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1. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**
   1. **The E – LEAP Program**

The E-LEAP Program was located in Dire, Dillo, Miyo, Arero, Dhas and Moyale woredas of Borena Zone in Oromia Region. The program was designed to directly benefit 47,046 people among the vulnerable groups living in 12 kebeles of 6 target woredas, identified based on their vulnerability to drought and other related risk situation. The program started implementation on 01/10/2012 by Help Age International (HAI), as per the grant agreement between HAI and the European Community Humanitarian Office (ECHO). The program was envisaged to have a period of 14 months starting from 01/10/2012 until 30/11/2013. However, the agreement was amended to include one month no cost extension to 31st December 2013. Save the Children International (SCI) provided child-centered technical support to the program as per MOU signed between HAI and SCI. The program intervention was expected to achieve the following three important results/outputs namely:

**Result 1:** Improved knowledge of vulnerable communities in relation to identified hazards often affecting them and effective and efficient mitigating plans.

**Result 2:** Vulnerable groups at community level are better protected against future disaster hazards in 12 kebeles, through PVCA consultations as well as disaster preparedness and risk reduction initiatives

**Result 3**: Increased learning among DRR actors and institutions of vulnerable group’s intergeneration risk reduction and preparedness actions through learning, evaluation and Advocacy.

* 1. **Relevance of the Program Intervention**

The program was relevant in enhancing resilience and reducing vulnerability of drought prone local communities through inter-generational approaches and all-inclusive good practices in Southern Ethiopia. The program objectives and strategy were consistent with, and supportive of the government’s DRM SPIF. The program was in particular in line with the DRR program of DRM SPIF, aimed at building up and sustaining resilient capacities of vulnerable communities through diversified livelihood opportunities, natural resources management and environmental protection. It was also in line with and contributing to the Pastoral Community Development Program (PCDP) that works to establish effective models of public service delivery, investment and disaster risk management and to increase the resilience of pastoral communities to external shocks.

* 1. **Program Efficiency**

The program contract agreement (Agreement No ECHO/-HF/BUD/2012/91058) between ECHO and HAI was signed on 16/11/2012. However, subsequent negotiations with the Regional government took a long time and agreement was not signed until 14th March, 2013. This delay led to subsequent delays in initiating the program implementation on time. Even though, some program start-up activities had been carried out since October 2012, implementation of most of the program activities commenced only after signing of the program agreement with the Regional Government on 14 March 2013. Owing to this delay, HAI designed effective strategy i.e. use local government structure in order to compensate for the late start. Unanticipated and unusually intensive rains received in the program areas right after Regional Government’s approval of the program did further constrained on commencement of implementation of some activities, like rangeland reclamation, rehabilitation of water ponds, and construction of water cisterns which have to be delayed until the change of the rainy season. The combined effects of these factors obliged partners to extend the program completion time by one month until 31/12/2013, with no additional cost.

**Implementation of planned activities:** The program has accomplished all the planned activities successfully and made significant progress towards achieving the result areas as planned in the program proposal. However, the following three activities, which were not fully realized under the third result area, need to be finalized;

* Program research to identify 6 good practice case studies from past experiences and activities under result 1 and 2 and document them for publication
* Produce 6 short films on innovative intergenerational DRR interventions
* Production of 4 technical briefs on the design and implementation of OP led intergenerational DRR activities for DRR actors.

**Budget allocation and utilization:** As per the program proposal, the total eligible cost of the program was EUR 555, 556.00 out of which EUR 500,000.00 (90%) was ECHO’s contribution and the balance Euro 55,556.00 (10%) was to be covered under co-financing. As per the report received from HAI, the program secured a total budget of Euro 555,556.00 of which the program used about Euro 553,551.09, which is about 99.6 % of the planned budget up to 31st December 2013. Comparison of budgets and expenditures generally indicates that the program has utilized almost all the program budgets as planned.

**Program management efficiency:** HAI was working closely with the Zone and Woreda government offices and local communities, by involving them in all stages of the program cycle. HAI mainly played facilitation role as well as provided technical assistance in planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and overall management of the program activities. The program implementation was coordinated by HAI- Program Coordination Team from a program office established in Yabello. A Program Coordinator supported by a Child centered DRR specialist, and three program officers (one program officer for two woredas or four kebeles) were responsible for program delivery and coordinating the technical support to the target woredas. The program was managed by a Senior Emergency Program Manager (expatriate) and supported technically by Senior Emergency/DRR Program Officer, both based in Addis Ababa. Additional strategic support was provided by the Country Director and further technical support was provided by ECHO and FAO Addis Ababa Based program officers who periodically made field monitoring missions and provided much needed technical support. HAI- DRR technical advisors and SCI Child Centered specialists based in Addis Ababa and Nairobi also provided child centered DRR programming technical support. The program’s organizational capacity in terms of manpower related to quality and quantity of professional staff and their appropriateness to the area was found adequate.

At zonal level, the program was closely working with the offices of DPP and PADO. Both of these offices assigned focal persons who were involved and played a major role in the dialogue sessions and preparation of community action plans. Likewise, at woreda level, there were two focal persons assigned by PDO and DPPO of each woredas. These woreda focal persons (12 in total) worked with the program Officers who represented the program at the ground level. This assignment of the focal persons at different levels contributed to improved coordination and collaboration among the implementing partners and helped integration of the program activities with the respective zone, woreda and kebele development plans.

* 1. **Program Effectiveness**

**Result 1: Improved knowledge of vulnerable communities in relation to identified hazards**

At early stage of the program period, various program planning meetings were held in the field with zonal government departments and existing ECHO and non-ECHO DRR partners in Borena zone and all the 6 woredas. These meetings besides creating a common understanding on all DRR related program activities implemented in Borena zone, helped to share information on each INGO's operational impact and areas of work. These as a result enhanced adequate coordinated effort among the Borena cluster DRR actors in order to avoid duplication of resources and created conducive working environment in sharing good DRR practices and implementation methodologies in Borena zone.

The preparedness and response capacities of extremely vulnerable groups to drought and other disasters in the 12 pastoralist communities in Borena was strengthened by organizing inter-generational DRR community groups based on the traditional local disaster response systems. The innovative older people led inter-generational approach which HAI has adopted was found appropriate for drawing useful traditional DRR knowledge and practice to new generations and in the process of building new generations' resilience to disasters. In using the inter-generational approach, the program has created opportunity for sharing older persons' traditional knowledge, skills, expertise and experience which contributed to the effectiveness and efficiency of DRR programming in Borena zone. The program through the intergenerational approach made it possible the transfer of older persons’ traditional knowledge on weather patterns, climate change, early warning indicators including coping strategies to the youngsters during program implementation. This further disclosed the availability of rich and untapped experience in the traditional knowledge, which is critical to understanding the climate change and its impact.

Moreover, the various dialogue and learning exchange sessions of the program enhanced the knowledge and capacity of both tradition and science, which helped in building resilience of community members to drought and other associated hazards. The PVCA training and subsequent program planning process enabled the communities to identify their own capacities and vulnerabilities in relation to disaster management, developing mitigation strategies and building resilience to cope with future hazards. This was clearly demonstrated through the improved ability and knowledge in identifying hazards and developing the various action plans in the 12 kebeles by the communities.

**Result 2: Vulnerable groups at community level are better protected against future disaster hazards in 12 kebeles through PVCA consultations as well as disaster preparedness and risk reduction initiatives**

As a result of the disaster preparedness and risk reduction initiatives implemented under the four categories of small infrastructure development/rehabilitation programs (water supply, restocking, range management and watershed management) vulnerable groups at community level of the 12 targeted kebeles were better protected against future disaster hazards.

* Construction of 4 underground water reservoirs (cisterns) addressed the dry season’s water shortage gap of 1,678 people living in 4 the kebeles, thereby improving their disaster preparedness and risk reduction capacity.
* The implementation of range management activities in 509 hectare land benefited 3,437 people living in 4 kebeles through improved availability of pasture resources and enhanced rangeland management practices of the pastoral community.
* The program intervention through restocking of 2,245 drought resistant goats and 83 draft oxen, contributed to reducing the vulnerability and increasing resilience to drought of more than 378 households or 2,181 people in the program area.
* Implementation of soil and water conservation structures in 446 hectares of 4 different watersheds contributed to improvement of soil fertility and moisture availability, thereby positively affecting the conservation and regeneration of the natural resources in the area.

**Result 3: Increased learning among DRR actors and institutions of vulnerable group’s intergeneration risk reduction and preparedness actions through learning, evaluation and Advocacy.**

As a result of the program launching and PVCA validation workshop conducted at early stage of the workshop all key stakeholders including representatives from woreda sector offices, kebele and community members created clear understanding on the overall program activities, implementation strategy, resources allocated and roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder. HAI with SCI and other DRR INGOs completed the development of an "all inclusive and active participation vulnerability framework" which was distributed to VEP members as well as to ECHO (field office, Ethiopia) and FAO for final comments before it is fully adopted and disseminated to DRR actors and other stakeholders. The introductory orientation workshops conducted and mini media support activities under taken in all the 12 schools of the program target kebeles, besides promoting the inter-generational approach, helped to strengthen the capacity of the school DRR clubs in playing their role of promoting DRR knowledge and good practices among their communities. Articles prepared on intergenerational approach and other innovative DRR interventions transmitted through the Ethiopian Radio and Oromifa radio programs contributed a lot in increasing learning among DRR actors and the public at large. The program advocacy and learning effort through events linked to the DRR-Day and other DRR related events promoted the learning of the program to local and INGOs and government policy makers.

* 1. **Program Impacts**

Most of the activities undertaken by the program indicated signs of progress towards making a positive impact in the lives of the targeted households. The program is only 15 months old and contains some fairly long-range goals that go beyond its life span. Any impact observed can only be partial. Nevertheless, some key discernible trends could be identified to indicate the potential benefits and impact trends.

1. The efforts made to sensitize vulnerable community’s partners at kebele and woreda level through various familiarization and awareness creation workshops and related PVCA sessions at woreda and kebele levels contributed to improved knowledge of vulnerable communities in relation to identified hazards and development of effective and efficient mitigating plans.
2. Implementation of 12 intergenerational DRR small scale resilient infrastructure programs, contributed to risk reduction and protection of the vulnerable groups at community level against future disaster hazards. In this regard the following potential benefits and impact trends were observed.
   1. As a result of the 4 underground water reservoirs *(cisterns)* constructed in 4 kebeles

* The dry season severe water shortages of the 1,678 people living in 4 kebeles were reduced.
* The developed water points reduced women’s time spent in fetching water. From 5 hrs to 0.5-1hr.
* With the time saved, women were able to pay greater attention to the feeding and welfare of their families, and engage in other more productive activities to generate supplementary income.
* Availability of clean water has also provided substantial health benefits for every person in the community, particularly for women and children.
  1. As a result of 4 rangeland and pasture resources enhancement activities implemented in 509 ha located in the three kebeles, the enclosure areas showed remarkable recovery in terms of biomass accumulation and many community members particularly women have been able to harvest grass from the enclosures and used it to feed their animals, or sold it to earn additional income.
  2. The program intervention through restocking of 2,245 drought resistant goats and 83 draft oxen contributed to reducing the vulnerability and increasing the resilience to drought of more than 378 households or 2,181 people in the program area.

1. In general, the program’s interventions through learning, evaluation and advocacy increased learning among DRR actors and institutions of vulnerable group’s on intergenerational risk reduction and preparedness actions.
   1. **Program Sustainability**

The evaluation finding generally indicates that, the approach followed in which most of the program actions were implemented by active participation of the target community, supported with local government will ensure future continuity and sustainability of the program initiatives. A range of training programs that were provided for the target community institutions and the local partner staff would improve knowledge and skills and thus expected to improve the planning and management of the local development initiatives. Intergenerational DRR clubs established in all the 12 kebeles and established Vulnerability Committees established in the six Woredas are expected to play a supportive role at their respective level in facilitating the maintenance and protection of the physical assets created under the program, which would have enormous contribution to sustainability of the program outcomes.

**1.6.1 Sustainability of implemented small scale resilient infrastructure programs**

**Water Supply Schemes:** The water supply schemes visited in all woredas involved considerable community participation including contribution of local materials and labor. The institutions like Water Management Committees which are essential to ensure the sustainability of the schemes were organized and trained under the program support and took over responsibility for their operation and maintenance.

**Watershed Management:** Though, most of the SWC structures were implemented at communal lands, since they are formally transferred to 124 youth organized under self help groups (15 female and 15 male in a group), they have specific responsible bodies to their management, operation, and maintenance. Besides these organized user groups, there are Community Watershed Teams (CWTs) organized in every watershed (4 male and 3 women) who oversee the sustained management and utilization of the resource derived as a result of the constructed SWC structures.

**1.6.2 Sustainability of implemented resilience livelihood actions**

**Livestock Restocking:** Restocking of livestock (goat and oxen) undertaken by the program in the targeted kebeles and households are believed to be sustainable due the following factors that the program has ensured.

* Community participation in the restocking was given adequate emphasis by the program, including in the selection of recipients, defining the types and numbers of animals for restocking, purchase of stock, and overall management of the program.
* Since the restocked goats and oxen were purchased from local markets they are most likely be adapted to local environmental conditions and diseases.
* There were close supervision and follow-ups by the intergenerational groups regarding the status of the livestock after the completion of the restocking.

**Support for Self-help Groups:** The trainings and awareness rising sessions on small business development and management given to each group and their legal certification by the respective Woreda Cooperatives Promotion Offices will have strong contributions for their sustainability. In this regards, the beneficiaries were observed speaking of the knowledge they acquired, the benefits of the intervention and the positive behavioral changes the program brought to their lives.

* 1. **Mutual Reinforcement (Coherence)**

Ethiopia’s current DRM-SPIF aims at building up and sustaining resilient capacities of vulnerable communities through diversified livelihood opportunities, natural resources management and environment protection. There were different DRR/DRM related programs implemented by the respective Woreda government and NGOs working to address the problem in Borena Zone. E-Leap program is one of such programs implemented with an official MoU signed between HAI and Borena zone PDO. Different consultative meetings that were undertaken by the program in the field with different DRR partners, contributed in reducing duplication of DRR interventions in the program targeted kebeles and also in strengthening collective bargaining through unified agenda and approaches. Moreover, these consultative meetings helped to identify linkages and enhanced networking and coordination among the different DRR actors, particularly among ECHO partners in Borena zone.

* 1. **Cross-Cutting Issues and Innovation**

The Ethiopian DRM Policy provides for the appropriate mainstreaming of gender issues noting that gender should be adequately integrated and mainstreamed in DRM planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. In this regard, the program trained its staff and other stakeholders on mainstreaming age, gender and disability into community based disaster risk management, so that all the activities would be implemented from the inclusiveness perspective. Recognizing the fact that older people, women and persons with disabilities are some of the most vulnerable groups in any community, the E-LEAP program adopted an all-inclusive approach for all major interventions to enhance capacities of communities to increase resilience and reduce vulnerabilities to drought and other hazards. From the various KIDs and FGDs it has been learnt that the program had been encouraging the participation of women in all aspects of capacity building and training as well as disaster management activities undertaken. It was further observed that women in the various established committees were actively engaged in all DRR initiatives and learning.

* 1. **EC-Value Added**

The program implemented various activities in the area of visibility highlighting the major drivers of the program including the donor ECHO and the implementing agency HAI. In this regard program factsheets, and stickers were produced, and stickers showing ECHO and HAI logos were posted on program vehicles, office doors and at program sites where infrastructural projects are located. The program field office further produced CDs soft copies of PVCA assessment report, which were distributed to program partners on DRR day. All these efforts contributed to the realization and visibility of the ECHO funds by the communities, local government, other donors and stakeholders.

* 1. **Lessons Learnt**

The following main lessons can be drawn from the planning and implementation of the E-LEAP program

1. The facilitating role played by HAI instead of replacing the local government structure has contributed to the sustainability of the program outputs.
2. PVCA planning procedure which the program applied for developing the action plans was appreciated by the community, zone and Woreda offices, as it is almost as close to the traditional decision making processes of the community (Gada system) which helped to ensure local ownership and endorsement of the action plans by the traditional system.
3. The scarcity of water supply sources particularly during the long dry season was more severe for pastoralists; this therefore should be taken as priority agenda for any future development intervention in the program area.
4. The fact that program management is located at Yabello, with no representative at woreda levels and no adequate transport was a challenging experience for the program management.
5. Community Action planning (CAP) exercises in which the community gather and discuss and prepare plans using simplified planning procedures should be taken as very good lessons to be replicated to other areas.
6. The program transparency in declaring budget allocated to each kebele in advance of planning was highly praised by the communities and many expressed that this advance notification of budget earmarked for the various programs in a kebele has enabled the communities in prioritizing and deciding action to be taken up in the plan on the basis of known resources
7. Adequate emphasis should have been given to improve the management capacity of implementing partners at woreda levels, so that they can adequately contribute to the implementation and sustainability of the program.
   1. **Recommendations**

Based on the above findings the following recommendations are forwarded for consideration by concerned bodies:

1. The Evaluation Team recommends that ECHO and HAI should seriously consider funding a future program phase, and in this regard the principal focus should be replication and expansion of the lessons learnt from the last program.
2. If the program is to continue into a next phase, taking in to account the logistical arrangement required for close follow-up and supervision and to make maximum use of limited resources, it is strongly suggested that the program be concentrated in a limited geographic area.
3. Give more emphasis to the use of biological measures on the degraded watersheds to maximize the benefits for the communities and also enhance their rehabilitation. This should include the introduction of more grasses, shrubs and trees and the use of more exchange of experience tours to other areas with a strong biological component.
4. More efforts should be made by implementing partners in support of upgrading the technical capacity of Woreda government staff.
5. If the program is to continue into a next phase, ensure that the next phase includes a plan for preparation of baseline data involving surveying and monitoring, and the inclusion of vulnerability profile and gender information in both information gathering and planning processes.

