behalf of the Ministry I want to thank you for your participation in these Pre-Conferences and we look forward for the contribution that it will bring to the well-being of the communities in the lowlands.

[Matthias Spaeth \(German Welthungerhilfe\) kick-off note](#)

The DREAM – initiative aims at improved collaboration of all stakeholders to create better understanding regarding already ongoing and planned initiatives for a more synergetic use of limited resources. The relatively recent reform of the Ethiopian Charity law, which led to the Ethiopian Civil Societies Proclamation Proc. No. 1113-2019 provides a golden opportunity to boost collaboration of actors from different walks of life for the betterment of the country in general and of the lowland areas in particular.

Let me quickly introduce myself so that you know who is talking to you. RR HoA for WHH (GAA). The organisation is active in the fight against hunger and malnutrition in Ethiopia since 1972 and since then has established numerous partnerships with Ethiopian CSOs for the planning and implementation of manifold Development- and Humanitarian Programmes and Projects. We strongly believe that the partnership concept does not only allow WHH a better understanding of the context in which we work but also better access to and acceptance in the communities we work with. Furthermore, we consider the development of sustainable local organisational infrastructures as key for sustainable development in Ethiopia. We are also a member of the so called Alliance2015, a strategic alliance of 8 European NGOs (of which 7 are active in Ethiopia) to promote collaboration, high working standards and the synergetic use of resources to increase reach and impact of our activities. Please contact me to learn more about WHH and A2015, if you are interested.

The lowland areas of Ethiopia, with arid and semi-arid agro-ecology, are under increasing pressure due to several stress factors including climate change, population pressure, natural resources degradation, inadequate policy support and a reduction in local peoples' coping capacity. A lack of sustainable service systems, and limited opportunities for livelihoods diversification, are aggravating the negative impacts on the population. You will agree that the accomplishment of these major challenges requires the development and implementation of strategies which are appropriate to use the available limited resources efficiently for the implementation of effective measures to achieve impact. There is much room for improvement regarding - the involvement of actors and stakeholders whose potential has not yet sufficiently tapped, but also - For the establishment of coordination mechanisms and modes of cooperation that unfold synergies and mechanism to scale promising and good practices to an extent necessary.

The former CSO legislation did not really invite for strategic, synergetic, added value-based and inter-sectoral collaboration for several reasons. I am going to only discuss a few key features of the old and new proclamation, which I consider decisive for our discussion. 1. Ethiopian Charities & Societies were not allowed to raise more than 10% of their revenues from foreign sources. This regulation and the fact that funding opportunities and opportunities for income generation were significantly limited, kept the Ethiopia Charities generally under-resourced and fragile. Glad, that this provision had been repealed. 2. Ethiopian resident charities and international CSO (INGOs) were prohibited from advocacy activities. Though advocacy and lobbying are key to ensure that civil societies' voices are heard and genuinely considered in decision making on issues important to them. Now, CSOs are encouraged to engage into advocacy and lobbying regarding laws and policies relating to activities they are performing. This is a quantum leap in the political culture of the country 3. Famous 70/30 rule: Though it is per se not a bad idea to limit overheads, the broad definition of administrative costs was done on the account of capacity development, networking and the possibility to link up projects with (operational) research base our joint activities on evidence, but also for scaling up of promising practices. Though the ratio between programme and administrative costs went even up to 80/20, the much stricter definition of what is considered "overhead" provides now the necessary space for improved collaboration and sustainable development. 4. Last but not least strained the negative perception of CSO a fruitful collaboration. CSOs were considered more of a threat rather than an additional resource for the development agenda of the country. CSA saw its role more as a controller and micro manager and perceived CSOs as a pure implementer of individual projects. Heavy administration often led to significant delays in terms of registration, procurement and timely implementation of agreed activities. Now, we observe a much more collaborative relationship with defined time limitations re administrative duties of the agency.

The new proclamation now opens avenues in many regards as it allows moving from project-centred to strategic collaboration. Civil society is now able to actively involve into opinion- and decision-making processes. The revised definition of administrative activities allows new forms of collaboration and networking with new actors that are crucial in bringing together skills, expertise and other resources to develop inter-sector collaboration. This allows response to the ever-increasing complexity of challenges the country faces. It is now possible to leverage impact of each stakeholder through systems thinking: The impact in main thematic areas relies on analyzing driving and hampering factors as well as addressing key actors and stakeholders in the respective system. Systems are shaped at family, community and state level, by government circles, private businesses, learning institutions and in the physical, political and cultural environment. This is necessary in order to identify the most important levers the country and the regions have for creating lasting impact. It will be possible to increase investments into capacity- but also organisational development of local organisations who are key for sustainable development and service delivery. And these new opportunities for cooperation will also provide scope for innovation and testing of new business models which might provide new job opportunities and perspectives for the this and the next generation.

Therefore, I very much welcome the DREAM initiative and strongly believe that the DREAM comes true if we grasp the now given opportunities. Thank you.

[Coordination: How to create resilience in the low lands? On-going activities and the scope for coordination]

[Presentation from Somali Regional Government](#)

Background of the Somali region:

- Area: 350,000 km²
- Population: approximately 8,000,000
- Cultivable land: 2,100,000 ha
- Cultivated land: 455,250 ha
- Irrigable land: more than 620,000 ha

The Somali region has set a ten-year Development Plan with four main strategic pillars from 2021-2030 targeting: livelihood improvement, improved planning, land rehabilitation, rangeland management, WASH, emergency preparedness and capacity building.

The strategic pillars of the Development Plan are:

- Improve rural infrastructure investment and market access (1st pillar)
- Modernisation of agricultural production and productivity (2nd pillar)
- Natural resource development, protection and utilization (3rd pillar)
- Enhance food security and improve disaster risk management (4th pillar)

The most important ongoing programmes in the Somali region are: the Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP), one of the key programmes in the region. The Development Response to Displacement Impact Project (DRDIP), the Lowlands Resilience Project (LLRP) and GIZ Strengthening Drought Resilience (SDR) programme.

Community collaboration:

All our interventions are based on a bottom up and inclusive approach; hence we jointly plan activities according to their needs. Communities are represented by the watershed development committee, the participatory rangeland management committee, the kebele development committee, and the kebele and woreda administrations.

We provide awareness creation about the protection, conservation and wise utilization of natural resources in collaboration with the woreda administration, people with potential indigenous knowledge, customary institutions and the community as whole.

We have deployed development agents to each kebele and have FTCs or PTCs to cascade intended agricultural packages to our extension beneficiaries. We have also demonstration sites in FTCs or PTCs to enhance the knowledge and skills of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists communities to adopt improved seeds, technology and climate smart agriculture.

Opportunities for better coordination:

There is a need to build a better networking environment between programmes, and there is room for donors and NGOs to develop plans for their interventions based on the regional ten years development plan. Furthermore, currently a pastoral development policy and strategy for the region were developed which shows a big opportunity for development practitioners.

- National Agro-forestry Development Strategy (2020-30)
- National Strategy for Watershed Development
- Development, Management and utilization of community watersheds proclamation No.1223/2020
- Existence of cluster coordination meetings at national, regional, zonal levels which all stakeholders come together and discuss and share priority issues.

Challenges:

- Severe land degradation
- Substance crop and livestock production systems
- Over grazing
- Traditional production system which is not attractive
- Invasive plant species
- Wide spread unplanned urbanization
- Inadequate and sustainable land policy

Opportunities:

- Irrigated commercial agriculture
- Wheat production
- Sesame production
- Forage
- Fruit and vegetables
- Agricultural mechanization
- Contract farming
- Construction of grain stores
- Tax free agricultural machineries and irrigation facilities
- Sustainable land use and rehabilitations
- Updating of regional land use policy
- Soil and water conservation
- Afforestation

Strategic area of intervention to move Somali region agriculture forward:

- Strengthening the agriculture research to fulfil the emerging agricultural technology demand

- Intensive skill based training, particularly at grass-root levels
- Irrigation, mechanization and urban agriculture ∪ Strengthen market information and infrastructure
- Create conducive environment to attract foreign direct investment
- Focus on context specific interventions that can bring paradigm shift across the value chain
- Horticulture (floriculture, fruits and vegetables), crop production, livestock production, fisheries/ aquaculture, apiculture, forestry, etc.

Presentation from Afar Regional Government

Afar regional agriculture sector vision: Increase the income of pastoralist and semi-pastoralist areas by creating sustainable agriculture by 2030

Main objectives of the agriculture sector:

1. Increase livestock and fish production and productivity
 - Livestock development: feeding, breeding and health
 - Dairy, meat, honey, fish, chicken and eggs production and productivity
 - Improve livestock species
 - Increase livestock feed and water quantity, quality and utilization
 - Increase the productivity of natural grazing and range
2. Sustainable natural resource development and utilization
 - Advanced agricultural technologies
 - Sustainability of rangeland
3. Increase crop production and productivity
4. Agricultural inputs and products marketing
5. Building institutional enforcement capacity
6. Sustainable agriculture resilient to climate change

Most important ongoing programmes: GIZ SDR, DRSLP, LLRP and PSNP

Community collaboration: To increase the resilience of pastoralist and agro-pastoralist communities working jointly on participatory planning, implementation, management-cost sharing (in terms of in cash, in kind, in labour).