**II. INTRODUCTION**

* 1. **The Program:** E-LEAP (Learning, Evaluation and Advocacy Program) for the inclusion and active participation of vulnerable groups, through intergenerational approaches to increase resilience and reduce vulnerability in local communities to drought in Ethiopia.

The E-Leap program is located in Dire, Dillo, Miyo, Arero, Dhas and Moyale woredas of Borena Zone in Oromia Region. The program was designed to directly benefit 47,046 people among the vulnerable groups living within the local population of 12 kebeles from 6 target woredas, which are identified based on their vulnerability and drought and other related risk situation. The program started implementation on 01/10/2012 by HAI, as per the grant agreement between HAI and the ECHO. The program was envisaged to have a period of 14 months starting from 01/10/2012 until 30/11/2013. However, the agreement was amended and signed between HAI and ECHO to incorporate a one-month no cost extension to December 31st, 2013.

* + 1. **Overall Objective**

The overall objective of E-LEAP project is to enhance resilience and reduce vulnerability of drought prone communities through all-inclusive ‘older people’ led inter-generational approaches and activities in Borena zone.

* + 1. **Specific Objective:**

Specifically, the E– LEAP Action objective is to strengthen preparedness and response capacities among local vulnerable communities in the 12 kebeles selected from Arero, Dillo, Dire, Dhas, Miyo and Moyale woredas. The most vulnerable groups targeted by the project comprise older persons, women headed households, children and persons with disabilities.

* + 1. **Program Results:**

**Result 1**: Improved knowledge of vulnerable communities in relation to identified hazards often affecting them and effective and efficient mitigating plans.

**Result 2**: Vulnerable groups at community level are better protected against future disaster hazards in 12 kebeles through PVCA consultations as well as disaster preparedness and risk reduction initiatives

**Result 3:** Increased learning among DRR actors and institutions of vulnerable group’s intergeneration risk reduction and preparedness actions through learning, evaluation and Advocacy.

* + 1. **Planned Program Activities under each result area**

**Result 1:** *Improved knowledge of vulnerable communities in relation to identified hazards often affecting them and effective and efficient mitigating plans.*

* Program planning meeting with existing ECHO and non-ECHO partners in the 6 woredas to identify linkages and kebele of implementation of the program
* Establishment of 12 most vulnerable community groups as inter-generational DRR clubs and Establishment of Vulnerability Committees
* 12 intergenerational participatory vulnerability and capacity assessment (PVCA) sessions
* At least 2 pilot Climate science, traditional knowledge dialogue sessions will be conducted in two kebeles
* Production of a community emergency preparedness and resilience building plan which are responsive to the vulnerabilities and contributions of vulnerable groups.
* Setting up a Buddy self-help system – partnering older people and with other less vulnerable people within the community so that in times of stress these “buddies” ensure the protection inclusion and wellbeing of the vulnerable

**Result 2:** *Vulnerable groups at community level are better protected against future disaster hazards in 12 kebeles through PVCA consultations as well as disaster preparedness and risk reduction initiatives*

* Identification and implementation of small scale resilient infrastructure projects (one per kebele) which is responsive to the vulnerabilities and capacities of older people.
* Identification and implementation of resilience livelihood actions (one per kebele) which is responsive to the vulnerabilities and capacities of older people.
* Budget management sessions with older people and other vulnerable groups with community financing structures

**Result 3:** *Increased learning among DRR actors and institutions of vulnerable group’s intergeneration risk reduction and preparedness actions through learning, evaluation and Advocacy.*

* 1 X 3 day workshop in Addis to launch the program, , identify vulnerability expert panel and to design a DRR inclusion framework for vulnerable groups and intergenerational approaches to help guide the program and other DRR partners
* Set up of Vulnerability specialist panel data base
* Program research to identify 6 good practice case studies from past experiences and activities under result 1 and 2 and document them for publication
* Produce 6 short films and monthly public radio broadcasts on innovative intergenerational DRR interventions
* Production of 4 technical briefs on the design and implementation of OP led intergenerational DRR activities for DRR actors.
* Organize at least three learning workshops (school, community meeting, ...) by DRR clubs to promote the intergenerational approach and participation of vulnerable groups in planning and intervention community initiatives
* 8 Advocacy and learning events linked to the Day for DRR and other DRR related events
  + 1. **Program Target Groups**

The program planned to target two selected kebeles from each of 6 selected woredas in Borena Zone, Oromia Regional State, benefitting 47,046 persons.

* + 1. **The Program Final Beneficiaries**

A total of 52,348 persons (111% of the target beneficiaries) in 12 Kebeles in Dire, Dillo, Miyo, Arero, Dhas and Moyale Woredas directly benefited from the various interventions of the program. These beneficiaries of the program are those identified by the communities of the 12 intervention kebeles in the 6 target woredas. Specifically, the beneficiaries are those vulnerable groups such as Older People (OP), Women Headed Households (WHHs), Children & Young People (C&YP), and People with Disabilities (PwDs), identified through community dialogues.

* 1. **Program Background**

The majority of the people living in Borena zone of Oromia Region consist of pastoral and agro-pastoral, deriving their income and subsistence, mainly from rearing livestock. The zone is considered to be rich and valuable in different types of resources including inhabiting huge livestock population rich in biodiversity as well as minerals, energy and cultural heritages. They have also natural resource and environmental management approaches using dry and wet season grazing pattern applying generation long indigenous knowledge and practices. However, potential is constrained by recurrent drought, poor provision of animal health services and limited livestock marketing opportunities. Drought has been, and still is a prominent factor in Borena zone pastoralist communities. Like other pastoral and agro-pastoral areas of Ethiopia, the Borena zone pastoralists face cycles of drought, rangeland degradation, de-stocking of animals, rangeland recovery, and restocking of animals followed by a new cycle of drought and recovery.

Historically droughts occurred every 6-8 years, but are now reduced to 1-3 years. In the last 7 years there have been 3 major droughts (2006, 08, 11). Impact of drought includes reduced pastures, overgrazing/land degradation; water shortage; decreased livestock, disease resistance/productivity; livestock emaciation/death; reduced livestock prices/income; crop failure; food insecurity/malnutrition affecting children, pregnant/lactating women and old people; interruption of development activities. Migration in search of work or with animals, by young family members leave old people left looking after children, PwD or sick family members with no access to food/income. Uncertainty in weather patterns/extremities in Borena are eroding people's resilience and effectiveness of practices/assets developed/accumulated specifically in response to known weather patterns. All vulnerable groups are not only excluded from receiving benefits but from participation in program planning/design in relation to their area development. Older people's knowledge/experience of the environment and past crises is often ignored however, Borena communities are led by elder councils and the traditional *Geda[[1]](#footnote-2)*, so there is potential for old people to positively contribute their knowledge in DRR programs. Children and young people (CYP) meanwhile, rather than learning about how to reduce risk/mitigate the impacts of drought, find themselves removed from education to support their families as income decreases.

In addition, rapid expansion of unwanted plant species, conflict over key rangeland resources aggravated the vulnerability of pastoral communities due to natural resource degradation, risks of drought and conflict to the extent of threatening the livelihood system. Above all, weakening of the indigenous pastoral institutions and incompatibility with the modern government structure has contributed to the misuse of the natural and environmental resources and exposing them to the effect of climate change. Understanding and supporting existing indigenous pastoral and agro pastoral strategies and enhancing capacities of communities of the Borena zone - to reduce drought risk are important steps in getting humanitarian and development interventions right. In this regard, HAI has been implementing the E-LEAP (Learning, Evaluation and Action Program) program for the inclusion and active participation of vulnerable groups, through intergenerational approaches in six woredas (districts) of Borena zone of Oromia Region. Implementation of the program has also been supported with technical partnership of SCI. As indicated in the TOR, the objective of the program is “Enhancing resilience and reducing vulnerability of drought prone local communities through intergenerational approaches and all inclusive good practices in Southern Ethiopia.

As per the grant agreement between HAI and the European Commission Humanitarian Office (ECHO) the E-LEAP program after 15 months of its implementation (October 1, 2012 to December 31, 2013) it was officially terminated on December 31, 2013. This evaluation document is therefore prepared on the basis of the final evaluation of the program conducted from1st February 2014- 26th January 2014, by independent consultants.

**2.3 Objective of the Final Evaluation**

As indicated in the TOR, the main objective of the final evaluation is to independently evaluate the impact, relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the E – LEAP program implemented in the 12 kebeles, located in 6 woredas in Borena zone. Specifically the objectives are:

1. To assess the impact of E-LEAP Program’s DRR activities on reducing vulnerabilities and increasing resilience, the most vulnerable community groups comprising older people, women children and person with disabilities.
2. To evaluate the relevance, coherence and appropriateness of the Program design, and whether it was conducive to deliver the expected results.
3. To determine efficiency and cost effectiveness of the Program

**2.4 Evaluation Methodology**

This Final Evaluation was carried out from 1st February 2014- 26th January 2014 by a team composed of the following members: Teferi Bekele – Team leader consultant, and Shumbash Tolla, Team Member consultant. The evaluation exercise used a participatory approach in which the views of beneficiary communities, the Program field staff, concerned local government offices and representatives of HAI were incorporated. The approach provided the opportunity for the communities to investigate and analyze their own program activities and objectives, and to understand what is happening and take decision about the future. The data collection was conducted in three selected sample woredas and three kebeles in such a way that both primary and secondary data were generated. The methodologies employed in the evaluation process include: (i) Document/Literature review, (ii) Focused Group Discussions (FGDs), (iii) Key Informant Discussions (KIDs) and (iv) Field observations.

**2.4.1 Document/Literature Review**

Systematic compilation of information available from existing material, the program proposal and interim reports submitted to the donor (ECHO), other program reports, PVCA and other assessment reports, program launch workshop minutes, and the program’s work plan.

**2.4.2 Key Informant Discussions (KIDs)**

The key Informant Discussions (KIDs) were conducted at various levels of the evaluation process. Following the signing of the contract agreement, brain storming meeting was conducted with the representatives of HAI, including Mr. Feleke Tadele, the Country Director, Mr. Alfred Mondiwa, the Senior Emergency Program Manager and Mr. Dereje Hailemariam, the Senior Emergency/DRR Program Officer based in Addis Ababa, Head Office of HAI in Ethiopia.

Based on these KIDs and documents reviewed, the consulting team designed checklists and detailed field level programs to guide program level FGDs, KIDs and field observations properly. KIDs were also conducted at program level with the Program coordinator Mr. Tsegaye Tadesse, at the program coordination office in Yabello town. Members of the program level KIDs include: The government technical staffs of the three target Woredas (i) Woreda administrative offices, (ii) Pastoral Development Offices (PDO), (iii) Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Offices (DPPO), (iv) Water offices and (v) Cooperative Promotion Offices. The KIDs were further extended to the kebele levels including representatives of the Kebele administrative offices and community facilitators of the respective three target kebeles. List of KID participants is presented in Annex 4.1.

**2.4.3 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)**

Focus Groups Discussions (FGDs) were conducted at community level, in 3 purposefully selected kebeles (i.e. one kebele from each of the three sample woredas). The FGDs in the sample kebeles involved the participation of a cross-section of the program target groups including, older persons, women headed households, youth and Persons with disabilities. Selection of the sample kebeles for the FGDs was made in consultation with the program coordinator and the respective woreda focal persons, taking into account the representation of major program activities. Field visits (direct observation) include Doledina Cistern construction in Cheriti Kebele of Arero Woreda, Kencho sub-watershed and established mini-media at Gombissa elementary school in Gombissa kebele of Miyo woreda.

**Table 2.1: Kebeles and Respondents Covered Under the FGDs and KIDs**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Woredas** | **Kebeles** | **Respondents Covered Under** | | **Program Actions assessed under Result 2** |
| **FGDs** | **KIDs** |
| 1 | Arero | Galaba | 13 | 3 | Restocking and Range land management |
| 2 | Dillo | Chereti | 17 | 7 | Water development and Self-help groups |
| 3 | Miyo | Gombisa | 14 | 4 | Restocking and watershed management |
| 4 | Zone level | |  | 5 |  |
|  | **Total** | | **44** | **19** |  |

**III. FINDINGS OF THE FINAL EVALUATION**

* 1. **Relevance of the Intervention**

The ever changing and highly complicated nature of climate change posed critical challenges to humanities in general and pastoral communities, in particular. Pastoralists are largely climate dependents. This fact is well backed by literatures in the case of these particular communities - Borena. Pastoral communities in the Borena zones of Ethiopia have been changing and adapting their livelihoods to changing environmental conditions for centuries (Save the children final assessment report, 2009).

The program objectives and strategy was consistent with, and supportive of the government’s Disaster Risk Management strategic program and investment framework (DRM SPIF) and related sector policies. The program in particular was in line with the DRR program of the DRM SPIF which is aimed at building up and sustaining resilient capacities of vulnerable communities through diversified livelihood opportunities, natural resources management and environment protection. The program was part of the efforts to contribute to the achievement of national development plan (PASDEP) and in line with and contributing to the the Pastoral Community Development Program (PCDP) that worked to establish effective models of public service delivery, investment and disaster risk management and to increase the resilience of pastoral communities to external shocks.

The program design was focused on achieving the following three inter-related result areas within the given program period and to serve as a measure of the program’s overall effectiveness: (i) Improving knowledge of vulnerable communities in DRR: (ii) Improving protection of vulnerable groups at community level against future disaster hazards: and (iii) Increasing learning among DRR actors and institutions of vulnerable groups. Specific indicators were also set to measure the achievement of each of these results.

* + 1. **Improved knowledge of vulnerable communities in relation to identified hazards often affecting them and effective, and efficient mitigation plans**

The program objective and result areas were relevant and in line with pastoralist priorities and government policies and strategies. During the series of discussions held with the communities, it was noted that the program purpose and its key interventions were highly relevant to address food insecurity in the program area. The program was also considered relevant from policy and strategy perspective as the federal government’s rural development policy and strategy prioritized water development, rangeland management and restocking of drought resistant livestock, as key development agenda in the pastoral areas. The results of these activities are discussed in the subsequent sections.

* + 1. **Vulnerable groups at community level are better protected against future disaster hazards in 12 kebeles through PVCA consultations as well as disaster preparedness and risk reduction initiatives**

This result area was intended to improve protection of vulnerable groups at community level against future disaster hazards in 12 kebeles through PVCA consultations as well as disaster preparedness and risk reduction initiatives. This PVCA planning and assessment method used the communities in the lead role for assessment, active planning, design, implementation and evaluation of the activities. All the program strategies were aimed at reducing the community’s risk to disasters by building resilient capacities of vulnerable communities. It focused on identifying the most frequent and disastrous hazards, the causes of the vulnerability to the hazards, factors of vulnerable groups in a community and exploring what local capacities can be used so as to best enhance the resilience of the at-risk community members. Along this, pastoralists in the various FGDs noted that the program actions were relevant in addressing their real needs and problems with appropriate interventions through their involvement in assessment, planning and implementation. Further in this regard, the government policy stresses the value of the community-driven development approaches and the capacity of the community to manage risk and effectively plan and implement DRR interventions with proper fund management[[2]](#footnote-3). It gave due emphasis to developing the sector through improving rangeland management and productivity, water supply, enhancing livestock marketing system and improving access to basic infrastructure.

* + 1. **Increased learning among DRR actors and institutions of vulnerable group's inter-generational risk reduction and preparedness actions through learning, evaluation and advocacy (LEAP)**

HAI in an effort to increase resilience and reduce vulnerability of the Borena community it used a CMDRR approach where the community especially the most vulnerable segment of the community took the lead in identification, planning, and implementation of the DRR interventions. To this effect the intergenerational approach to DRR provided the opportunity for cross learning among the different generations. Older people’s traditional knowledge was given emphasis to achieve the program objective through participating them in different dialogues sessions and workshops. The program plan in developing vulnerability framework to identify indicators of good practice in the inclusion and active participation of vulnerable groups in DRR was found relevant to increased learning among DRR actors and institutions. In this regard, the various Key Informants interviews at the zonal and Woreda levels revealed that the intergenerational and inclusive system had paramount importance in enhancing the inclusion and empowerment of vulnerable groups to participation in the DRM/ CCA. Hence, intergenerational and inclusive systems were found as key priorities for the pastoral communities as well as the government, in terms of building resilient communities in the area.