Coordination with programmes, donors and NGOs:

- Integrate planning
- Monthly task force meeting Afar Pastoral and Agricultural Task Force
- Quarter, bi-annual, yearly base field monitoring and evaluation
- Supervision
- Technical Committee
- Steering Committee
- Experience sharing

Presentation from Tezera Getahun from Pastoralist Forum Ethiopia (PFE)

Pastoralist Forum Ethiopia (PFE) is a Consortium of 25 CSOs (national and foreign) bringing positive changes in rights and livelihood system of the pastoralist. Our work includes pastoral advocacy, capacity building, networking, empowerment, commercialization and entrepreneurship in Ethiopia. Important advocacy elements: recognition of

pastoralism (including agro-pastoralism and other livelihoods in the system) as a way of life and production system. Networking: e.g. CELEP and UNIYRP. The Forum has members in almost all pastoral regions (now there is tendency to call them 'lowlands').

Community approaches:

As a consortium, most of the activities are run through members but advocacy activities involve pastoralists and local institutions: e.g. organising the Ethiopian Pastoralist Day (EPD); development of the Pastoralist Policy and Strategy (already approved by the FDRE Council of Ministers). We strive to reach all 15 million pastoralists in Ethiopia. Also, we do contributions on the global pastoral movement (actively participated in the development of the AU Policy Framework, UN International Year on rangelands and Pastoralism).

Partners and financing instruments:

Nationally, PFE works with its 25 member organisations (national and international CSOs), our affiliates (traditional institutions, pastoral councils), professional associations, national consortia working on various levels and academia and research institutions, and government and legislative organs. Internationally, PFE is a focal organ of the UNIYRP ISG, CELEP and WAMIP in Eastern Africa and works closely with IGAD and the Eastern and Southern African Pastoralist Network (ESPAN). We don't have fund sources at the moment (previously from the World Bank, CORDAID, MRGI, and DF) but a few members of PFE contribute annual fees; we mostly work on a voluntary basis without any type of payment.

Collaboration opportunities:

The biggest scope/added value for collaboration: with GIZ and other partners we have promoted and protected the rights of pastoralist and their institutions, e.g. land issues and resiliency, implementing the AUPPA and UNIYRP, building internal capacity enhancement for PFE and its local member CSOs. GIZ focusing on pastoralist institutions - support pastoralists rather than impose to them a different system.

Institutional strengthening and institutional development - changing - need to strengthen the informal institutions. Pastoralism is a way of life.

[Presentation from Hussein Iddris from Afar Pastoralist Development Association \(APDA\)](#)

Over 26 years implementation, using the patterns the Afar already have, APDA has modelled the way to support the Afar pastoralists into social and economic development through their culture and lifestyle as holistically as possible as follows:

At the community base as a development team:

- Afar literacy, basic education and support to higher education
- Mobile primary health emphasising maternal and child health
- Female empowerment to equal involvement and freedom from harmful practices

Facilitated through:

- Access to water: rainwater harvesting cisterns; volcanic steam harvesting; ponds/ dams; boreholes and shallow wells
- Veterinary service through treatment, vaccination, fodder when needed; re-stocking after disaster
- Rangeland rehabilitation: watershed management; reseeding; supporting removal of prosopis juliafora
- Income generation through cooperatives and microfinance strongly supporting women and linking the community to the market

Since implementation is holistic and community-driven, there is no priority of activity. The organisation has worked in all but 4 woredas in the Region currently working in 24 woredas.

Community approaches:

APDA uses a community – partnering and driven approach as follows:

- In each community of implementation a community development committee is formed composed of the clan and religious leadership, women's and youth leadership of 7 persons (3 females and 4 males)
- Community needs – based assessment is conducted, the community deciding on priorities, sites and beneficiary criteria/ selection
- All activities are carried out through the community disaster risk reduction prism establishing community ownership to the problem and the solution and driving their contribution
- Community members are trained in the basic means of service delivery
- Deliberate means is taken to include females in all committees as well as giving them the role as agents of behaviour – change as women extension workers
- APDA has learnt from the community adopting the traditional means of water preservation and access, environment protection, early warning, conflict resolution and much more. The organisation reach is the communities remote from government or other NGO services supporting upwards of 500,000 pastoralists annually

Partners and financing instruments:

APDA's main partners include:

- Foundations: Banyan Tree Foundation, USA; Barbara May Maternity Foundation, Australia; Pestalozzi Children's Foundation, Switzerland; Ethiopiaid UK, Canada, Australia
- INGOs: Welthungerhilfe, Germany; Bread for the World, Germany; SONNE International, Austria; CORDAID Netherlands; Mennonite Central Committee, Ethiopia
- Agencies: UNFPA Ethiopia; UNICEF Ethiopia; GIZ, Ethiopia; KFW through Ministry of Agriculture

APDA has developed a Social Enterprise named 'Gabat' registered in 2019 that funds can be generated for development.