* 1. **Program Implementation Efficiency**
     1. **Timeliness**

The program contract agreement (*Agreement No ECHO/-HF/BUD/2012/91058*) between ECHO and HAI was signed on 16/11/2012. However, subsequent negotiations with the regional government took a long time and agreement was not signed until 14th March, 2013, (more than 5 months after the commencement date of the program) which resulted in subsequent delays in the implementation of most of the program activities. This delay led to subsequent delays in initiating program implementation on time. Even though, some program start-up activities had been carried out since October 2012, implementation of most of the program activities commenced only after signing of the program agreement with the Regional Government on 14th March 2013. Unanticipated and unusually intensive rains received in the program areas right after the Regional Government’s approval of the program further constrained commencement of implementation of some activities, like rangeland reclamation, rehabilitation of water ponds, and construction of water cisterns, which were delayed until the change of weather allow. The combined effects of these factors forced the partners to extend the program completion time by one month until 31/12/2013, with no additional cost.

* + 1. **Implementation of planned activities**

The program has accomplished almost all the planned activities successfully. The project in this regards had made significant attempt to achieve all the result areas indicated in the project proposal except for finalization of the following three activities, which were not fully realized under the third result area;

* Program research to identify 6 good practice case studies from past experiences and activities under result 1 and 2 and document them for publication
* Produce 6 short films on innovative intergenerational DRR interventions
* Production of 4 technical briefs on the design and implementation of OP led intergenerational DRR activities for DRR actors.

Most of the planned activities were implemented jointly with the respective implementing partners at woreda sector offices, kebele and community levels. The assignment and arrangements of the woreda focal persons within PDO and DPPO of each woredas created better working collaboration and smooth implementation of the program activities. On the overall the final evaluation concluded that progress in implementation up to December 31st 2013 were on track in achieving the intended objectives and result areas.

* + 1. **Budget allocation and utilization**

As per the program proposal, the total eligible cost of the program was EUR 555, 556.00 out of which EUR 500,000.00 (90%) was ECHO’s contribution and the balance Euro 55,556.00 (10%) was to be covered under co-financing. As per the report received from HAI, the program secured a total budget of Euro 555,556.00 of which the program used about Euro 553,551.09, which is about 99.6 % of the planned budget up to 31st December 2013. Based on the available information comparisons of budgets and expenditures were made so that one could have a general clue on the overall pace of the program implementation and budget utilization. The summary of comparison of budgets and expenditures of the program up to 31st December 2013 is presented in the following Table 3.1. Comparison of budgets and expenditures generally indicates that the program has utilized almost all the program budgets as planned. There are however, marginal under spending observed on major cost category like personnel and office running costs, in which the program utilized only 89% and 70% of the respective planned budget. This could however, be explained against the planned recruitment of the community facilitators, which was instead agreed to use the existing government DAs in each kebele on top up payment basis.

**Table 3.1: Summary of Draft Financial Report (Budget Vs Expenditure) in (Euro), for Learning, Evaluation and Advocacy Program in Ethiopia (E-LEAP).**

**For the period from 1st Oct 2012 to 31st Dec 2013**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Nr** | **Description** | **Program Budget** | **Actual**  **Expenditure** | **Balance Against Budget** | **% Spent** |
| 1 | Personnel | 100,222.00 | 88,888.63 | 11,333.37 | 89% |
| 2 | Office Running costs | 16,640.00 | 11,658.31 | 4,981.69 | 70% |
| 3 | Program activities | 335,234.00 | 339,949.50 | -4,715.50 | 101% |
| 4 | General Equipments | 10,006.00 | 9,862.99 | 143.01 | 99% |
| 5 | Travel | 39,200.00 | 42,414.08 | -3,214.08 | 108% |
| 6 | Monitoring & Evaluation | 15,810.00 | 22,009.85 | -6,199.85 | 139% |
| 7 | Visibility | 2,100.00 | 2,554.11 | -454.11 | 122% |
| 8 | Indirect costs - 7% | 36,344.84 | 36,213.62 | 131.22 | 100% |
|  | **Total Direct Cost for the Program** | **519,211.00** | **517,337.47** | **1,873.53** | **100%** |
|  | Overhead Cost | 36,344.77 | 36,213.62 | 131.15 | 100% |
|  | **Total Program Cost including Overhead** | **555,556.00** | **553,551.09** | **2,004.68** | **100%** |

* + 1. **Program management efficiency**

HAI was working closely with the Zone and Woreda government offices and local communities by involving them at all stages of the program cycle. In this regard, HAI mainly played a facilitation role and provided technical assistance in planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and overall management of the program activities. The Senior Emergency Program Manager (expatriate) based in Addis Ababa and reporting to the Country Director, was responsible for the overall management and coordination of monitoring and evaluation activities of the program. Day to day field management and coordination was led by the Program Coordinator based in Yabello. The Program Coordinator was responsible for the program delivery and coordinating the technical support by the program technical team to the target woredas. The Program Coordinator was supported by Senior Emergency/DRR Program Officer (based in Addis Ababa), the Child centered DRR specialist (receiving Child centered DRR technical support from SCI), and three program officers (one program officer for two woredas with two kebeles in each woreda). Assignment and respective base location of the program staff is indicated on the following Table 3.2.

**Table3.2: Assignment and respective base location of the program staff**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Job title** | **Role** | **Base Location** |
| Country Director | Responsible for overall country Program management and strategy for Ethiopia. | Addis Ababa |
| Senior Emergency Program Manager (Expatiate) | Overall Management, coordination and monitoring of all Emergency and Disaster Risk Reduction Programs (including E – LEAP) | Addis Ababa |
| Senior Emergency/DRR Program Officer | Responsible for Emergency and DRR technical support | Addis Ababa |
| 1 Program Coordinator | Coordinates day to day field management of the program interventions in the six woredas. | Yabello field office |
| 1 Child centered DRR specialist | Close technical support to the Field Office on implementation of Child centered DRR program. | Yabello field office |
| 1 Program officer | Responsible for Arero & Dhas woredas | Yabello field office |
| 1program officer | Responsible for Dire & Dillo woredas | Mega town |
| 1program officer | Responsible for Miyo & Moyale woredas | Moyale town |
| 12 Community Facilitators (CF) | Assigned by secondment for facilitating the program interventions in the respective target kebeles. | 1 CF in each target kebele |

The Program Coordinator was supported by an administration and finance assistant responsible for financial control and handling of administrative matters and support staff; a cleaner and three guards for the program office in Yabello. Both the program coordinator and the Child centered DRR specialist were supporting the program by frequent visits to the program target Woredas with an estimated 2/3rds of their time. This frequent mentoring and coaching to the target woredas and kebeles by the program coordinator and the Child centered DRR specialist helped to ensure the momentum of the program plans are maintained. The program team also received additional support from the Country Director, the HAI in London specialist personnel, Local ECHO staff, FAO specialist who provided additional technical support which made a great difference during the implementation. The program’s organizational capacity in terms of manpower related to quality and quantity of professional staff and their appropriateness to the area was found adequate.

At the zonal level, the program was closely working with the offices of Disaster Prevention & Preparedness (DPP) and Pastoralist Area Development Offices (PADO). Both of these offices assigned focal persons who were involved and played a major role in the program dialogue sessions and preparation of community action plans. They worked with the Program Coordinator and help link the program with the government’s plans at Zone level. Likewise, at woreda level, there were two focal persons assigned by Pastoralist Development Office and Disaster Prevention & Preparedness offices of each woredas. These woreda focal persons (12 in total) worked with Program Officers who represented the program at the ground level.

Though there was an initial plan of recruiting community facilitators to be assigned in each targeted kebeles, this was later revised with the zonal government agreement, to use instead existing Development Agents in each kebele, on top up payment basis. Accordingly, one Development Agent in every kebele was working as a program focal person and facilitating the program interventions with the program team. This approach of working with the government employee was also discussed and agreed with the Zonal PADO with an official MoU signed between HAI and Borena zone PDO. These 12 community focal persons were the actual community facilitators (Development agents) of the program who were facilitating the various meetings with communities on the ground and working in collaboration with the intergenerational DRR groups to implement the program at the ground level. This assignment of the focal persons at different levels contributed to improved coordination and collaboration among the implementing partners and helped integration of the program activities with the respective zone, woreda and kebele development plans.

Our overall impression is that the program was well managed. The program’s specific objectives were by enlarge met, the required quarterly and semi-annual reports were produced, basic administrative systems were in place (including procedures for controlling the use of such things as transport, telephones and photocopying, inventory in accordance with HAI administration and financial procedures) program staff were motivated and worked hard, and the quality of leadership was high**.** Joint monitoring visits by zonal government partners were conducted as planned. A four member joint monitoring team, two from zone Finance and Economic Development Office (FEDO), one from Zone Pastoralist Office (PO) and one from Zone Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Office (DPPO) conducted program monitoring visit in the month of October, 2013. The team appreciating the program approach and the progress made in terms of implementing the various program activities submitted its report with its conclusion and recommendations to HAI. The following is an excerpt taken from the joint monitoring report.

|  |
| --- |
| **Excerpt taken from the Zonal joint monitoring report October, 2013**  *According to the program plan, and community action plans which was validated on the program launching workshop on 14th of March 2013, we conclude that the program has implemented most of the activities and hopefully all will be completed within the program period – end of December 2013. We highly appreciate the achievements made within this short period – given the delay of the signing of the program agreement. The team was also surprised to see such an achievement within this short period and with such limited logistical support in the vast geographical coverage*. |

**3.3 Effectiveness of the Program in Achieving Purposes**

In general, in all of the woredas the evaluation team visited, the program was unanimously reported as effective. One of the points mentioned to substantiate this was that in almost all of the cases, the program has addressed activities that are in full conformity with the interests and priorities of the targeted communities and with plans prepared with active involvement and participation of the community. This was possible due to the fact that planning and implementation of the program was accomplished with adequate involvement of all stakeholders who received ample opportunities to steer the program towards their area of interest. The other point was transparency reflected by the program in planning and implementing activities in which in almost all the cases the communities and the counterpart government offices were well informed and allowed to have a say in terms of allocating and managing resources. Effectiveness of the program under each result area and planned activity are discussed in the following section.

* + 1. **Improving knowledge of vulnerable communities in DRR**

**Activity 1.1:** *Program planning meeting with existing ECHO and non-ECHO partners in the 6 woredas to identify linkages and kebele of implementation of the program*

At early stage of the program period, various program planning meetings were held in the field with zonal government departments and existing ECHO and non-ECHO DRR partners in Borena zone and all the 6 woredas. The purpose of these program planning meetings were to identify linkages and consult on the selection of the most vulnerable kebeles for the implementation of E-LEAP. Accordingly, the 12 most-at-risk kebeles were identified and PVCA exercises were conducted in all the 12 selected kebeles, in order to gain knowledge and skills in DRR to inform planning and action for prevention, preparation and mitigation activities. The most vulnerable kebeles were nominated by the local government structure and validated by various stakeholders during the program launch workshop on 14th March 2013. The most vulnerable kebeles selected for the implementation of E-LEAP under this process are shown in the following Table 3.3:

These meetings besides creating a common understanding on all DRR related program activities implemented in Borena zone, helped to share information on each INGO's operational impact and areas of work. These as a result enhanced adequate coordinated effort among the Borena cluster DRR actors in order to avoid duplication of resources and created conducive working environment in sharing good DRR practices and implementation methodologies in Borena zone.

**Table 3.3: Most vulnerable kebeles selected for the implementation of E-LEAP**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Target Woredas** | Dire | Miyo | Moyale | Dhas | Arero | Dillo |
| **1st Target kebeles** | Dhokole | Gombisa | Maddo | Dhas | Galaba | Cheriti |
| **2nd Target kebeles** | Dembela Bedena | Girincho | Tuuka | Gayo | Oroto | Kadhim |

***Activity 1.2:*** *Establishment of 12 most vulnerable community groups as inter-generational DRR clubs and Establishment of Vulnerability Committees*

As planned, 12 intergenerational DRR groups, each consisting of 30 members were established in each of the 12 program intervention kebeles. The Intergenerational DRR groups in each kebele were representatives of the most vulnerable groups and the communities at large (Older People, Women Headed Households, Children & Young People as well as People with Disabilities), identified and selected by the target communities, based on voluntary situations. The intergenerational DRR groups were the lead in the resilience planning and implementation initiatives and centre of the program management at kebele level. Apart from representatives of the most vulnerable groups, to make the DRR group more vibrant influential kebele officials and other adult members were included in the DRR groups.

As per the various FGDs and KIDs, the process of establishing or forming the intergenerational DRR group in each kebele was done through consecutive meetings that the program conducted with the respective kebele communities. These meetings were helpful to raise or create more awareness about the program approach, objectives and strategies and the need to establish a local institution. Moreover discussion sessions organized at community level helped the whole community understand the group’s composition, role, selection criteria and related issues. The FGDs conducted in the three sample kebeles confirmed the application of the following criteria in the process of selecting of the intergeneration DRR group members:

1. Willingness to serve as representative of the most vulnerable segment of the population and the community as well.
2. Be one of the most vulnerable groups category mentioned above (OP, WHHs, C&YP or PwDs), if not, he/she has to be influential, respected and with some official responsibility in the kebele
3. Be one that has traditional knowledge on early warning, local climate change, enthusiastic to contribute for the improvement of livelihood of the most vulnerable segment of the community
4. Be active participant in community dialogue sessions etc.,

The intergenerational DRR groups were formed with full consent of the members to play their major role and responsibility of serving as the voice for the vulnerable group, to ensure their inclusion and participation in all DRR/CCA and development initiatives that are implemented in their community. Besides taking the lead role in the overall management of the program activities the intergenerational DRR groups were able to participate in the woreda level vulnerability committee and ensured the needs and contribution of vulnerable groups were included. The FGDs and KIDs further confirmed that all these were possible as a result of the program’s various capacity building efforts, such as familiarization and awareness creation workshops, experience sharing and learning sessions and DRR/CCA trainings conducted at different levels.

**Woreda level vulnerability committees (WVCs):** As in the program proposal, the woreda level vulnerability committees (WVCs) in the six operation woredas were formed at early stage of the program. Members of the vulnerable committee were selected from the inter-generational groups and concerned woreda government offices including Woreda PDOs. Each inter-generational group nominated 4 members to be represented at woreda level and these were further introduced and incorporated into Early Warning Committees at woreda level, whose role were expanded to include dealing with vulnerability inclusion issues. The woreda vulnerability committee in each woreda was formed through a one day workshop organized by HAI team to discuss all its roles and responsibilities and come up with MOUs. Vulnerable people from neighboring kebeles, as well as people with disabilities working in woreda offices, representatives from older people and disability associations were given priority for membership to be included in these committees. The total number of members of this committee in each woreda ranges from 10 to 20. In most cases representatives from woreda PDOs were assigned to coordinate the activities of the committee, while the woreda DPPOs served as a secretary.

As per the FGDs and KIDs, the established vulnerability committees at woreda level played significant role in the inclusion and reflection of the needs, contributions and concerns of the local vulnerable people in the Woreda Development/DRR planning and budget management plans. The Vulnerable Committees were also able to provide local information and expertise to the Woreda authorities. In most cases these Vulnerable Committee representatives were considered as advisors and contact persons on an on-going basis at Woreda level, to ensure that the needs, concerns and contributions of all vulnerable groups are included in the various woreda development undertakings.

***Activity 1.3:*** *12 intergenerational participatory vulnerability and capacity assessment (PVCA) sessions*

The program planning process used a Participatory, Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (PVCA) method, which enabled communities to identify their own capacities and vulnerabilities in relation to disaster management, developing mitigation strategies and building resilience to cope with future hazards. Prior to commencement of the planning process, a two days training on PVCA and DRR/CCA planning was given to woreda partners at Yabello town. The training was facilitated by experts from Bahir-dar University and a total of 29 experts (1Female and 28 Male) drawn from the PDOs and DPPOs of the six woredas and HAI staff attended the training. The training included different team-work exercises and field test sessions through which the trainees conducted a practical PVCA exercise in the nearby communities at Dembela Bedena kebele in Dire woreda.

Following the PVCA training, 12 intergenerational community dialogue sessions were conducted in all the 12 kebeles for the identification of community vulnerabilities, risks and capacities. During these dialogue sessions, vulnerabilities and capacities assessed, gaps identified and risk and social mapping of the most vulnerable groups were conducted. It is based on these identified vulnerability and capacity assessment gaps, that the communities were able to plan and agree on the strategies to implement community managed disaster risk reduction actions. Accordingly, as per the identified priority needs of the specific communities, community action plans (one livelihood and one infrastructure development interventions were planned in every community) were drafted in all the 12 kebeles. In general 400,000 Birr per kebele was reallocated to be used for financing one livelihood and one small scale infrastructure development interventions per kebele. The types of selected development interventions in the respective kebeles and the corresponding budget plan as announced in the program launching workshop is indicated in Annex3. In the PVCA assessment or the 12 community dialogue sessions, more than 400 people were participated and as a result their knowledge and skill on CMDRR was reported as improved. The FGDs besides confirming their participation on in this planning process, appreciated the program approach as it did not come up with tailor-made or pre-prepared project ideas unlike some other NGOs in the area. The FGDs further reflected that the E-LEAP program was the first of its kind in creating such participatory planning opportunity for the community and transparent in disclosing the budget allocated to each kebele in advance of the planning exercise.

***Activity 1.4:*** *At least 2 pilot Climate science, traditional knowledge dialogue sessions will be conducted in two kebeles*

With the purpose of enhancing the knowledge and capacity of both tradition and science and also help build resilience of community members to drought and other associated hazards, two dialogue sessions, each of two-days were organized in Yabello and Moyale towns. Based on a TOR developed and invitation extended to two local institutions (Borena Dry Land Agriculture Research Institute from Yabello and Bule Hora University from Hageremariam ) for facilitation of the two dialogue sessions, Bule Hora University was selected by the HAI field office team.

The first dialogue session was conducted in Yabello town from 9th to 10th of October 2013, in which 18 community participants representing Kadhim, Dhas, Gayo, Oroto and Cheriti kebeles were participated. The second session was conducted in Moyale town from 12th to 13th October 2013, in which 25 community participants representing D/Bedena, Web, Gorile, Medo, Tuka, Grincho and Gombisa kebeles were participated. In both of these dialogue sessions, government partners from the zone and woredas through their focal persons were also participated. As per the FGDs and KIDs, the dialogue sessions were conducted in a highly participatory manner through the use of discussion guidelines prepared by the climate science experts as well as HAI team. In both of these dialogue sessions it was concluded that there is an accumulated and untapped traditional knowledge and experiences, which are critical in understanding the climate change and developing the required adaptation and mitigation strategies.

In these sessions community representatives explained existing appropriate traditional knowledge on DRR and good and bad practices used in the past; presented their knowledge of how the climate and environment changed over the years (what where and how). The presenters further shared their knowledge on climate changes, the local weather patterns, and environmental indicators that are used to inform and forecast the future seasons in the local area. The presenters further explained about past disaster histories, their traditional early warning systems, changed indicators and vulnerabilities of their natural resources to various risks and hazard factors. On the other hand DRR specialists/scientists from Bule Hora University, explained about the scientific approaches on the climate, DRR approaches implemented at local, country and international levels, which were accepted as best practices in the past and documented in different literatures. These dialogue sessions allowed the DRR experts/scientists to learn from the community members and enabled the community members to gain better knowledge on climate change and seasonal forecasting as well as innovative DRR practice, which they may want, include in their community planning work and give feed back to their inter-generational DRR groups.

In general the dialogue and learning exchange sessions were helpful in enhancing the knowledge and capacity of both tradition and science and building resilience of community members to drought and other associated hazards. Moreover, the pastoralists learned more about other indigenous climate change related experience, while DRR experts/climate scientists received the opportunity to field check climate change models and scenarios. The proceeding of the dialogue sessions was documented and disseminated to all DRR stakeholders including INGOs, local NGOs, relevant Government departments at kebele, woreda and zone levels, DRR learning institutions, inter-generational clubs.

***Activity 1.5:*** *Production of a community emergency preparedness and resilience building plan which are responsive to the vulnerabilities and contributions of vulnerable groups including older people, children, women and PwD*

As a result of the community dialogue sessions, where vulnerabilities, risks and capacities of the most vulnerable groups were identified, and risk analysis and social mapping of the area were undertaken, the vulnerable groups came up with several disaster risk reduction strategies and activities. Among these the following most important strategies were prioritized and adopted for the purpose of this program intervention are: a) Institutional Development, b) Livelihood Strengthening, and c) Small scale Infrastructure Development. Accordingly, scope of activities to be carried out under these three thematic areas, comprising of actions that can reduce the vulnerability of the at-risk communities and thereby increasing their capacity for resilience building were determined, which include but not limited to:

* Capacity building and institutional strengthening (including knowledge management);
* Water harvesting and collecting mechanisms;
* Natural resource management and rangeland rehabilitation;
* Livelihood diversification.

Accordingly, communities identified specific activities for each kebele and ranked the identified interventions according to the expected contribution to the reduction of their vulnerabilities and enhancing their resilience. Only those which the communities ranked first for small infrastructure rehabilitation/development and Livelihood strengthening were considered under the E-LEAP. Other less priority actions were referred to other relevant DRR actors including the government. A report on the results of the PVCA exercises was compiled and also made available on CD and distributed to all stakeholders.

The action plans included the DRR activities planned for implementation, the steps they are going to take in order to achieve them and roles and responsibilities of each of the local stakeholder who were committed to the plan. In this regards the various FGDs were able to confirm that the PVCA planning procedure applied for developing the action plans was almost as close to the traditional decision making processes of the community (Gada system) which as a result helped to ensure local ownership and endorsement of the action plans by the traditional system. In the process of developing the community action plans at kebele levels, HAI staff and woreda Government stakeholders provided technical backstopping support to the respective communities through facilitating detailed decisions made by the communities and indicating alternative course of actions to address their problems identified during the PVCA.

***Activity 1.6:*** *Setting up a Buddy self-help system – partnering older people and other vulnerable individuals with less vulnerable people within the community so that in times of stress these “buddies” ensure the protection inclusion and wellbeing of the vulnerable*

This activity was mainly a process of partnering older people and other vulnerable individuals with volunteer able persons '*buddies*' within the community, so that in times of stress '*buddies*' ensure the protection, inclusion and well-being of the most vulnerable. In the process of establishing “*Buddy self-help system*”, the program officers in collaboration with intergenerational DRR groups, woreda level focal persons, and community facilitators introduced the concept of the *“Buddy system”* to all community members in the 12 kebeles. Following this familiarization and orientation works, identification and partnering of the most vulnerable people with that of the *‘Buddies’* were made by the community members (intergenerational DRR groups). The *‘Buddies’* were selected on voluntary basis to take care of the most vulnerable people. The most vulnerable people including widows and widowers, people with disabilities, vulnerable children youth, were selected by the community using agreed pre-determined criteria. Finally the community members were made aware of those partnered individuals (the most vulnerable individuals with volunteer able persons ‘buddies’) so that the community oversees the implementation of this arrangement as per agreed norms and procedures within the community.

Apart from helping these highly vulnerable individuals during crises, ‘buddies’ were encouraged to ensure that these people are afforded better protection on a day to day basis. In this regard, in some kebeles for example in Galaba , after the orientation and awareness creation, partnering of the two (the most vulnerable person and the ‘*Buddy*’ ) was made by supplementing some small funds to the ‘*buddies*’ on behalf of the most vulnerable persons they partnered with, for use as needed. In this regard the evaluation team encountered a case of a vulnerable person with a mental problem who benefited from having a *"Buddy"* by the name *Idris,* who was provided Birr 700 as a supplement, in support of his commitment to extend the required protection and support to the vulnerable on a day to day basis. Idris with the fund he received from the DRR group bought one female goat on behalf of the vulnerable person, which have already given offspring. In general a total of about 256 most vulnerable persons of which 114 are vulnerable women with disabilities, were partnered with the same number of volunteer buddies in the 12 targeted kebeles.

* + 1. **Improving protection of vulnerable groups at community level against future disaster hazards**

***Activity 2.1:*** *Identification and implementation of small scale resilient infrastructure projects (one per kebele) which is responsive to the vulnerabilities and capacities of older people, through an intergenerational approach*

As reported under result 1 above, 12 intergenerational DRR small scale resilient infrastructure projects (one per kebele) were identified by vulnerable groups through the PVCA exercise and community action planning. The implementation of these small infrastructure development/rehabilitation projects commenced after securing program agreement with the Regional Government on 14th March 2013. The major activities implemented under the small scale infrastructure projects include 1) Water development, 2) Rangeland Management and 3) Watershed Management. Effectiveness of these planned small scale infrastructure development projects implemented under the program support is presented hereunder:-

1. **Water development**

**Construction of Cisterns:** According to HAI terminal report, the program constructed 4 underground water reservoirs called ‘*cisterns’* in Dhas and Gayo kebeles of Dhas woreda and Kadhim and Chereti kebeles of Dillo woreda. These cisterns were constructed to collect surface run-off during rainy season and serve as water storage tanker for the purpose of human and livestock water supply. As reported, the capacity of the cisterns constructed ranges between 100 to 130 m3. All the cisterns constructed were appropriately utilized by the intended beneficiaries and others from adjacent areas. More than 1,678 people were estimated to benefit from the four cisterns constructed in the four kebeles. The number of population in each kebele that directly benefited from the cisterns is shown in Table 3.4:

**Table 3.4: Number of Beneficiaries that Directly Benefited from the Cisterns**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Kebele** | **Capacity** | **No. of Beneficiaries** | |
| HHs | Population |
| 1 | Cheriti | 120m3 | 87 | 562 |
| 2 | Kadhim | 130m3 | 53 | 342 |
| 3 | Gayo | 100m3 | 65 | 419 |
| 3 | Dhas | 120m3 | 55 | 355 |
|  | **Total** | | **260** | **1, 678** |

An underground cistern in Cheriti kebele of Arero woreda was visited by the evaluation team (See photo1A & B). The cistern has a capacity of about 120 M3 (with 8mt diameter and 3.3mt depth) and constructed for the purpose of domestic water supply and livestock watering. As per the KIDs made with Arero Woreda Administration the water from the cistern is serving over 562 people for at least 4 months of the dry period. Observation at the site level indicated that the cistern was constructed with double layer bottom and top concrete slabs as well as single layer reinforcement bars with concrete filled in the double layer masonry wall. The cistern was also equipped with masonry structures like cut-off drains to collect and feed water in to the reservoir and silt traps to avoid siltation, before water enters in to the underground reservoir. Afridev pump was also installed as a water lifting device. Assessment of the cistern generally showed that, it is well constructed and found technically sound. The cistern was located in a compound fenced with brushwood and thorns. According to the FGD/KID discussants of Cheriti there is a water management committee comprising of five members (3men and 2 women) established to look after the day to day management of the water point, which was fully in charge of the scheme. The water management committee established a water user fee collection system and started to collect fee from the water users (0.5 Birr /Jerican) to cover the operating and maintenance costs of the water structure.

The masonry construction work of the cistern was made by deploying construction crew from outside and the community was involved in free labor contribution of up to 1500 PDs (25 persons for 60 days) to the physical works (excavation, transporting local construction materials, access road clearing, clearing the site, as well as guarding and fencing). The community’s free labour contribution at each of the four sites was estimated at Birr 150,000 and this helped the program to make 20-25% saving on the construction work at each site. During the KIDs with the Cheriti woreda Administration it was confirmed that one similar cistern was constructed in Kahadim kebele under the program and started providing the required water supply service to the community.

**Photo 1 Case of Water Supply cistern Constructed in Cheriti kebele of Arero woreda**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | **B** |
| C:\Users\Teferi\Documents\1. 1 A HelpAge Photo\104NIKON\DSCN0391.JPG | C:\Users\Teferi\Documents\1. 1 A HelpAge Photo\104NIKON\DSCN0388.JPG |

**Pond Rehabilitation:** A pond in Dhokole community of Dire woreda with initial capacity of 1,520 m3 was fully rehabilitated through de-silting and widening and as a result the water holding capacity of the pond was reported as increased by 289% to 4,400m3. The excavation and de-silting work was carried out on Cash for Work basis in which 205 beneficiaries benefited from the CFW program. The pond was constructed to store surface water for use during dry season and more than 1,550 people living in Dhokole kebele were reported as direct beneficiaries from the pond through livestock drinking and domestic use. The pond was equipped with structures like spill way, silt trap and a trench of more than 400m to collect and feed water in to the pond. There was also organised water user group responsible for sustained management of the pond.

1. **Rangeland Management:**

Rangeland management is one of the program activities that was identified and prioritized under the infrastructure development intervention through the PVCA exercise and community action planning. The activity entail selective thinning of invasive bushes so as to avoid cutting of environmentally and culturally important woody plant species and also re-sprouting of invasive species after cutting. Accordingly, the program was engaged in supporting rangeland and pasture resources enhancement activities in three kebeles i.e. Galaba and Oroto kebeles of Arero woreda and Dembela Bedena kebele of Dire woredas. This rangeland management activity was initially targeted at 409 ha of land in these three kebeles. However, Kadhim kebele community was included at a later stage, in support of women self help group organized for fattening of small ruminants, in which the program supported bush clearing/thinning to facilitate ease of collection of grass to preserve as hay. As a result, the achievement in physical implementation of the range land management was reported at 509 ha, exceeding the original plan by nearly a 100ha.

More than 406 able bodied vulnerable people in the communities' were targeted to participate in the range land management/reclamation work on cash for work basis. Accordingly, these vulnerable group members were engaged in the range land management practices involving area closure and selective clearing on bush & noxious invasive plant species from 783 ha of land of which 509 ha was done through cash for work and the rest 174 ha was implemented as a community contribution. These beneficiaries participated in the range land improvement for 60 days and each participant received Birr 700 as a wage payment. FGDs revealed that the payment made for the CFW participants was not related to the minimum market wage in the area but much lower as it was considered as part of development contribution to the kebele. FGDs undertaken in the sample kebeles indicated that payments in exchange for their participation in the range land management was decided by the communities represented through the intergenerational groups. FGDs further expressed their appreciation of the project approach in disclosing the budget earmarked for the kebeles, prior to the development of action plan, which as a result helped the community plan as per the allocated budget. Hand tools such as Axe, Machete, Shovel, Pick ax, Hoe, Sledge Hammer etc. to be used for bush clearing were also distributed to beneficiaries participated in the range land improvement by the program. However, FGD conducted in Galaba indicated that hand tools provided for the works was insufficient, which as a result affected quality and performance of the work. Types and quantities of hand tools distributed in the targeted kebeles are shown in Annex 2: Number of beneficiaries participated in the range management activities through CFW and free labour contribution are shown on the following Table 3.5:

**Table 3.5: Number of beneficiaries participated in the range management activities, through CFW and free labor contribution**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Kebele** | **Rangeland size Rehabilitated for grazing in hectare (ha)** | | | **No. of direct beneficiaries** |
| **With CFW** | **With community contribution** | **Total** |
| 1 | D/Bedena | 253 | 80 | 333 | 847 |
| 2 | Galaba | 128 | 22 | 150 | 1084 |
| 3 | Oroto | 128 | 22 | 150 | 1083 |
| 4 | Kadhim | 100 | 50 | 150 | 423 |
|  | **Total** | **509** | **174** | **783** | **3,437** |

As can be seen from the table above about 783 hectares of rangeland was developed and made suitable for grazing. In this regard it is worth noting that some 150 hectare in Kadhim kebele was allocated for hay making from which women groups were able to harvest grass for their fattening program using 50% of the budget (i.e. Birr 50,000) allocated for the kebele. The remaining Birr 50,000 was allocated as start up fund for the women groups to develop small business.

KIDs and FGDs sources, made with the respective stakeholders including community leaders, revealed that implementation of range land development contributed to improved availability of pasture land and pasture resources and enhanced rangeland management practices in the respective pastoral communities.

In this regard, the implementation of the range land management activities in the 509 benefited more than 3,437 people living in the 4 kebeles. According to the discussions made with the program coordinator and woreda line government office staffs, the program intervention in this regard helped the pastoral communities to raise their knowledge of managing range land resources effectively and efficiently. This was particularly witnessed by the FGDs discussants undertaken at Galaba kebele where elders and other community members were seen very much esteemed with the involvement of HAI in this regard. FGD discussants at Galaba kebele were also witnessing the bitter experiences they had practiced before the program. As per their witness it was only during the wet period that they were able to keep their cattle around their respective residence areas. Even in the wet period the pasture resource was not enough to support daily needs of their livestock/cattle population. In dry periods they have to move all their livestock/cattle in places where enough water and pasture land is available. Increasing pressure on the range land of the hosting areas during this dry period was also reported as the usual source of conflicts among the pastoral communities. However, FGDs in Galaba kebele revealed that the communities received numerous benefits from the activities implemented as a result of the range land management implemented under the program among which the following are included.

As a result of the project intervention in this regard, the enclosure areas showed remarkable recovery in terms of biomass accumulation and many community members particularly women have been able to harvest grass from the enclosures and used it to feed their animals, or sold it to earn additional income.