Collaboration opportunities:

APDA has trademark - ability to support wide programmes such as that of GIZ building community resilience against shocks, gaining project sustainability in the hand of the community: that the community own the problem and go on to work for the solution protecting project infrastructure into the future, whether rehabilitated grazing lands, masonry – constructed structures, maintaining land free of prosopis juliafora once it has been removed. Like having community mobile health workers, women extension workers and community teachers, APDA wants to establish community environment and livelihood scouts as the actors for sustainability.

[Presentation from Dr Ali Ahmed Abdi from Aged and Children Pastoralist Association \(ACPA\)](#)

ACPA is a local organisation established in 2008. Our thematic areas focused on markets based livelihoods, education, health and emergency response interventions. ACPA was the 1st best development partners in pastoral areas in 2015, and the 2nd best development partners in pastoral areas in 2017.

Resilience Innovation for Livelihood Expansion (RILE) project:

It is a sub-sector activity focusing on the value chain livelihood under a sub-grant of the GIZ SDR programme. RILE has three key components:

- Enhanced livestock feed production and management practices
- Improved milk hygiene, sanitation and quality

- Increased market access and trade linkages

The target areas are north and south Jijiga districts of Fafan zone in Somali regional state.

Phases and beneficiaries of RILE:

- RILE Phase I (October 1, 2017 to August 31, 2018) Direct beneficiaries: 2,000 / Indirect beneficiaries: 3,000 / Total beneficiaries: 5,000
- RILE Phase II (January 1, 2019 to March 2019) Direct beneficiaries: 700 / Indirect beneficiaries: 780 / Total beneficiaries: 1,480
- RILE Phase III (January 22, 2020 to October 2021) Direct beneficiaries: 3,000 / Indirect beneficiaries: 5,000 / Total beneficiaries: 8,000

RILE achievements include:

- Established/strengthened milk marketing cooperatives
- Constructed and equipped one milk collection centre and three milk sheds
- Established community owned fodder production demonstration sites
- Training on participatory natural resource management
- Provided agricultural inputs to smallholder farmers
- Training on cooperative business management and entrepreneur skill
- Training on milk hygiene, quality and sanitation
- Milk fair platform to milk stakeholders

Lessons learnt:

- Input support for the smallholder farmers is initiation for encouragement to push better production
- Farmers involved fodder plantation as a daily labour also can benefit as training session
- Better collaboration among individuals of producers and retailers helps that to absorb good market

[Presentation from Tesfaye from Support for Sustainable Development \(SDD\)](#)

SSD was established in 2003 to support the development initiatives of the poor, neglected and marginalised communities of Ethiopia. SSD is legally registered.

SSD thematic areas in Afar (in order of importance):

- Irrigation infrastructure construction
- Irrigated agriculture development
- Community based disaster reduction management
- Community capacity building (individual and CBOs)
- Women economic empowerment (saving and credit schemes)
- Gender transformation
- Humanitarian emergency support

Community approaches:

- Linking relief with long term development
- Holistic approach to beneficiary needs
- Community partnership and active participation
- Strengthen local institutions and build the capacity of the beneficiaries
- Diversifying economic means of the target people

- Involvement and participation of all stakeholders at all project cycles (labour, materials, finance, ideas, etc.)

Partners and financing instruments:

SSD main partners:

- CLWR/CFGB
- Menschen für Menschen Switzerland
- Afar national regional state

CSSP2 sources of funding:

- International donors
- Local governments / ANRS covers 30% of the project costs in cash
- Community contribution (labour and local materials)

[Presentation from Lulseged Mekonnen Action from Integrated Sustainable Development Association \(AISDA\)](#)

Areas of work:

- Health (MCH, FGM, COVID-19) and Nutrition (Moringa, fruits and vegetables)
- Food security (small scale gravitational and solar assisted irrigation)
- Climate change adaptation and livelihoods resilience building
- WASH (solar assisted water supply, rehabilitation of boreholes, sanitation and hygiene)
- Humanitarian response and recovery
- Peace building and human rights (GBV)

Geographic areas of work: Afar regional state (interventions in all zones). Also plan to extend implementation in other regions (Easter Amhara, Southern Oromia and Somali).