1. **Watershed management**

In total 4 kebeles of which 2 in Moyale woreda (Medo and Tuqa kebeles) and the other 2 in Miyo woreda (Girincho and Gombisa kebeles) were identified for Water shed management project support under the small scale infrastructure development intervention. The communities were participated in the watershed development plan preparation through the intergenerational DRR groups, who took the lead role in selecting the watershed sites, setting up of work norms and beneficiary selection. This as a result contributed to the empowerment of the DRR groups and increased sense of ownership of the implemented structures among the beneficiary communities. The Soil and Water Conservation (SWC) activities planned and implemented were however, limited to structural SWC measures like bunds, micro-basins, and channel terraces, with no support of biological conservation measures. The intergenerational DRR groups in the respective watersheds were participated in the watershed development plan preparation following the PVCA process assisted by the community facilitators. The four watershed sites were delineated through the technical assistance from the woreda offices using GPS. In total more than 446 hectares of land were delineated where the different SWC structures planned for implementation were indicated. As per the program coordinator, the soft copies of the respective watershed maps are available in the program office. More than 573 vulnerable people (332 Female and 241 male) who were able bodied were targeted by the communities to participate in the watershed management mainly related to implementation of SWC structures. Number of beneficiaries participated in the SWC activities, through CFW and free labor contribution are shown in the following Table 3.5.

**Table 3.5: Number of beneficiaries participated in the SWC activities, through CFW and free labor contribution**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Kebele** | **Size of Watershed Managed areas in hectare** | **No. of direct beneficiaries With CFW** | | | **Potential beneficiaries of youth organized under cooperatives on the watershed sites** | | |
| **Male** | **Female** | **Total** | **Male** | **Female** | **Total** |
| 1 | Tuka | 103 | 52 | 79 | 131 | 16 | 16 | 32 |
| 2 | Maddo | 120 | 63 | 85 | 148 | 16 | 16 | 32 |
| 3 | Grincho | 113 | 62 | 81 | 143 | 15 | 15 | 30 |
| 4 | Gombissa | 110 | 64 | 87 | 151 | 15 | 15 | 30 |
|  | **Total** | **446** | **241** | **332** | **573** | **62** | **62** | **124** |

These community members were participated in the implementation of the various SWC structures on CFW basis for 60 days, in which each participant received Birr 700 as wage payment. Since the required hand tools for implementation of the different SWC activities were not supplied by the program, the beneficiaries were forced to use their own traditional tools. The FGDs indicated that the traditional tools were not adequate which negatively affected the quality and physical performance of the implemented structures. In this regard, participants have to give each other turns or wait until others were tired to use the tools and therefore did not utilize labour and time efficiently.

**Photo 2 Case of SWC structures Constructed in Kencho watershed Gombissa kebele of Miyo woreda**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | **B** |
| C:\Users\Teferi\Documents\1. 1 A HelpAge Photo\104NIKON\DSCN0411.JPG | C:\Users\Teferi\Documents\1. 1 A HelpAge Photo\104NIKON\DSCN0408.JPG |

More than 120 jobless youngsters organized under self help group (62 female and 62 male), were allowed to be engaged in some productive income generating activities like production of hey, cattle fattening and bee keeping activities in the watersheds developed under this program support. Together with the use right these groups were given the responsibility to manage, operate and maintain the watershed on a sustainable basis.

***Activity 2.2:*** *Identification and implementation of resilience livelihood actions (one per kebele) which is responsive to the vulnerabilities and capacities of older people, through an intergenerational approach*

Implementation of the livelihoods related plans selected by the respective communities through the PVCA exercises was aimed at increasing livelihood protection capacity among the most vulnerable community members. Like the small scale infrastructure development intervention plan, the community action plan resulted in the identification of resilience building livelihoods enhancement initiatives in the 12 communities – one per kebele. Of the 12 communities, livestock restocking was selected by eight kebeles (Dhokole, D/Bedena, Oroto, Galaba, Girincho, Gombisa, Tuqa and Medo). The three kebeles (Dhas, Gayo, and Chereti) planned for formation and support of older people self help groups through supporting income generating activities (existing or new) as livelihood enhancing initiative. Only one kebele (Kadhim) planned for formation and support of women self help group in hay making and promoting small ruminants fattening as income generating scheme.

* 1. **Restocking of Livestock**

**Restocking of Small Ruminants;** As per the KIDs and FGDs the program before starting the restocking project adequate planning and arrangements were made with the local communities. Accordingly, in order to keep the best interest and benefit of the targeted beneficiaries, the program in collaboration with the intergenerational DRR groups identified methods and procedures that need to be followed in the implementation of the restocking activities. In this regard, given the existing traditional system for restocking (Busa Gonofa[[3]](#footnote-4)) among the Borena pastoralists, community participation was given adequate emphasis by the program in the selection of recipients, defining the types and numbers of animals for restocking, purchase of stock, overall management of the program and impact assessment.

Accordingly, each of the activities implemented in the restocking project was planned in such a way that the community was adequately consulted and involved. HAI staff facilitated the intergenerational DRR groups in each of the eight kebeles, which discussed publicly among themselves and agreed on the selection criteria of beneficiaries, the number and type of livestock to be delivered per beneficiary, and the purchasing modality. Types of livestock for restocking was determined by the community drawing on their indigenous restocking practices as these practices reflected local interests and objectives. Accordingly, while goats were preferred for restocking in the 6 out of the 8 kebeles, the two agro-pastoralist kebeles in Miyo woreda however preferred oxen for restocking.

**Table 3.6: Distribution of livestock provision by no. of beneficiaries per kebele/woreda**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Woreda** | **Kebele** | **Livestock** | | **No of**  **Beneficiaries (HHs)** | **Total livestock distributed** |
| Type | No per HH |
| Arero | Galaba | Goat | 10 | 42 HHs | 420 |
| Oroto | Goat | 10 | 42 HHs | 420 |
| Dire | D/Bedena | Goat | 8 | 35 HHs | 280 |
| Dhokole | Goat | 10 | 35 HHs | 350 |
| Moyale | Tuka | Goat | 6 | 70 HHs | 420 |
| Maddo | Goat | 5 | 71 HHs | 355 |
| Miyo | Gombisa | Ox | 1 | 41 HHs | 41 |
| Grincho | Ox | 1 | 42 HHs | 42 |
| **Total** |  |  | **6 per HH** | **378** | **2328** |

FGDs revealed that goats were preferred than other livestock types, for they are more drought-tolerant, produce more milk and sell at higher prices. As can be seen in the table above, out of the 2, 328 total number of livestock restocked 2,245 (96%) were drought resistant goats and the rest 83 (4%) draft oxen. The goats for restocking were purchased from local markets such as Surupa and Arero markets as these local animals were believed to be adapted to local environmental conditions and diseases. Purchasing was handled by the community representatives together with animal heath personnel and experts from the woreda PO, with no subsequent complaints regarding the quality of the stock distributed. The livestock were inspected for signs of ill-health at the time of purchase by a trained veterinary worker from the respective woredas

Discussions with KIDs and FGDs informed the evaluation team that there was close supervision and follow-ups by the intergenerational groups regarding the status of the livestock after the completion of the restocking. Accordingly, the survival rate of the goats distributed is more than 90% which is encouraging as compared to the past history of restocking in these kebeles by other interventions. Their reproductively was also found good as the number of offspring together with the status those goats under pregnancy was found considerable. The data collected three months after the distribution is presented below.

**Restocking of Oxen;** Out of the eight PAs only Grincho and Gombissa kebeles (agro-pastoralists) opted for oxen as draft animals, for they are agro pastoralist and lost their draft oxen during the last repeated drought conditions in their areas. FGDS in Gombissa kebele indicated that the escalation of food prices together with the drought situation in 2011, led many poor households to sell their livestock assets including their draft oxen to generate cash income for food purchase at high and rising prices. As a result restocking for draft oxen came as a first priority in these kebeles under this program intervention. Purchasing committee was established from the intergenerational committee, PO representative, animal health professional from the woreda (to verify the health status of the oxen to be purchased).

**Table 3.7: Status of the livestock after three months of completion of the restocking program per kebele/woreda**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Factors of change** | **Woredas** | | | | |
| **Arero** | **D/Badana** | **Dhokole** | **Moyale** | **Miyo** |
| 1 | Death | 27 | - | 23 |  |  |
| 2 | Predator attack |  | - | 2 |  | 1 |
| 3 | Delivered | 63 | - |  | 83 |  |
| 4 | Sold | 2 | - |  |  |  |
| 5 | Slaughtered/eaten | 3 | - |  |  |  |
| 6 | Pregnant | 264 | - |  | 450 |  |
| 7 | Exists | 462 | - |  |  |  |
| 8 | Poor Health |  | - |  | 3 |  |
| 9 | Other |  | - |  |  |  |
|  | **Survival Rate** | **96.40%** |  | **93%** | **100%** | **98.80%** |

The oxen were purchased from local markets as these local animals were most likely to be adapted to local environmental conditions and diseases, and minimize transport costs. Criteria were also set to target the beneficiaries under the oxen distribution of which the following were included: Female headed house hold (widowed) with no supporter and has land to be ploughed, Old age, Disabled, People that live with HIV (PLWA). Accordingly, a total of 83 vulnerable persons (41 in Gombisa and 42 in Grincho kebeles) benefited from the oxen distribution under the program. The oxen were distributed in public ceremonies attended by local leaders and the government administration. The public ceremonies were considered an important way to validate the distribution process and enhance the accountability of the intergenerational committee to the community. Beneficiaries were not allowed to sell or exchange the oxen they were given for free as part of the community development program in the area. The intergenerational committee was given the responsibility to oversee this and ensure that each beneficiary under the oxen distribution has to share the draft oxen with those identified as needy in the neighborhood.

Though supporting a poor neighbor is a well accepted traditional practice in the area, in order to ensure the protection of the most vulnerable persons in the community groups (each of five members) organized in the community were expected to control this exchange of support among the community. Further arrangement in this regard was also made to ensure that old women and disabled persons with oxen can receive labor support from other members of the community in exchange of use of their oxen on their farm. Out of the 83 oxen distributed in Gombissa and Grincho kebeles only two were reported dead (one eaten by lion and another by hyena) and the rest (98%) were in good condition serving the purpose they are expected. All the oxen purchased were vaccinated and treated from against internal and external parasites prior their distribution to the targeted community members. Furthermore there are animal health scouts who were trained and given veterinary drugs by different NGOs in both Kebeles. Diseases which are beyond the kebele were encouraged to be reported to the woreda from which further support services are delivered as required.

* 1. **Support for Self-help Groups**

With the objective of enhancing their livelihoods, vulnerable people organized under three self help groups in Gayo, Dhas, and Cheriti were supported to be engaged in income generating activities, as identified through an inter-generational approach. These groups of vulnerable persons include older people, widows, orphans and PWD who had lost their assets or parents as a result of previous drought situations in the area. The beneficiaries organized under these three self-help groups were150 persons of which 40% were female. The group members in all the three kebeles were encouraged to start saving and it was based on a thorough assessment of their business idea (petty trade, livestock market etc) that the startup capital at the agreed ceiling was transferred to each group. Trainings and awareness rising sessions on small business development and management were also given to each group.

The FGDs in Cheriti kebele indicated that there were 52 vulnerable people organized under the self help group by the name *“wolda Mangudota latu chereti“in* the kebele. The program allocated Birr 81,400 against the community’s own contribution of Birr 5,200 which was deposited in a bank. Most of the members of the self-help Group were vulnerable old and disabled people who cannot work and do not have sons or strong wives to assist them. The self help group was led by a management committee comprised of five members including a chair person, purchaser, treasurer, sales, and accountant. The group has a legal status and received legal certificate from the Woreda Cooperatives Promotion Office. The group has its own memorandum of association in which members were agreed on rules and procedures that needs to be taken in implementing the selected activity, i.e. a simple implementation plan of the action prepared by the group members (how, when, what, who). The group was on the process of starting cattle fattening and grain marketing programs at the time of the evaluation. The management committee stated that they have received the necessary training by the concerned government office, facilitated by the program staff. However, considering that most members are illiterate and with inadequate experience in managing and handling business at hand, it is suggested that further adequate follow-up and support should be extended from the woreda concerned offices.

* 1. **Hay Making**

Kadhim kebele community in particular suffers from pasture shortages during the dry seasons and this as a result increased their vulnerability and challenges of maintaining a herd. With the objective of enhancing and diversifying their livelihoods, 50 vulnerable women were organized as a group in Kadhim kebele and supported by the program to be engaged in hay making as small business ventures and thereby to be extended to small ruminant fattening program. The program in one hand supported the group in facilitating the bush clearing and enclosure of the range land through CFWs, so as to enhance regeneration of grass to be harvested for hay making. On the other hand the group was encouraged to start saving and putting their contribution, against which the program transferred a matching fund to start income generation business. Trainings and awareness rising sessions on small business development and management were also provided by the concerned government offices, and facilitated by the program staff.

***Activity 2.3:*** *Budget management sessions with older people and other vulnerable groups with community financing structures to plan the implementation of current and future risk reduction interventions which are responsive to their vulnerabilities*

In order to familiarize the intergenerational DRR groups in budget management and planning techniques training on budget management and related issues were organized and facilitated by the program team in all the targeted 12 kebeles. In this regard, the woreda focal persons of the respective woredas were involved in these sessions and in particular the woreda finance and cooperative offices played a significant role as trainers or budget management session facilitators. The budget management trainings were provided for three days in each of the 12 target kebeles, in which more than 360 DRR group’s members attended the trainings of which 126 (35%) were female participants. AS per the KIDs made with program management and FGDs conducted in the target kebeles, participants were introduced to the different strategies and techniques of budget management which helped them to appropriately use their finance and resources to meet their businesses objectives. Some of the training topics covered included: a) The needs for program activity budgeting, b) The different types of budgets, c) How to plan and develop budget, d) Methods to monitor and make adjustments to budget when necessary and e) Common mistakes in managing budgets.

FGDs conducted in three targeted kebeles generally informed the evaluation team that the budget management sessions were effective in creating a fundamental understanding on budgeting and practical guidance on how to prepare and manage financial budgets. As a result of knowledge gained and budgeting techniques learned from these sessions, the inter-generational clubs' in the respective kebeles were able to plan and implement their current risk reduction interventions in a way they are responsive to their vulnerabilities using realistic financial income and expenditure.

* + 1. **Increasing learning among DRR actors and institutions of vulnerable group’s**

***Activity 3.1:*** *1 X 3 day workshop in Addis to launch the program, identify vulnerability expert panel and to design a DRR inclusion framework for vulnerable groups and intergenerational approaches to help guide the program and other DRR partners*

Following the finalization of the woreda and community level dialogue sessions, a one-day program launching and PVCA validation workshop was conducted on March 14th, 2013 at Yabello town. The workshop was attended by more than 40 participants from Borena zone, representatives of the six target woredas, Kebele administrations, DRR groups, HAI staff from head office and field office, as well as other stakeholders including partner NGOs. The aim of the workshop was to officially launch the program, present the results of the dialogue sessions and community action plans for discussion and get endorsement by the workshop participants. On the overall the workshop discussion created awareness about the program and helped familiarize the program stakeholders on program implementation strategy, specifically the *CMDRR and intergenerational and multi vulnerability approaches,* in line with the current government policy on DRM.

The program further organized a one day workshop in Yabello town on 28th December 2013 with objective of reviewing progress of the program experience and discuss on how to institutionalize and replicate experiences and lessons learnt under the program implementation. Over 50 participants from the zone, woreda government partners, NGO partners, Borena ECHO cluster members as well as representatives of the 12 intervention communities attended the workshop. The workshop was organized in such a way that HAI Yabello field office presented on the program planning and implementation approach, progress achieved and lessons learnt. Following the presentation, community representatives presented the processes and experiences they had passed through, starting from planning to the implementation of the various interventions by comparing plan versus achievement, the lessons learned and the challenges faced. The program participants finally concluded that the program was successful in achieving most of the expected result areas and contributed to the overall improvement of knowledge and skill of the vulnerable communities in relation to risk identification and development of effective and efficient mitigating plans. The workshop participants finally stressed on the need for expansion and replication of the lessons learned with further extension of the program.

***Activity 3.2:*** *Set up of Vulnerability specialist panel data base*

In January 2013, a meeting was hosted by SCI bringing together ECHO and Non ECHO DRR actors together, where the VEP - vulnerability expert’s panel was identified and the program concept and approach discussed deeply by participants. On this preliminary meeting Plan International, UNICEF, REGLAP, ACCRA, World Vision International, SCI and HAI were participated. In the meeting the VEP members agreed to design and propose a DRR inclusion framework for vulnerable groups and intergenerational approaches that help and guide the program and other DRR partners. The VEP devoting considerable time in developing an inclusive DRR framework finally drafted a Twin Track approach to Inclusive DRR Framework, namely: a) Promotion of an inclusive system with ordinary support and specialized service and b) Empowerment of vulnerable groups to participation in DRR through capacity building. The first draft of DRR inclusion framework was presented on the second meeting which was held on 22nd April 2013 and discussed with the presence of representatives from OXFAM, Federal MOLSA, Oromia Region PADC and HAI. A second and final draft of the Vulnerability Inclusive Framework, following the VEP meeting, was revised and distributed to VEP members as well as to ECHO (field office, Ethiopia) and FAO for final comments before it is fully adopted and disseminated to DRR actors and other stakeholders.

Setting up an online vulnerability expert database in collaboration with REGLAP was being finalized through SCI in Nairobi, Kenya. Once set up, the vulnerability experts’ database of specialists/ specialist organizations will be accessed by policy makers to help them ensure that they are including the vulnerable groups to the best of their ability, by considering the specific needs and including the positive contributions they can make in program design, implementation and follow-up.

***Activity 3.3:*** *Program research to identify 6 good practice case studies from past experiences and activities under result 1 and 2 and document them for publication*

KIDs and the program terminal report generally indicated that on the basis of preparatory meetings held with intergenerational DRR groups with regards to selection of the best practice case studies; one best practice case study per kebele was identified. A video of the six good practices case studies was completed and expected to be posted with collaboration with REGLAP. The best six good practice casesstudied include: intergenerational approach, working with partners using government structures, Local institutional empowerment, Transparency, Community contribution and Budget utilization. According to the program coordinator documentation of these six best practices for publication are delayed, mostly in relation to the late start of the program due to delays in the approval of E - LEAP program by the Regional Government authorities (approved in March 2013).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **My name is Kutulo Sora**. I am 25 years of age. I was born and grew in Borena. I am a program facilitator of the Cheriti Kebele. I am astonished by the work of Help Age in its initiative to address the issue of climate which is our burning issue and the world concern. In so doing it has focused on water development, range land management and supporting self help groups through DRR approach. I look at the program as a model for participatory community development work in our region. If I am transferred to another kebele I will also try to replicate this new approach where ever I go. The transparency disclosing budget in advance and the need based assessment done through the PVCA is exemplary exercise I ever seen. I will use this experience of the DRR and try to negotiate with newly intervening NGOs to use this approach and if negotiation does not work I WILL REPORT IT TO THE Woreda. I will seriously follow this approach in future development undertakings. I will reject any agendas that will contradict with the Help Age development approach. *(See photo)* | Kutulo Sora program facilitator in Cheriti Kebele |
| C:\Users\Teferi\Documents\1. 1 A HelpAge Photo\104NIKON\DSCN0399.JPG |
|  |

***Activity 3.4:*** *Produce 6 short films and monthly public radio broadcasts on innovative intergenerational DRR interventions*

The production of short documentary films on innovative inter-generational DRR interventions was contracted out to a film company called “Climax”, following the normal tendering, bid analysis and awarding process. The shooting of the six films (one film for each of the 6 woredas) were completed on the ground, with high participation of the communities, partners and all other stakeholders. The film scripts forwarded to the company after edition by the HAI is expected to be finalized and shared via videos with REGLAP.

Articles prepared by the program team on intergenerational approach and other innovative DRR interventions were transmitted through public radio broadcasts on Ethiopian Radio and Oromifa radio programs. In total 24 radio sessions (two days in a week) were transmitted in both of these radio stations. The KIDs conducted with the program coordinator and focal persons in the three sample woredas generally indicated that, these radio broadcasts contributed to increased awareness on intergenerational approach and other innovative DRR interventions among the communities and the public at large.

***Activity 3.5:*** *Production of 4 technical briefs on the design and implementation of OP led intergenerational DRR activities for DRR practitioners*

The preparation of four technical briefs, including restocking, intergenerational approach, watershed management and as well as good practices learned from other inclusive DRR actors operating in Borena zone is underway and expected to be finalized soon. Once these technical briefs are finalized HAI in collaboration with its partners is expected to post it on REGLAP website.

***Activity 3.6****: Organize at least three learning workshops (school, community meeting,) by DRR clubs to promote the intergenerational approach and participation of vulnerable groups in planning and intervention community initiatives*

In order to familiarize the program plans and promote the inter-generational approach, 12 familiarization and orientation workshops were conducted in the 12 schools and community centers of the program target kebeles. The main theme of these community based workshops in both schools and community centers was “*Building up the capacity of the most vulnerable community groups and reduce their vulnerability and increase their resilience, through including them in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of DRR activities*”. These workshops besides familiarizing the program approach provided the opportunity to promote good DRR practices, drought preparedness and traditional early warning systems for the workshop participants. Moreover, these workshops helped in the orientation and formation of the 12 school DRR clubs in all the program target kebeles. Representatives of local government, traditional leaders, community based organizations as well as community members participated on these workshops.

In order to strengthen the capacity of the established school DRR clubs in playing their role of promoting DRR knowledge and good practices among their communities, the program supported them with mini media materials and equipments to be used by schools DRR clubs. The provision of mini media materials and equipments was made to 12 schools located in the 12 targeted kebeles (one set in each of the target kebeles). The evaluation team visited the mini-media established in Gombissa Junior secondary school in Gombissa Kebele of Miyo woreda. As per the KIDs conducted with the school teachers, the school has a DRR club of 40 members (18 female and 22 male) who were engaged in enhancing public awareness on DRR and related good practices for the surrounding community. The school teachers further confirmed the receipt of different media materials and equipments like; solar-panel, tape recorder, amplifier, microphone, battery, regulator, and other accessories from the program. As per the school teachers, this mini-media support materials and equipment contributed in building the capacity of the school media which served the different social clubs organized in the schools, including DRR club, environmental clubs, HIV clubs, sport clubs, and hygiene education clubs.

***Activity 3.7****: 8 Advocacy and learning events linked to the Day for DRR and other DRR related events to promote the learning of the program to local and INGO and government policy makers and program staff*

To promote the learning of the program to local and INGOs and government policy makers, program staff and the public at large, the following advocacy and learning events linked to the Day for DRR and other DRR related events were undertaken by the program.

* HAI in collaboration with UNDP and Borena Zone -PDO celebrated Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) day in Borena Zone, Yabello town on October 13th, 2013, under the theme "LIVING WITH DISABILITY AND DISASTERS.". The aim of the event was to enhance public awareness on DRR and Disability and its crippling effect towards the disabled people specifically and pastoralist community livelihood development in general. On this occasion different government, non-governmental and UN Organizations were participated including: the mixtures of International NGOs, Local NGOs involved in DRR, UN agencies, 13 Districts Administrators, 13 district Women and Children Affairs, 13 Pastoralist Development Offices, 13 DPPO, 13 OPADO, 13 education office, zone administration, 2 research institutions and other 8 sector offices were invited and attended a 1 day workshop. PVCA assessment report was duplicated and distributed on CD soft copy on this DRR day occasion.
* HAI Ethiopia supported the Dire woreda Labor and Social Affairs Office, both technically and financially, to organize and celebrate Older People’s day at Dubluk Rural town. Older People’s day was celebrated colorfully on October 1st, 2013, in Dubluk school compound in the presence of 312 participants (240 male and 72 female). Under this occasion, Older People’s day was celebrated for 22nd time in the country. The celebration helped to draw attention of donors, governments, NGOs and the general public to efforts of older persons, civil society organizations and others.
* More than 1000 pamphlets on intergenerational DRR approach produced and distributed in all the target woredas and kebeles.
* Names of intergenerational groups and list of restocking beneficiaries laminated and posted in all the target woredas administration offices.
* 12 notice boards with ECHO and HAI logo distributed to each kebele to be used by the respective kebele Administration.
* 13 signboards with ECHO and HAI logo illustrating the details of the program were erected at program sites, where water supply schemes constructed and watershed and rangelands are developed and rehabilitated.

**3.4 Program Impacts**

Most of the activities undertaken by the program indicated signs of progress towards making a positive impact in the lives of the targeted households. The program was only 15 months old but contained some fairly long-range goals that go beyond its life span. Therefore, any impact of the program observed can only be partial. Nevertheless, the following key discernible trends were identified to indicate the program potential benefits and impact trends.

1. The efforts made to sensitize vulnerable community member’s and partners at kebele and woreda level through various familiarization and awareness creation workshops and related PVCA sessions contributed to improved knowledge of vulnerable communities in relation to identified hazards and development of effective and efficient mitigating plans. In this regard the following major impacts were observed under this result area.

* Improved capacity of the intergenerational DRR groups, which enabled them to actively participate in woreda level vulnerability committees and take the leading role in the overall management of the program activities.
* The vulnerability committees established at woreda levels contributed in the inclusion and reflection of the needs, contributions and concerns of the local vulnerable people in the Woreda Development/DRR planning and budget management plans.
* The 12 intergenerational participatory vulnerability and capacity assessment (PVCA) sessions enabled the development of action plans that were responsive to the vulnerabilities and capacities of the vulnerable groups and the communities at large in the 12 targeted kebeles.
* The 2 pilot climate sciences, traditional knowledge dialogue sessions conducted in Yabello and Moyale towns enhanced the knowledge and capacity of both tradition and science and also helped build resilience of community members to drought and other associated hazards.

1. Implementation of small infrastructure development/rehabilitation projects in the 12 kebeles, contributed to risk reduction and protection of the vulnerable groups at community level against future disaster hazards. In this regard, the following major potential benefits and impact trend under this result area were presented.
   1. As a result of the underground water reservoirs *(cisterns)* constructed in the 4 kebeles.

* The dry season severe water shortages of the 1,678 people were addressed.
* Women’s time spent in fetching water at far distances was reduced. Before the program most of the FGD discussants indicated that they used to fetch water from *“ Boleba “* which is a traditional water pointlocated at 5 hours walking distance for round trip. The FGD discussants further indicated that when the *“ Boleba “*  water point dried, they used to travel as far as Dello pond which is 8 hours round trip, where the water as well was salty and dirty. Taking in to account these two previous experiences of the beneficiaries in their respective areas, the program was able to reduce this walking distance to only 30 to 60 minutes.
* With the time saved, women were able to pay greater attention to the feeding and welfare of their families, to provide more assistance with family food preparations and to generate supplementary income.
* Availability of clean water provided substantial health benefits for every person in the community, particularly for women and children. Having water close to their respective residence areas, households were able to collect more water and attend personal hygiene and maintain a sanitary domestic environment. Some proxy indicators traced during the FGD indicated an increment of household water consumption from approximately on average 10 liters per households per day, to more than 20 liters per household per day.
  1. As a result of the 4 rangeland and pasture resources enhancement schemes implemented in 509 ha of land located in the three kebeles.
* Improved availability of pasture land and pasture resources and enhanced rangeland management practices of the pastoral community were maintained. The intervention further helped the pastoral communities to raise their knowledge of managing range land resources effectively and efficiently.
* As per the FGD discussants in Galaba kebele, the enclosure areas showed remarkable recovery in terms of biomass accumulation and many community members particularly women have been able to harvest grass from the enclosures and used it to feed their animals, or sold it to earn additional income.
  1. The program intervention through restocking of 2,245 drought resistant goats and 83 draft oxen contributed to reducing the vulnerability and increasing the resilience to drought of more than 2, 181 most vulnerable people in the program area.

1. In general, the program’s interventions through learning, evaluation and advocacy increased learning among DRR actors and institutions of vulnerable group’s on intergenerational risk reduction and preparedness actions. In this regard the following major result areas could easily show some of the immediate impacts observed.

* The program launching and PVCA validation workshop conducted on March 14, 2013 created awareness about the program and also helped familiarize the program stakeholders on program implementation strategy
* As a result of the program Advocacy and learning effort through events linked to the DRR-Day and articles prepared and transmitted through public radio broadcasts on intergenerational approach and other DRR interventions ;
* Enhanced public awareness on DRR and Disability and its crippling effect towards the disabled people specifically and pastoralist community livelihood development in general.
* Helped to draw attention to efforts of older persons, civil society organizations and others, and further to the possible transfer of knowledge and skill from the older persons to the young ones.
  1. **Program Sustainability**

The evaluation finding generally indicates that, the approach followed in which most of the program actions were implemented by active participation of the target community supported with local government will ensure future continuity and sustainability of the program initiatives. A range of training programs that were provided to the target community institutions and the local partner staff contributed to improved knowledge and skills and thus expected to improve the planning and management of the local development initiatives. Program participants reported that they were fully involved in the planning of the various program interventions starting from the development of community action plans, which reflected their needs, identified their roles and responsibilities. This as a result developed sense of ownership of DRR/DRM activities implemented, among the community members and enhanced maintenance and protection of the physical assets created under the E-LEAP action.

HAI played a facilitation role as well as provided technical assistance in planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and overall management of the program DRR/DRM activities. This as a result helped in building the capacity and creating confidence of the local institutions which will have enormous contribution to sustainability of the program outcomes. The involvement and coordination of local stakeholders' and community representatives were central to the sustainability of the program outputs at different levels. Woreda established Vulnerability Committees played a supportive role at woreda level to facilitate the planning and implementation of inter-generational DRR approaches and build the resilience of all the vulnerable persons in conjunction with governmental DRR actors at woreda level. While this approach helped ensure local ownership, it also created common and shared responsibility with the woreda level actors.

**3.5.1 Sustainability of implemented small scale resilient infrastructure projects**

**Water Supply Schemes:** Water Management committees which are essential to ensure the sustainability of the schemes were organized and trained under the program support and took over responsibility for their operation and maintenance. The water management committees further established water user fee collection system and started to collect fee from the water users to cover the operating and maintenance costs of the water structure.

**Watershed Management:** Though, most of the SWC structures were implemented at communal lands, and since they are formally transferred to 124 youth organized under self help group (15 female and 15 male), they have specific responsible bodies to manage, operate and maintain the structures by committing the required resources on sustainable basis. The SWC implemented under the program generally showed reasonable technical sustainability performance. Most of these structures were planned and implemented based watershed management approach and were expected to be managed as such by the community. Besides the 124 youngsters organized under the user groups, there was a watershed management team (4 male and 3 women) established at watershed level. These committees are expected to contribute for sustained management and utilization of the resource derived as a result of the constructed SWC structures.

**3.5.2 Sustainability of implemented resilience livelihood actions**

**Livestock Restocking:** Restocking of livestock (goat and oxen) undertaken by the program in the targeted kebeles and households are believed to be sustainable due the following factors that the program ensured.

* Community participation in the restocking was given adequate emphasis by the program, including in the selection of recipients, defining the types and numbers of animals for restocking, purchase of stock, overall management of the program and impact assessment.
* The goats and oxen for restocked were purchased from local markets as these local animals are most likely to be adapted to local environmental conditions and diseases.
* There were close supervision and follow-ups by the intergenerational groups regarding the status of the livestock after the completion of the restocking.
* Beneficiaries were not allowed to sell or exchange the oxen they are given as they are given for free and expected to share the oxen with those who are in need in the neighborhood. The intergenerational committee oversees this.

**Support for Self-help Groups:** The vulnerable people organized under the three self help groups in Gayo, Dhas, and Cheriti were supported to be engaged in income generating activities which were suitable and responsive to their vulnerabilities and capacities, as identified through an inter-generational approach. The trainings and awareness rising sessions on small business development and management given to each group and their legal certification by the Woreda Cooperatives Promotion Office would have also strong contributions for their sustainability. In this regards, the beneficiaries were observed speaking of the knowledge they acquired, the benefits of the intervention and the positive behavioral changes the program brought to their lives.

**3.6 Mutual Reinforcement (Coherence)**

Ethiopia’s current DRM-SPIF aims at building up and sustaining resilient capacities of vulnerable communities through diversified livelihood opportunities, natural resources management and environment protection. In the implementation of such DRM/DRR programs the Government is putting great focus on promoting active engagement of community institutions from the basis of decisions regarding type of activities to be undertaken and geographical areas and populations to be targeted. In this regard,the country has made substantial progress in terms of improving, streamlining and integrating the entire DRM cycle. The success of all DRM/DRR programs under the DRM-SPIF policy is not impossible without active participation and efforts of all the Governmental, NGOs and private sector working in the zone[[4]](#footnote-5). In Borena Zone, there were different DRR/DRM related programs implemented by the respective Woreda government and NGOs working in the area, to address the problem. In Borena Zone, the Pastoral Community Development Program (PCDP) works to establish effective models of public service delivery, investment and disaster risk management and to increase the resilience of pastoral communities to external shocks. More broadly, a wider range of more development orientated programs that work to address the root causes of vulnerability can be classified under this category. This leads to the need to encourage greater coordination and integration of similar activities that seek to reduce overall household and community level vulnerability to disasters.

E-Leap program is one of such programs implemented with an official MoU signed between HAI and Borena zone PDO. Different consultative meetings undertaken in the field with different DRR partners, contributed in reducing duplication of DRR interventions in the program targeted kebeles and also in strengthening collective bargaining through unified agenda and approaches. Moreover, these consultative meetings helped to identify linkages and enhance networking and coordination among the different DRR actors, particularly among ECHO partners in Borena zone.