Community approach:

- Work in collaboration and coordination with local actors (Gov, I/LNGOs, CBOs and communities)
- Bring women and girls at the forefront
- Community participation and empowerment
- Ongoing upgrading of organisational capacity
- Exploiting the expertise of government technical experts

Target population: pastoralist and agro-pastoralist Afar communities (282,000 people)

Main funding partners (now and before):

- GIZ (Borehole Rehabilitation and solarization, Action research on desert locust control, Anima feed)
- IRC (COVID 19, Emergency drought response ERM VI and VII)
- WHH/GAA (Borehole rehabilitation and solarization, COVID 19)
- USAID (direct funding) Linking agriculture with Nutrition-Moringa and fruit, livelihoods strengthening)
- Development Fund (Norway)-Norad (Climate Change Adaptation, WASH, Food security, Animal Vaccination & treatment)
- Save the Children International – EC/ECHO Emergency drought response recovery programme
- Merci Corps- USAID PRIME-Market Linkage and livelihood resilience

- CARE Ethiopia PRIME-Market Linkage and livelihood resilience
- OXFAM GB - SIDA, UNOCHA , Ethiopian Diaspora fund (Emergency Disaster Response)
- Greif Packaging Charitable Trust-UK FGM
- Pharo Foundation-UK , Stars foundation-UK FGM
- SK Foundation Netherlands FGM

Collaboration opportunities:

- Local knowledge and commitment
- Diversified qualification and experience of staff
- Proven track records and reputation
- SIDA funded Capacity building on WASH – July 2015 - July 2017
- USAID/LCD organisational capacity development – (2015-17) (received Achievement Certificate) Collaboration with partners
- With GIZ – Mutual assessment of resources and problems of water sources with the participation of government and communities)
- With government at all levels- design projects based on facts and deep discussions aiming at solving problem and ensuring sustainability

[Presentation from Zeyneb Abdile from Mother and Child Development Organisation \(MCDO\)](#)

Topics:

- Protection: sexual gender based violence (SGBV)/FGM child protection
- Education
- Health and nutrition
- Livelihood (women empowerment)
- Repatriation and restocking
- WASH
- Promoting citizen-state engagement for inclusive social, economic and political rights through strengthening the capacity of local CSOs

The geographic areas where our organisation is active are: Fafan zone (Tuluguled, Awbare and Qabribayah), Jarar zone (Dhegahbur and Ararso), Dawa zones (Moyale, Mubarak, Hudat and Qadhadumo), and Liban zone (Dheka softi and Qarsadula)

Community approaches:

MCDO works directly with communities at grass root level in order to identify and address the needs and priorities of project which community needs. We use different community structure like:MCDO aims to support the following different communities: women with FGM survivors, highly vulnerable children (HVC), child labour and exploitation, teachers and parents, community leaders, religious leaders, youth associations and women associations.

Partners and financing instruments:

Our main partners are government offices (ARRA, Regional DPPB, Regional HAPCO, Regional BoFED, Regional BoWCA, RHB and REB), NGOs (Help for brothers (Germany), CCRDA, CSSP2 (ECSF) and UN Office of Humanitarian Affairs), and INGOs (UNHCR, UNICEF, Pact/Ethiopia, Save the Children International (SCI), WFP and Population Service International (PSI)).

Collaboration opportunities:

The bigger scope/added value of collaboration that we see is with GIZ and with other organisations/partners. MCDO works in partnership with various international organisations such as UNICEF, SCI and ECSF as well as local charity organisations and government institutions. It is a member of the Pro-Development Network CCRDA.

Q&As from the presentations

There is huge potential for irrigated in Somali region. Do you have any ongoing initiatives?

[Somali Regional Government] There are present meetings held by stakeholders, there are cluster meetings and other meetings held with NGOs, they are strong.

How do Somali and Afar governments respond to the problem of engagement of regional and woreda government sector?

[Afar Regional Government] There is no a big underlined problem on the engagement between the regional and woreda government sectors, but there is some problem. There are awareness creation conferences and there is also community-based engagement at the regional and woreda level, and also came up with discussion, conference or the alignment with the planning part. There is planning and agreement to do on the planning also, to do this engagement coming to the regional and woreda government sector, to do the activities of the programmes, to the engagement by mutual respect from the community level. Also the inter-communication of the region and woreda, the view is in other services because the institutional activities are not separated from the political situation. We need to separate the political situation from the institutional engagement. The development sector needs so many expertises on the sectors of the positions so that we alleviate the problems of the engagement.

[IGAD] We need to be clear on the coordination aspect. In the first place, I don't know whether we have a common framework for coordination. If we don't have a common goal/interest, it is and it will be very difficult to coordinate. To my understanding, Ethiopia has already endorsed it within the framework of the IGAD Drought Resiliency initiative, a country programming paper to in drought emergencies, which is a national framework to embark on, and I don't know whether we are familiar with that or not.

The second point, when we talk about coordination we need to clear in terms of institutionalisation; who is responsible to coordinate what and how? Everyone is talking about resilience but I don't think there is a common platform to coordinate it. So when we focus on coordination we need to have an institute which is responsible to coordinate, to lead and harmonise through various platforms (it can be a steering committee, a technical committee, a working committee, and any other similar platforms). So we need to be clear and agree on duties and responsibilities of these institutional segments.

The third, last point, when we talk about coordination a very important thing is planning and monitoring. If we are not planning in a harmonised and integrated manner it will be difficult to coordinate. Once we have a harmonised plan, I think, it will be also good to have joint-monitoring, evaluation and learning phase, so at the end of the day we can evaluate all the interventions that we did in with similar indicators, so at the end of the day, we can evaluate ourselves whether we have brought impact implications on the livelihoods of the communities on the ground, otherwise, if we are following the similar situation I think we can stop the application of [], resources, etc.

Let's have a common framework, clear duties and responsibilities and who shall lead this coordination. We need to be clear with the institutional set up and with the thematic areas that we are engaged with in order to exchange knowledge, information and the like.

Where is the boundary with the regional water office? And who is responsible for the sustainability of the built infrastructure?

[APDA] We don't only work on four woredas but we prioritise four. The most vulnerable woredas are the ones we follow. During emergency we have to work on all the 24 woredas in the region. As a development strategy, we are working on four woredas. Drought affected woredas, harsh environmental conditions with no access to water and roads, affected by droughts frequently. During the emergency or the outbreak we go to all woredas but our strategy is to cover woredas with the hardest environments and service the most vulnerable communities.

We have a boundary with the regional government. First when we design the project, we design with the woreda, the community and the regional government. We have a separate boundary, we are filling the gap of the Water Bureau. We design with them and with the communities and we select those communities.

About sustainability, we set a strategy with the community, we discussed with them about synergy and we discuss about sustainability for that infrastructure.

Break-out group A

1. What are the key objectives in strengthening lowland resilience?

When we say resilience building, for us at the USAID, it is a very comprehensive idea, which is not only related to livelihoods, but it is beyond livelihoods, it can be peace and security, WASH, health, sanitation, everything contributes to the resilience of a household and a community. Other social services as well (health, education, peace and stability), they also contribute to the resilience of a household. Building and strengthening the wellbeing of a household. Different level: household, community and system level. For USAID, resilience building is a comprehensive framework which is beyond livelihood, which includes different component that contribute to wellbeing, such as health, education, peace and security.

We need to have a common framework, common vision. We need to have a common goal to which different sectors can contribute. We need to be very clear in the problems that we are solving. We need to also have a common measurement system, we need to have an integrated joint-plan. Joint-development plan at the woreda level (government and NGOs), joint-implementation plan at the target woreda and then we will have a common measurement system to see how we are performing and implementing. We need to maintain our communication as well (technical working groups).

The capacity of a community to cope with the natural calamities without compromising the initial functions. We need to consider when we talk about resilience, that there is the human, social and environmental resilience. We have to integrate them

Bring in diversification in production and livelihood. Diversification can reduce risks.

Build capacity against any shocks and stresses.

The participants agreed:

- *The objective of building resilience is beyond livelihood; it is related to building capacity against any shocks and stresses to address peace, security, stability and other social services at the household, community and system level*
- *Resilience includes the environment and not only human factors*
- *Diversification to reduce risks*

2. Where should we coordinate?

We need to have a common objective or goal, once we have it, we should have a framework where to embark on. The first phase is the planning phase.

Coordination at the national level (policies and harmonising approaches), regional level and woreda level is where our partners are engaged. We need to move to the region and woreda.

At national level: harmonising approaches and strategies, developing guidelines, capacity building and policy issues. Pastoralist and dry areas should be separated.

- *Institutional level* (federal, regional and woreda) - it's all about the formulation of policies and programmes, capacity building, resource mobilisation, system distribution, organisational structure
- *Geographic level* (spatial distribution) because there are activities specially at the woredas
- *Thematic level* - natural resources and environment management, irrigation management, water, land, biodiversity, renewable energy, market access, production enhancement and livelihood diversity, disaster risk management (DRM)

The participants agreed:

- *Institutional level*
 - *National level: deal with institutional building, policy issues, harmonisation strategies, guidelines development in the context of the lowlands*
 - *Regional level: coordination in harmonisation, coordination in the context of the lowlands*
 - *Woreda level institution*
- *Geographic level (spatial distribution, i.e. regions and zones)*
- *Thematic level*
 - *Natural resources and environment management (water, land, renewable energy, etc.)*
 - *Market and trade access*
 - *Production enhancement and livelihood diversification*

3. How to practically improve coordination in current programmes?

Develop a common framework or a resilience building initiative

We don't have any flagship programme at the Ministry of Agriculture, this should be discussed.