* 1. **Cross-Cutting Issues**

Hazards and climatic changes have differential impacts on women and men as gender based differences have a strong impact on their vulnerabilities as well as the coping capacities. It is well recognized that women and men experience, perceive and are exposed to different levels of risks and vulnerabilities, with women more disproportionately affected. The Ethiopian DRM Policy in this regard provides for the appropriate mainstreaming of gender issues noting that gender should be adequately integrated and mainstreamed in DRM planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

Recognizing the fact that older people, women and persons with disabilities are some of the most vulnerable groups in any community, the E-LEAP program adopted an all-inclusive approach for all major interventions to enhance capacities of communities to increase resilience and reduce vulnerabilities to drought and other hazards. In this regard, the program trained its staff and other stakeholders on mainstreaming age, gender and disability into community based disaster risk management, so that all the activities will be implemented from the inclusiveness perspective. Accordingly, women, particularly, in the program areas, were considered as the most vulnerable group due to various socio-cultural factors such as lack of education, restricted mobility and traditional role of women. From the various KIDs and FGDs it was learnt that the program encouraged the participation of women in all aspects of capacity building, trainings as well as other disaster management activities undertaken. It was observed that women in the various established committees were actively engaged in all DRR initiatives and learning.

In general, gender was adequately considered as a crosscutting issue in the program design, and the program document specifically underlined the need for inclusion of gender approach in the PVCA exercise and the development of community action plans, capacity building and trainings which are conducted with inclusiveness and active participation of older people, women, children and persons with disabilities. As can be seen in the following table, participation of women in different aspects of the program interventions or application of gender provisions as required in the DRM-SPIF was generally rated as good (38.26%).

The program was adequately responsive in most of the activities which require gender sensitivity. In this regards participation of women was registered at more than 50% in Water supply development (65%), restocking of goats and oxen (56%), and Youth cooperatives established on the watershed (50%). However, there were also some activities where participation of women were not adequately reflected (<50%), such as participation of women in program launching sessions (4.6%) , PVCA training (5.6%), Woreda Vulnerability Committee (15.1%), and Dialogue session on climate science (10.5%).

**Table 3.7: Program beneficiaries under different program interventions disaggregated by Sex**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Activities** | **Sex disaggregated data of program intervention** | | | **% of women beneficiaries** |
| **Female** | **Male** | **Total** |
| 1 | Community dialogue sessions | 7350 | 7650 | 15000 | 49.0 |
| 2 | Intergenerational DRR groups | 155 | 205 | 360 | 43.1 |
| 3 | School DRR clubs formation & orientation | 168 | 212 | 380 | 44.2 |
| 4 | School mini media support | 2220 | 2280 | 4500 | 49.3 |
| 5 | Woreda Vulnerability Committee | 15 | 45 | 60 | 25.0 |
| 6 | Rangeland Management interventions | 1891 | 1945 | 3836 | 49.3 |
| 7 | Restocking (goats and oxen) | 1220 | 960 | 2180 | 56.0 |
| 8 | Self help groups for income generation | 540 | 555 | 1095 | 49.3 |
| 9 | Water development Cistern + Pond | 2033 | 1095 | 3128 | 65.0 |
| 10 | Program launching sessions | 3 | 62 | 65 | 4.6 |
| 11 | DRR/CCA & budget management session | 126 | 234 | 360 | 35.3 |
| 12 | DRR day event | 38 | 57 | 95 | 40.0 |
| 13 | Older people day event | 205 | 271 | 476 | 43.1 |
| 14 | PVCA training | 4 | 68 | 72 | 5.6 |
| 15 | Community institutions | 145 | 215 | 360 | 40.3 |
| 16 | Woreda Vulnerability Committee | 16 | 90 | 106 | 15.1 |
| 17 | Dialogue session climate science | 4 | 34 | 38 | 10.5 |
| 18 | Establishing buddy of self help system | 114 | 143 | 257 | 44.4 |
| 19 | Youth Cooperatives established on the watershed | 62 | 62 | 124 | 50.0 |
| 20 | Watershed Management intervention | 8586 | 10027 | 18613 | 46.1 |
|  | **Total** |  |  | **51105** | **38.26** |

**3.8 Visibility**

The program implemented various activities in the area of visibility highlighting the major drivers of the program including the donor ECHO and the implementing agency HAI. In this regard program factsheets, and stickers were produced, stickers showing ECHO and HAI logos were posted on program vehicles, office doors and other program equipment. Signboards with ECHO and HAI logos and stickers illustrating the details of the program were also seen placed at program sites where water supply schemes constructed and watershed and rangelands are developed and rehabilitated. The program field office further produced CD soft copy of PVCA assessment report, which is distributed to program partners on DRR day celebrated on October 13th, 2013. All these efforts contributed to the realization and visibility of the ECHO funds by the surrounding communities, donors and others.

**IV. LESSONS LEARNT**

The following main lessons can be drawn from the planning and implementation of the E-LEAP program

1. The facilitating role played by HAI instead of replacing the local government structure contributed to the sustainability of the program outputs.
2. PVCA planning procedure which the program applied for developing the action plans was appreciated by the community, zone and Woreda offices, as it is almost as close to the traditional decision making processes of the community (Gada system) which helped to ensure local ownership and endorsement of the action plans by the traditional system.
3. The scarcity of water supply sources particularly during the long dry season was more severe for pastoralists; this therefore should be taken as priority agenda for any future development intervention in the program area.
4. The fact that program management is located at Yabello, with no representative at woreda levels and no adequate transport was a challenging experience for the program management.
5. The program transparency in declaring budget allocated to each kebele in advance of planning was highly praised by the communities and many expressed that this advance notification of budget earmarked for the various programs in a kebele enabled the communities in prioritizing and deciding action to be taken up in the plan on the basis of known resources
6. The other point raised in relation to transparency was in almost all the cases the community and the counterpart government offices were well informed and also had saying in terms of allocating resources on the community need and priority basis.
7. Adequate emphasis should have been given to improve the management capacity of implementing partners at woreda levels, so that they can adequately contribute to the implementation and sustainability of the program.
8. Community Action planning (CAP) exercises in which the community gather and discuss and prepare plans using simplified planning procedures should be taken as very good lessons to be replicated to other areas.
9. The fact that the watershed management committees established at the watershed levels did not have legal entity or internal enforcing mechanisms limited the application of appropriate management and control mechanisms for sustained utilization of the watershed resources.
10. Given the Borena pastoralists already have traditional system for restocking (Busa Gonofa[[5]](#footnote-6)) , community participation was given adequate emphasis by the program in the selection of recipients, defining the types and numbers of animals for restocking, purchase of stock, overall management of the program and impact assessment.
11. The importance of seed-capital support to those vulnerable people organized under self help group against their savings, particularly in order to assist their efforts to start business and helped develop effective savings culture in the communities.
12. **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**
    1. **Conclusion**

The program in general was relevant in enhancing resilience and reducing vulnerability of drought prone local communities through inter-generational approaches and all-inclusive good practices in Southern Ethiopia, in particular in the six targeted woredas (Dire, Dillo, Miyo, Arero, Dhas and Moyale) of Borena Zone, Oromia Region. The program objectives and strategy were consistent with, and supportive of, the government’s Disaster Risk Management strategic program and investment framework (DRM SPIF) and related sector policies.

The initial program launching and PVCA validation workshop created clear understanding on the overall program activities, management, allocated resources and roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder. This joint planning, did not only help create a common vision and high esprit between the program and partners, it also encouraged ownership, synergy and complementarities between program components. The efforts made to sensitize vulnerable community’s partners at kebele and woreda level through various familiarization and awareness creation workshops and related PVCA sessions at woreda and kebele levels contributed to improved knowledge of vulnerable communities in relation to identified hazards and development of effective and efficient mitigating plans.

The PVCA training and subsequent program planning process through the 12 intergenerational groups dialogue sessions enabled the communities to identify their own capacities and vulnerabilities in relation to disaster management, developing mitigation strategies and building resilience to cope with future hazards. This was clearly demonstrated through improved ability and knowledge in identifying hazards and developing the various action plans in all the 12 kebeles by the communities. These action plans were responsive to the vulnerabilities and capacities of the vulnerable groups and the communities at large and effective in enhancing the inclusion and reflection of the needs and concerns of the local vulnerable people in the Woreda Development/DRR planning and budget management plans.

The preparedness and response capacities of most the vulnerable groups to drought and other disasters in the 12 pastoralist communities in Borena was strengthened by organizing inter-generational DRR community groups based on traditional local disaster response systems. The innovative older people led inter-generational approach which HAI adopted was found appropriate for drawing useful traditional DRR knowledge and practice to new generations and building new generations' resilience to disasters. In using the inter-generational approach, HAI created opportunity for sharing older persons' traditional knowledge, skills, expertise and experience which contributed to the effectiveness and efficiency of DRR programming in Borena zone.

A significant increase in learning among DRR actors and institutions of vulnerable group’s on intergenerational risk reduction and preparedness actions was also registered as a result of the various program’s interventions through learning, evaluation and advocacy workshops, panels, and events. The program was implemented through the knowledge and active participation of pertinent sector offices of Bale Zone (Administration and PDO) and the respective woreda’s PDOs, DPPOs, Water offices and Cooperative Promotion Offices of the six woredas. Particularly Zonal PDOs and the respective woreda’s PDOs and DPPOs who were directly involved by assigning focal persons and played a major role in coordinating and integrating the program efforts with the zone and woreda development plans. The working relationship and collaboration of the program with the local community as well as government partner offices was seen as strong and this is mainly because of HAI’s experience and high level of awareness on the social aspects of the program areas.

The program has accomplished all the planned activities successfully and made significant progress towards achieving the result areas as planned in the program proposal. However, the following three activities, which were not fully realized under the third result area, need to be finalized;

* Program research to identify 6 good practice case studies from past experiences and activities under result 1 and 2 and document them for publication
* Produce 6 short films on innovative intergenerational DRR interventions
* Production of 4 technical briefs on the design and implementation of OP led intergenerational DRR activities for DRR actors.

**5.2 Recommendations**

Based on the above findings the following recommendations are forwarded for consideration by concerned bodies:

1. The Evaluation Team recommends that ECHO and HAI should seriously consider funding a future program phase, and in this regard the principal focus should be replication and expansion of the lessons learnt from the last program.
2. If the program is to continue into a next phase, taking in to account the logistical arrangement required for close follow-up and supervision and to make maximum use of limited resources, it is strongly suggested that the program be concentrated in a limited geographic area.
3. Give more emphasis to the use of biological measures on the degraded watersheds to maximize the benefits for the communities and also enhance their rehabilitation. This should include the introduction of more grasses, shrubs and trees and the use of more exchange of experience tours to other areas with a strong biological component.
4. More efforts should be made by implementing partners in support of upgrading the technical capacity of Woreda government staff.
5. If the program is to continue into a next phase, ensure that the next phase includes a plan for preparation of baseline data involving surveying and monitoring, and the inclusion of vulnerability profile and gender information in both information gathering and planning processes.
6. Consider increasing the number of hand tools so as to maximize efficient utilization of labour and time.
7. In order to promote ownership and managerial sustainability of the watersheds, adequate emphasis should be given in helping communities get organized, develop their watershed’s by-laws, and establish enforcing mechanism such as development of simple operating plans, rules and schedules for management and utilization of watersheds.
8. Considering the fact that most members of the self help groups are illiterate and their inadequate experience in managing and handling business at hand, it is suggested further adequate follow-up and support should be provided from the woreda concerned offices.
9. There must be adequate coordinated effort among the Borena cluster DRR actors, in order to maximize integration and complimentarily among their different interventions and enhance efficiency and effectiveness of the DRR programming in the region as well as creating conducive atmosphere for sharing good DRR practices and implementation methodologies in Borena zone.
10. Encourage the Water Work Offices to provide additional technical training to the Water committees on how to operate and maintain the water systems. Training in the past tended to focus mainly on the organization and management of the schemes with insufficient attention paid to the technical aspects of their operation and management.
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*For the inclusion and active participation of vulnerable groups through intergenerational approaches to increase resilience and reduce vulnerability in local communities to drought in Ethiopia*

**[Arero, Dhas, Dillo, Dire, Miyo and Moyale Woredas in Borena Zone, Oromia Region-Ethiopia**]

**Funded by: European Commission**

Agreement Number: ECHO/-HF/BUD/2012/91058

*The Program was implemented by HelpAge International with child-centered Disaster Risk Reduction technical support of Save the Children International*

*Program period: October 1, 2012 to December 31, 2013*

*The final evaluation report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the HelpAge International- and European Commission- Directorate General Humanitarian and Civil Protection (ECHO)*

**Addis Ababa, Ethiopia**

**March, 2014**

Annex 1 – Evaluation Rating Table for evaluation of the performance of the overall intervention by the consultant.

\*This evaluation rating table below was annexed to the ToRs for information to the consultants

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Rating (1 low, 5 high)** | | | | | **Rationale** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **Impact** |  |  | **x** |  |  | The program period was too short to show impact. |
| **Sustainability** |  |  |  | **x** |  |  |
| **Coherence** |  |  |  | **x** |  |  |
| **Coverage** |  |  |  | **x** |  |  |
| **Relevance** |  |  |  |  | **x** |  |
| **Appropriateness** |  |  |  |  | **x** |  |
| **Effectiveness** |  |  |  | **x** |  |  |
| **Efficiency** |  |  |  | **x** |  |  |
| **Accountability** |  |  |  | **x** |  |  |
| **Mainstreaming C-C Issues** |  |  |  | **x** |  |  |

**ANNEX 2: Agricultural Hand Tools Distributed under the program**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Types of hand tools provided** | **Unit** | **Quantity distributed to kebeles by woredas** | | | | | | **Total** |
| **Arero** | **Dhas** | **Dire** | **Dillo** | **Miyo** | **Moyale** |
| 1 | Axe | pcs | 94 |  | 44 |  | 6 | 6 | 150 |
| 2 | Machete | pcs | 44 |  | 40 |  | 8 | 8 | 100 |
| 3 | Shovel | pcs |  | 100 |  | 100 | 60 | 60 | 320 |
| 4 | Pick ax | pcs |  | 70 |  | 70 | 50 | 50 | 240 |
| 5 | Hoe | pcs |  |  |  |  | 50 | 50 | 100 |
| 6 | Sledge Hammer 5kg | pcs |  | 10 |  | 10 | 8 | 8 | 36 |
| 7 | Water level (on string) | pcs |  |  |  |  | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| 8 | Sledge hammer small | pcs |  | 12 |  | 12 | 2 | 2 | 28 |
| 9 | Tape meter (50mroll) | pcs |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| 10 | Nylon rope (100m roll) | pcs |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 |

**Annex 3: Types of community led DRR initiatives and corresponding budget plan by Kebele[[6]](#footnote-7)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Woreda** | **Kebele** | **Activities Identified and Budget allocated** | | | | **Total Birr per kebele budget** |
| **Livelihood enhancement** | **Budget** | **Infrast Dev't** | **Budget** |
| 1 | Arero | Galaba | Restocking | 300,000 | Rangeland | 100,000 | 400,000 |
| Oroto | Restocking | 300,000 | Rangeland | 100,000 | 400,000 |
| 2 | Dhas | Gayo | Cooperative | 100,000 | Water | 300,000 | 400,000 |
| Dhas | Cooperative | 100,000 | Water | 300,000 | 400,000 |
| 3 | Dirre | D/Badana | Restocking | 200,000 | Rangeland | 200,000 | 400,000 |
| Dhokole | Restocking | 250,000 | Pond | 150,000 | 400,000 |
| 4 | Dillo | Cheriti | Cooperative | 100,000 | Water | 300,000 | 400,000 |
| Kadhim | Hay making | 100,000 | Water | 300,000 | 400,000 |
| 5 | Moyale | Tuka | Restocking | 300,000 | Watershed | 100,000 | 400,000 |
| Maddo | Restocking | 250,000 | Watershed | 150,000 | 400,000 |
| 6 | Miyo | Gombissa | Restocking | 200,000 | Watershed | 200,000 | 400,000 |
| Grincho | Restocking | 200,000 | Watershed | 200,000 | 400,000 |
|  |  |  |  | **2,400,000** |  | **2,400,000** | **4,800,000** |

**ANNEX 4: List of contacts on the Final Evaluation of the E–LEAP (Learning, Evaluation and Advocacy Program) in Borena Zone of Oromia Region – Ethiopia**