At the national, regional and woreda level, we should bring the stakeholders together having a common vision for the lowlands development. A vision from the government side is changed to diversify and create opportunities, livelihood diversification for the lowland areas. Once we have a common vision, a common goal for the pastoralist areas; we need to agree at the national, regional and woreda level how to measure and what to reach at the different sectors. We also need to know who is contributing to what so not to overload the whole system. We need a joint-plan at the different levels (guiding log framework). How can we also learn as we go and measure the impact as we move on? If we have this log framework, it is not only learning but also complementing our interventions, that complementarity will contribute to the bigger resilience.

Sectors coordination systems are set by the government level, for example, there is a WASH coordination forum/platform. We need sector-based coordination systems at the government level. We need to establish platforms at the different levels to harmonise the development joint-plan.

Participants agreed to:

- *Develop a common framework on resilience building initiatives*
- *Have a common goal/vision and understanding*
- *Establish platforms at the different levels and have a common joint-plan*
- *Develop a clear log frame for the implementation*

- *Agree on a measurement method/system*
- *Have a joint/harmonised monitoring, evaluation and learning system*
- *Network, learn and build capacity in inter-sectoral/intra-sectoral communication*

Break-out group C

1. What are the key objectives in strengthening lowland resilience?

Access to markets and infrastructure is something to pay attention to.

We need to unpack what lowland is. It is about extreme events (drought and flood), it is about access to knowledge, information, markets; so really not only connected to decision-making but market opportunities, but also related to a different livelihood style (pastoralism, agro-pastoralism and movement). These are the three characteristics that we need to unpack. Probably we are not in a position to solve all of them, but from these, which are the most urgent and doable from our perspective.

The development of policies appropriate for the lowland context, and in this regard, a better alignment between traditional structures of decision making with the normal administrative structures in the country.

There is a lot going on [in the lowlands] but it is fragmented, no coordinated, there is also no place where you can find this information together. We need to screen and know what all of this is proven, what is useful to come together as best practices to influence policies and decision-making. The inventory is good, but I don't see the value yet.

We want to know about each other, and to engage with each other and learn from the best practices. Bring opportunities to open-up and come together. This Pre-Conference wants to map all the different initiatives.

Most of the NGOs are coordinating and aligning with the lowland risk management plan at the humanitarian context, but this is not happening at the development sector.

There seems there are no prioritisation in the key lowland areas. We need to strengthen a platform based on priority intervention areas.

Humanitarian agencies work together in clusters in the short-term, but how can we learn in the long-term from each other and the pastoralist communities themselves on how they coped with the different challenges and disasters in the past? Time scale projects will be important if we can map out actors and look for coordination.

NGOs have the potential to provide good practices and develop good concepts, but how can we scale it up so it helps the entire region? I see a big need for more open investment in the local service delivery structures in order to move from a project to a programmatic and holistic approach. I don't see local organisations having the chance to improve their own organisation capacity.

The investment in the lowlands is more than humanitarian than develop. For these investments, knowledge management is key. Bringing this information in a portal is key. This problem is much more serious in the lowland areas where several organisations are working, but what is next?

2. Where should we coordinate?

Pastoralists are not farmers, they are indigenous people with their own tradition, cultures and cosmo vision. We can learn more from pastoralist organisations. The communication is a bit blocked. The link between the grass-root organisations and international organisations is lacking a bit.

Coordination can start from a regular learning/exchange platform (monthly/quarterly). We can gather regular updates from each of the agencies, so we can learn what each organisation is doing. The chance of duplication is very high if we don't know what other organisations are doing in the area.

If we have a kind of consortium approach, strategies come together and have a kind of log frame, we might have the chance to improve the communication and coordination and enhance the impact.

Different thematic areas can have an umbrella platform.

3. How to practically improve coordination in current programmes?

–

Participants agreed:

- Question 1: We need to create a platform/consortium/knowledge management to have organisations working together in order to avoid duplicating each other
- Question 2: A platform has to be on different thematic area. We need to look at issues and topics. Therefore cultural issues, health and nutrition, among others. The platform should be thematic.
- Question 3: We need to identify ways to overcome fragmentation.

Break-out group from Afar

1. What are the key objectives in strengthening lowland resilience?

Integrated land use management plan, watershed development plan, soil and water conservation and biological management, mountain development activities, minimizing unwanted /invaded plant species/parthenium, prosopis, and Calotropis, gully rehabilitation, natural resource conservation activities, rangeland rehabilitation, forage production, crop production, fruit production using irrigation, and DRA system/early warning information implementation.