**Annex 4.1 Lists of Key Informants Contacted on the Final Evaluation of the E-LEAP Bale Zone**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Participants' Name** | **Location** | **Organization** | **Position** |
| 1 | Feleke Tadele | Addis Ababa | HAI | Country Director |
| 2 | Alfred Mondiwa | Addis Ababa | HAI | Senior Emergency Program Manager |
| 3 | Dereje H/mariam | Addis Ababa | HAI | Senior Emergency/DRR Program Officer |
| 4 | Petros Wako | Yabello | Zone PDO | Vice Head |
| 5 | Sara Dera | Yabello | Zone PDO | NRM Process |
| 6 | Fitsum Degemu | Yabello | Zone FEDO | NGO coordination |
| 7 | Gayo Guyo | Yabello | Zone DPPO | Head |
| 8 | Tesgaye Tadesse | Yabello | HAI | E-LEAP coordinator |
| 9 | Galalu Duba | Arero Woreda | PDO | Supervisor (FP) |
| 10 | Wako Liban | Arero woreda | Education | Head of (WVC) |
| 11 | Duba Alii | Arero woreda | Transport | Administration |
| 12 | Fitsum Amare | Dilo woreda | water and Energy | Head |
| 13 | Mohammed Alake | Dilo woreda | Women /child affair | Delegate |
| 14 | Doyo Nura | Dilo woreda | PDO | Livestock expert |
| 15 | Galma Guyo | Dilo woreda | Administration | Focal person |
| 16 | Wario hufure | Dilo woreda | Revenue | Delegate |
| 17 | Wari Dalcha | Dilo woreda | DPPO | Expert |
| 18 | Diba Sore | Dilo woreda | PDO | Vice head |
| 19 | Yacob Bachare | Miyo woreda | Finance | Expert |
| 20 | Miyo shama | Miyo woreda | PDO | Expert |
| 21 | Dr.Sadik Kasim | Miyo woreda | PDO | Expert |
| 22 | Halake Gelgalo | Miyo woreda | Education | Vice head |

**Annex 4.2 Lists of Focus Group Participant in Galaba kebele of Arero Woreda**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Participants' Name** | **Position** | **Responsibility** |
| 1 | Tonda Isaq | IGDRRG member | Old age/ restocking pastoralist |
| 2 | W/t Lanna Aga | IGDRRG member | student |
| 3 | Tukuresa Gugni | IGDRRG member | student |
| 4 | Isaq waji | IGDRRG- purchase committee chair | Bush clearing /pastoralist |
| 5 | W/ro Jibo Dadadtu | IGG member | Old age/restocking /pastoralist |
| 6 | Ibrahim Huka | IGDRRG member | Old age/restocking pastoralist |
| 7 | Dullo Kume | IGDRRG- purchase committee chair | Bush clearing/ pastoralist |
| 8 | W/ro Besha Chua | IGDRRG member | Disable /pastoralist |
| 9 | W/ro Gimba Jeldessa | IGDRRG member | Old age/restocking pastoralist |
| 10 | Gumii biloya | IGDRRG member | Old age/restocking pastoralist |
| 11 | Ibren Huko | IGDRRG member | Old age/restocking pastoralist |
| 12 | W/ro Kefa Mohammed | IGDRRG member | bush clearing /pastoralist |
| 13 | W/t Derartu Isak | IGDRRG member | student |

**Annex 4.3 Lists of Focus Group Participant in Cheriti kebele of Dilo Woreda**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Participants' Name** | **Position** | **Responsibility** |
| 1 | Dida Wako Wario | Chair person IGDRRG | pastoralist |
| 2 | Gobbuu Gurmu Awashi | Secretary IGDRRG | pastoralist |
| 3 | W/ro Dimtu Malicha | IGDRRG member | Member of the self help group |
| 4 | Guyyoo Dida Boruu | IGDRRG member | School representative |
| 5 | Kuntulo Soraa Tulluu | DA | Focal person |
| 6 | Kabala Boruu Shawaa | IGDRRG member | Member the IGDRRG |
| 7 | W/ro Hacurre Doyo | IGDRRG member | Member of the self help group |
| 8 | W/ro Booraa Haroo | IGDRRG member | Members of the self help group |
| 9 | W/ro Galgaluu Boruu | IGDRRG member | Members of the self help group |
| 10 | W/ro Bokku Molu | IGDRRG member |  |
| 11 | Guyyoo bonaya reede | IGDRRG member | PWD representatives |
| 12 | Kishanna dhadacha jiloo | IGDRRG member | PWD representatives |
| 13 | Abakula malicha boruu | IGDRRG member | Child representatives |
| 14 | Moluu abiduba halakee | IGDRRG member | Members of the self help group |
| 15 | Wako boruu shawo | IGDRRG member | Members of the self help group |
| 16 | W/ro Tunee halakee obaa | IGDRRG member | Members of the self help group |
| 17 | Guyyoo tadhii galgalo | IGDRRG member | Members of the self help group |

**Annex 4.4 Lists of Focus Group Participants in Girincho kebele of Miyo Woreda**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Participants' Name** | **Position** | **Responsibility** |
| 1 | Bedane Racho | IGDRRG member | Chair person /pastoralist |
| 2 | Biliso Arero | IGDRRG member | pastoralist |
| 3 | Guyo Diba | IGDRRG member | Budget committee/pastoralist |
| 4 | W/ro Rufo Kiya | IGDRRG member | Monitoring committee/ pastoralist |
| 5 | Ibrahim Dabaso | IGDRRG member | pastoralist |
| 6 | W/ro Jilo guyo | IGDRRG member | Monitoring committee/ pastoralist |
| 7 | W/ro Kalu Molu | IGDRRG member | pastoralist |
| 8 | Zenabu Hinsarmu | IGDRRG member | DA |
| 9 | Roba Okatu | IGDRRG member | pastoralist |
| 10 | Jaldesa Huka | IGDRRG member | pastoralist |
| 11 | jaldesa Halake | IGDRRG member | pastoralist |
| 12 | Husen Jaldesa | IGDRRG member | pastoralist |
| 13 | Ayansh Lomi | IGDRRG member | pastoralist |

**ANNEX 5: Check list for Key Informant Interview and FGD For Evaluation of the E – LEAP (Learning, Evaluation and Advocacy Program) in Borena Zone of Oromia Region – Ethiopia**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **R-1** | **Improved knowledge of vulnerable communities in relation to identified hazards often affecting them and effective and efficient mitigating plans.** | |
| 1.1 | Programme planning meeting with existing ECHO and non-ECHO partners in the 6 woredas to identify linkages and kebele of implementation of the programme | * Were there any Program planning meetings undertaken with relevant government stakeholders as well as existing ECHO and non-ECHO DRR partners? * If there were any when and where were these meetings conducted and for how long? * What was the purpose of these meetings and attendance of the meetings? * How effective were these meetings in creating medium for sharing good DRR practices and implementation methodologies in Borena zone? * What was the outcome and impact of these meetings in particular contributing to the effectiveness and efficiency of DRR programming in Borena zone? |
| 1.2 | Establishment of 12 most vulnerable community groups as inter-generational DRR clubs and Establishment of Vulnerability Committees | * How many DRR clubs of vulnerable community groups established in the project areas? * What was the purpose of establishing these DRR clubs in the respective communities? * Were you involved in the DRR clubs of vulnerable community groups? * Was there any training provided with regard to increasing knowledge and understanding vulnerabilities among the DRR clubs members. * Can this DRR clubs function without the presence of HelpAge? * What was the linkage between DRR clubs to govt. and NGO networks and projects in the area? * What are the efforts made in strengthening inter-generational clubs and local government DRR capacity at both woreda and zonal levels? * How many PVCA sessions (participatory vulnerability and capacity assessment sessions) conducted as a result of the established DRR clubs? * How many Vulnerability Committees formed to work with DRM authorities at woreda level, as a result of the intergenerational DRR clubs? * How frequent are these woreda Vulnerability Committees meet for disaster preparedness and early warning purposes? * Was there any effort made in extending these DRR clubs at school level, so as to properly account the DRR needs of children and youth? How many kebels are covered under established school DRR clubs? * Was there any effort made towards ensuring active participation of the most vulnerable community groups in planning and budgeting processes at kebele level and woreda level's. * What is the status of the developing an "all inclusive and active participation vulnerability framework" to be used as a basis for including all vulnerable community groups in disaster preparedness and disaster risk management from local, woreda to regional levels |
| 1.3 | 12 intergenerational participatory vulnerability and capacity assessment (PVCA) sessions | * In how many kebeles that the PVCA exercises were conducted? * What was the purpose of conducting these PVCA exercises? * How many PVCA sessions (participatory vulnerability and capacity assessment sessions) conducted as a result of the established DRR clubs? |
| 1.4 | At least 2 pilot Climate science, traditional knowledge dialogue sessions will be conducted in two kebeles | * How many pilot climate science and traditional knowledge dialogue sessions conducted in the project areas? Where and for how long? * Who facilitated the dialogue sessions conducted between climate science and traditional knowledge? * What was the outcome of the dialogue sessions in terms of enhancing the knowledge and capacity of both tradition and science and also help build resilience of community members to drought and other associated hazards? * Was there any effort made in documenting and disseminating the outcome of the dialogue sessions to all concerned DRR stakeholders? |
| 1.5 | Production of a community emergency preparedness and resilience building plan which are responsive to the vulnerabilities and contributions of vulnerable groups including older people, children, women and PwD | * How was the inclusion and participation of the most vulnerable people ensured in the preparation (identification and prioritization of problems and actions) of the community emergency preparedness and resilience building plans? * What are the steps and procedures followed to ensure the action plans are as close as possible to the traditional decision making processes (Gada system) of the community to ensure local ownership and endorsement by the traditional system. * How many community emergency preparedness and resilience building plans produced as a result of the intergenerational PVCA sessions conducted in the project areas? * How responsive were these plans to the vulnerabilities of the most vulnerable groups in the communities and contribution climate change adaptation? * How effective were the contribution of the most vulnerable groups including older people, children, women and people with disabilities in the production of community emergency preparedness and resilience building plans? |
| 1.6 | Setting up a Buddy self-help system – partnering older people and other vulnerable individuals with less vulnerable people within the community so that in times of stress these “buddies” ensure the protection inclusion and wellbeing of the vulnerable | * What is the status of establishing a "Buddy self-help system" in the DRR intergenerational groups? * What are criteria employed for selecting the "Buddy Self-Help persons”? * Were you involved in the "Buddy self-help system" DRR clubs of vulnerable community groups? * Can this "Buddy self-help system" function without the presence of HelpAge? * What was the linkage between "Buddy self-help system" to govt. and NGO networks and projects * Have you received any training in Familiarization of the "Buddy self-help system"? If so, describe what you learned. * How has this training helped the vulnerable in the community? (Request specific examples) * How sustainable is this support system in ensuring the protection, inclusive and well-being of the most vulnerable during times of crisis? * What are the actions taken and supports provided towards the proper functioning of the e “Buddy self-help system” in ensuring the protection, inclusion and the well-being of the most vulnerable during times of crisis? |
| **R-2** | **Vulnerable groups at community level are better protected against future disaster hazards in 12 kebeles through PVCA consultations as well as disaster preparedness and risk reduction initiatives** | |
| 2.1 | Identification and implementation of small scale resilient infrastructure projects (one per kebele) which is responsive to the vulnerabilities and capacities of older people, through an intergenerational approach | * What was the process followed in the identification and implementation of intergenerational DRR small scale resilient infrastructure projects? * What kind of technical support provided towards improving and increasing knowledge and understanding vulnerabilities to various hazards and risks and mitigation measures. * What kind of risk reduction and adaptation measures (activities) identified as part of the intergenerational DRR and small scale resilient infrastructure projects? * How many intergenerational DRR small scale resilient infrastructure projects (one per kebele) were implemented? * What are the outcome of the DRR small scale resilience infrastructures and how are they intended to specifically benefit the most vulnerable groups * How responsive were these intergenerational DRR projects to the vulnerabilities and capacities of children and young people, older people, persons with disabilities * How many beneficiaries have been involved in developing disaster preparedness and risk reduction initiatives which are implemented to benefit the most vulnerable groups? |
| 2.2 | Identification and implementation of resilience livelihood actions (one per kebele) which is responsive to the vulnerabilities and capacities of older people, through an intergenerational approach | * How many DRR actions with capacity to create resilience livelihood (one per kebele) were identified and implemented? * Who were involved in the planning, implementation and monitoring of these DRR initiatives at kebele level levels? * How suitable and responsive were these DRR actions to the vulnerabilities and capacities of vulnerable groups? * How many Planning and budget management sessions conducted to plan the current and future risk reduction interventions, * How many DRR actions with capacity to create resilience livelihood (one per kebele) were identified and implemented? * How many beneficiaries were actively involved in the implementation of the selected initiatives DRR resilience livelihoods actions? * What were the criteria’s involved in selecting these beneficiaries? * What are the type and number of livestock restocked under the Restocking of Drought Resistant Livestock? What is the current mortality rate of the restocked livestock? * What were the terms and conditions put for the use of unconditional cash transfer to support the selected most vulnerable beneficiaries with cash payments? Was there agreed ceiling rate for the cash payments? * How many beneficiaries were involved in the implementation of hay making small business ventures? * How suitable and responsive were these DRR actions to the vulnerabilities and capacities of vulnerable groups? * What were the impacts of these various DRR small scale resilience livelihood actions? * How many beneficiaries have been involved in identification and implementation DRR actions with capacity to create resilience livelihood (one per kebele) were? |
| 2.3 | Budget management sessions with older people and other vulnerable groups with community financing structures to plan the implementation of current and future risk reduction interventions which are responsive to their vulnerabilities | * What are the types of training sessions which have been implemented by the project? * How many Planning and budget management sessions conducted to plan the current and future risk reduction interventions? * Who participated on these Planning and budget management sessions? * How many inter-generational clubs have received budget management trainings sessions? * What was the outcome of the training in terms of improving capability of the inter-generational clubs to plan, implement and monitor their activities and financial resources? |
| **R-3** | **Increased learning among DRR actors and institutions of vulnerable group’s intergeneration risk reduction and preparedness actions through learning, evaluation and Advocacy.** | |
| 3.1 | 1 X 3 day workshop in Addis to launch the project, , identify vulnerability expert panel and to design a DRR inclusion framework for vulnerable groups and intergenerational approaches to help guide the project and other DRR partners | * When and where was the project launching workshop conducted? Number of male and female participants? * What was contribution of the workshop in helping guide the project and other DRR partners? * What other workshops were organized to create forum for the Vulnerability Expert Panel (VEP) so as to discuss? * The proposed DRR inclusive Framework for vulnerable groups and * Inter-generational approaches to help guide the project and other DRR partners? * What was the outcome of these workshops? * Was there any efforts made disseminate these outcomes to other DRR actors in the country and beyond? |
| 3.2 | Set up of Vulnerability specialist panel data base | * What is the status of setting up an online vulnerability expert database? * Was there any efforts made to contribute materials to REGLAP learning, evaluation and advocacy discussions in the East Africa region, country learning group in Ethiopia, and website content? |
| 3.3 | Project research to identify 6 good practice case studies from past experiences and activities under result 1 and 2 and document them for publication | * What is the status of conducting Research and identify case studies on best DRR practices in Borena zone * What are the basis for developing these good practice case studies on best DRR practices? * How many of these good practice case studies identified and documented for publication? * Was there any efforts made to disseminate these good practice case studies to other DRR actors in the country and beyond? |
| 3.4 | Produce 6 short films and monthly public radio broadcasts on innovative intergenerational DRR interventions | * What is the status of producing short films and monthly public radio broadcasts on innovative intergenerational DRR interventions? * How many of these short films and monthly public radio sessions broadcasted? * What was the outcome of these broadcasts? |
| 3.5 | Production of 4 technical briefs on the design and implementation of OP led intergenerational DRR activities for DRR practioners | * What is the status of producing technical briefs on the design and implementation of older people led intergenerational DRR activities for DRR practitioners * How many of these technical briefs produced for DRR practitioners? * Was there any efforts made to disseminate these technical briefs to other DRR actors in the country and beyond? |
| 3.6 | Organize at least three learning workshops (school, community meeting, ...) by DRR clubs to promote the intergenerational approach and participation of vulnerable groups in planning and intervention community initiatives | * Were there any workshops conducted in schools and community centres by intergenerational DRR clubs to promote the intergenerational approach and participation of vulnerable groups in planning and intervention community initiatives? * When and where were these workshops in schools and community centres conducted? Number of male and female participants? * What was contribution of these workshops in promoting the intergenerational approach and participation of vulnerable groups in planning and intervention community initiatives? |
| 3.7 | 8 Advocacy and learning events linked to the Day for DRR and other DRR related events to promote the learning of the project to local and INGO and government policy makers and programme staff | * What arrangements have been made to organize the learning events linking to the Day of DRR * When and where were these advocacy and learning events conducted? Number of male and female participants in the events? * What was contribution of these advocacy and learning events in promoting the learning of the project to local and INGO and government policy makers and program staff? |
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1. Oromo society is modeled on Geda. A complex system of social organization where Geda elders hold particularly important roles with high levels of decision making [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. *DRM SPIF- Disaster Risk Management and Food Security Sector of the Ethiopian Ministry of Agriculture* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. *Busa gonofa. There is a culture where clans agree to give animals to the ones who lost their cattle due to disaster and the like. The clan will decide how many cattle should be contributed by the individuals for the individual in question. This is not true for those who mismanaged their resource.* [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
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