2. Where should we coordinate? /

3. How to practically improve coordination in current programmes?

We should coordinate based on the objective of lowland resilience, BoFED should play to coordinate each development activities, the donors should strengthen governmental institutions, the coordination should start grass root level/kebele level up to regional level, we should follow one door approach (NGO's, government and local organisation), livestock productivity (enhancement of Health and breed) , awareness creation on how to utilize their child's with different feeding practices, identified the place where we will implement soil and water conservation practices, usage of alternative energy like stoves to alleviate a problem of deforestation, reduce community vulnerability, enhancing community capacity, support the responsiveness of the community, most projects focus on specific areas where overlap is very common. Therefore, projects should be plan and implement in areas where other projects did not reach, otherwise, it become duplications.

[Reporting back from discussion in break out groups]

Group from Afar

Question 1 - The key objectives include water conservation, natural resource conservation, regional rehabilitation, irrigation systems for food production, information, income-generating activities in communities from town-areas, use of

alternate energy options as deforestation is common in the area. Strengthen the rehabilitation activities at the community level.

Question 2 - Coordination is not a common objective. The coordination should start from a common objective on the lowland resilience. The donors should be in line with the government institutions because most of development activities are more accommodated in some districts.

Question 3 - The coordination should start at the community level up, at kebele level to the regional level. At the regional level, we should gather the objectives in the same activities.

Group A

Question 1 - Work building capacity against shocks and stresses at the household, community and regional level. It is not only about human resilience.

Question 2 - The coordination should be at three levels institutional (national, regional, woreda/kebele), geographical level, thematic level (work on accessing markets and improving production).

Question 3 - We have to develop a common framework to build resilience. Having clear roles and responsibilities will take us to the improvement of coordination. Harmonising the plan is one of the issues. Developing a clear log frame, a measurement system or intervention, having harmonised monitoring, evaluation and reporting system. Networking and inter-sectoral communication.

Group C

Question 1 - We need to unpack what lowland resilience is (it is more than just market opportunities, it is also knowledge, information and livelihood styles from pastoralists and agro-pastoralists). We need proper policies for lowlands which then require improved structures, and so on. One of the main outcomes has been that there are many fragmented and uncoordinated initiatives.

Questions 2 & 3 - Establish a system for thematic areas in order to increase best practices (by system, I mean a platform, for example, an online platform which could then generate and pull information on issues that are affecting agro-pastoralists), and this could be linked to key local institutions such as the Disaster Risk Management Bureau and the Water Bureau, but also is important that the Ministry of Peace has a legal mandate to coordinate all pastoral programmes, including humanitarian activities, it can also be under the roof of the Ministry of Peace. We need more coordination and we suggest to create a thematic platform and this should be under or linked to the different institutions involved in Addis but also in the region.

[Plenary discussion and wrapping up]

What is the takeaway from today's Pre-Conference for our future coordination?

What is expected from all of us to make this coordination a reality?

[Afar] [Audio not clear]

[Somali] We got good experiences and new information that we have not known [before this conference]. Time is so limited, and information, some of us have a bag of information [to share with others], but in the future let's have more time.

[Frank] How to really make coordination work in reality and how to work in the long term framework? My takeaway point relates to the good basis that this pre-conference has laid to the two coming pre-conferences. Pastoralist forum, someone should take the lead in taking this coordination and framework going.

[Dr Kaba - GIZ] There are a lot of actors in the lowlands working in similar areas or in very related activities. We need to find a road in which can really coordinate our efforts, this is what we learnt from today. There are areas in which we can coordinate our activities. We need to coordinate even starting from planning, we can plan together, we can organise forums together, we can even build capacity together; there are so many things where we can coordinate. Now we can bring together our knowledge, skills, several technologies and innovations, and even sometimes we can bring together our resources, including money, and the know-how from individuals to coordinate our own efforts and be more effective and efficient. We can also create a forum to exchange our best practices, then we can easily do these sort of exchanges.

[Dr Elizabeth - GIZ] We need to move forward. I am convinced that the lowlands are offering opportunities which can be part of the backbone economy of Ethiopia; they are treasures which need to be really wisely used. We have to come to which activities can be taken to get a good band leader/director to coordinate. Coordination for actors to come together and between them cooperation is needed. If everyone knows where his/her place is, cooperating, listening to each other, then it might become a beautiful performance. And how to get there? Training and capacitation. We are at the beginning with a lot of stakeholders having a lot of good initiatives and good materials, but again, for a harmonised performance, we need coordination, good cooperation and capacitation.

[End]